Mixing Business with Pleasure: The Impact of Blended Relationships on Emotion

Work in Organizations

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Stacy Lynn Fitzpatrick-Timm

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Susanne Jones

March 2011

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the many people whose support has been invaluable to me during my doctoral work. First of all, I would like to thank my adviser, Dr. Susanne Jones. I cannot express how influential her advice and guidance has been during my doctoral program. The basis for this dissertation began in a course with Dr. Jones. I am grateful for her advice, feedback, and support in helping me learn how to develop those ideas as a scholar.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Dean Hewes, Dr. Ascan Koerner, and Dr. Jeff Simpson, for their support and feedback. They were each influential in helping me create a more focused and directed study.

I would also like thank all of the friends and the colleagues I have been fortunate enough to have had in my life during this process, especially Naomi Kagawa, Eunsoon Lee, Karen Kelly, Elizabeth Grayden, and Jerie McArthur. Their continued support and friendship, both socially and professionally, has enriched my life in so many ways. Also, thank you to my friends and dance companions, who offered encouragement and humor throughout this process.

Finally, I am so grateful for my family and their continued love and support during this journey. My mom and dad, brothers, sister, grandfather, grandmother, aunts, uncles, cousins and extended family have provided me with continuous love and support over the years. Also, thank you to my husband, Brian Timm, for being so patient, for supporting me, and for constant encouragement.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family.

Abstract

The current study examined status-different blended relationships in the workplace. Relational Framing Theory was applied as a means of understanding the two primary functions of workplace blended relationships. Two hundred and twenty-four subjects, employed both full and part time, were asked to complete an online survey about their experience and management of emotional stress during a conflict with a superior. Results indicated that employees maintained four types of blended relationships in the workplace. Furthermore, intensity of emotional stress experienced during conflict and the preferred emotion work strategy in response to this stress was dependent upon the type of blended relationship maintained. This study provides insight into how employees view their blended relationships and how work and social functions of workplace relationships are managed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Mixing Business with Pleasure: The Impact of Blended Relationships on Emotion

Work in Organizations

The average American family spends in excess of 110 hours per week at

work (Bernstein, 2004). One outcome of spending so much time at work is a

change in the functional nature of interpersonal relationships employees form and

sustain with each other at work. The formation of interpersonal relationships

among people in an organization becomes particularly problematic when those

interpersonal relationships are between workers at different levels of the

organizational hierarchy. Consider, for example, a lower level employee who has

developed both a work and casual friendship with a supervisor. In this case, that

relationship is likely serving multiple functions for both the employee and the

superior. This, in turn, influences the expectations for and maintenance of that

relationship (see Burleson & Samter, 1994).

Above and beyond *work relationships*, which serve an instrumental

function and which emphasize goal-oriented interactions employees engage in to

complete tasks (Bridge & Baxter, 1992), *social relationships* fulfill psychological

needs such as connectedness, inclusion, and affiliation (Burleson & Samter,

1994). Relationships that serve both a social and work function are most

accurately defined as *blended relationships* (Bridge & Baxter, 1992). While they

are task-oriented and facilitate the accomplishment of work-related goals, blended

relationships also provide enjoyment, advice, nurturance, or information. It is

precisely for this social function that a blended relationship between employees at different levels of an organizational hierarchy can be a potential source of emotional stress because the demands and functions of social relationships may clash with those of traditional "work-only" relationships (see the above letter). This emotional stress is further exacerbated if employees hold different statuses (e.g., superior-subordinate) because the subordinate may be under greater pressure to conform to the work and social expectations of the superior.

Goals and Advances of the Current Study

In this project I examine how employees manage the emotional demands of blended relationships they form and sustain at work. As I suggested earlier, a blended relationship is one in which an employee maintains a relationship with another employee (particularly a supervisor) that serves two functions, namely a work and a social function. The demands of these two functions are not always congruent with each other. Specifically, it is the social dimension of a blended relationship that tends to generate turmoil and stress. When the two relational functions are not congruent with one another, employees must choose which relational function will guide their behavior and determine if and how they will resolve the relational incongruence. If employees attend to the work function of a blended relationship and forgo social functions, such as the continued sharing of personal information, employees risk losing support and acceptance. However, if employees attend to the social function of a blended relationship and forgo the

work function, they may not be able to complete work-related tasks, thus jeopardizing their chance for promotion or increasing the risk of job loss. If they attempt to integrate the two incompatible functions, yet cannot, employees may become frustrated and emotionally stressed.

It seems that most of us have some form of blended relationships, yet the advantages, challenges, or mechanisms of these relationships have rarely been fully examined. While the nature of blended relationship has received little scholarly attention, emotion management in the workplace has been examined extensively (for a review, see Ashkanasy & Zerbe, & Härtel, 2002). One reason for this extensive research is that organizations profit from successful stress management among their employees. Blended relationships play a substantial role in the way employees experience and subsequently cope with stress. Thus, to be more precise, in my dissertation project I examine whether and to what extent incongruent blended relationships are a source of stress for employees and how these employees subsequently cope with their stress.

This project has a number of theoretical advances. First, it examines the dynamics of blended relationships in the workplace from the perspective of Relational Framing Theory and determines the degree to which the functions of relationships are represented by the relational frames identified by Dillard and Solomon (2005). Extant research on blended relationships focuses on the formation of friendships among professionals (Gibbons & Olk, 2003), dialectical

tensions experienced in blended relationships (Bridge & Baxter, 1992), and perceptions of equity in blended relationships (Kingsley-Westerman, Park, & Lee, 2007). In this project, I synthesize these theoretical strands by providing a common language by which to examine blended relationships.

Identifying the underlying dynamics of blended relationships leads to the second theoretical contribution of this project, namely the advancement of current emotion work theory. I propose that the relational frames that guide both work and social functions of blended relationships significantly influence the emotion work strategies employees use to cope with emotional stress. However, I stipulate that novelty moderates the relationship between these relational frames and emotion work coping strategies. By novelty I mean the extent to which a stressful event at work occurs for the first time. I examine novel stress events because repeated exposure to conflict in a blended relationship, particularly if the context and stimulus are the same, facilitates the development of scripts for how to cope with that conflict, thereby reducing the likelihood of emotional stress. Thus, emotional stress is likely to be greater in unique stress situations because employees do not have a script for how to handle the clash between the two functions of their blended relationship.

A final theoretical advancement of this project is that it integrates research in organizational and interpersonal communication. Specifically, this project highlights the reciprocal influence of social and work functions on workplace

relationships and how these blended relationships can ultimately influence organizational variables, such as motivation or job satisfaction (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). For example, imagine Terry is in a blended relationship with his supervisor Ehren and experiences a conflict between the work and social functions of this relationship. Most commonly, researchers examine organizational output variables measured from the perspective of Terry's relationship with the organization he works *for*, not with respect to his relationship with the people he works *with*. The problem with this approach is that it minimizes the fact that organizations are comprised of people and their relationships with each other. Thus, the "interpersonal" (or social) dimension of an organization is frequently ignored. If Terry experiences a clash between the work and social functions of his blended relationship with Ehren, the emotional stress experienced in response to this conflict might have implications for Terry's motivation, attitude, work performance, and evaluations of his work.

Finally, from a pragmatic perspective, this project provides a more reliable means of determining how successfully an employee can be integrated into a work environment. For example, despite the fact that personality factors have been shown to have limited reliability in determining whether an individual will be a good fit in an organization, these factors are still used to make hiring decisions or to evaluate the performance of current employees (Hunthausen, Truxillo, Bauer, & Hammer, 2003). Since organizations are comprised of people,

an understanding of how people relate to their colleagues would be a more effective means of assessing how well someone fits into an organizational culture.

Preview

The theoretical foundation of my dissertation is Relational Framing Theory, which identifies three cognitive dimensions that meaningfully differentiate interpersonal relationships employees seek and maintain at work. Consequently, I first elaborate on Relational Framing Theory before I discuss emotion work and the types of strategies people use to engage in emotion management. I then examine some of the unique challenges that work relationships present to the application of RFT. Afterward, I present my hypotheses and the methods I used to test these hypotheses. Finally, I present the results of this study and the implications of these results. I close with a discussion of the limitations of this study and potential directions for future research.

Conceptualizing Interpersonal Relationships in Organizations

Relational Framing Theory

Relational Framing Theory (RFT) suggests that people make sense of interpersonal relationships and "particularly ambiguous nonverbal cues" through the use of organized knowledge structures called *relational frames* (Dillard & Solomon, 2005, p. 325). Relational frames streamline the communication process by calling attention to certain features of a relationship rather than others and by providing insight into which behaviors might be most appropriate and effective in

a particular situation (Dillard & Solomon, 2005).

There are three dimensions that characterize all interpersonal relationships. The first of these dimensions is referred to as *dominance-submission*. This dimension assesses the degree to which people perceive one another as more or less controlling or in some way influencing the behavior of another. In other words, in relationships characterized by this dimension, one person yields, submits, or complies with another person—see Dillard 2002 (Solomon, Dillard, & Palmer, 1999; Dillard & Solomon, 2005). While this dimension plays a role in every interpersonal relationship, it may be particularly relevant in relationships we form with people at work. For example, when employees are asked by their superiors to complete a task, the superiors have control over the employees' behavior to the extent that the employees could be denied promotions, receive bad evaluations, or even lose their jobs if they do not complete the task.

A second relational frame is *affiliation-disaffiliation*; it is concerned with the level of appreciation or respect people show one another. This frame refers to the degree to which people report liking, affection, or positive regard for each other. It is particularly relevant for social relationships and provides a way of understanding how messages, especially those concerned with the exchange of private or personal information rather than task-related information, might be interpreted in social relationships at work.

The final frame, *involvement*, refers to the degree to which individuals are interested, engaged, or active in a relationship (Dillard & Solomon, 2005). Involvement is not a frame that is mutually exclusive from either dominance or affiliation. Instead, Dillard and Solomon (2005) conceive of involvement as an *intensifier* that makes a particular relationship type more or less salient. Applied to the two relational functions I examine here, a low level of involvement in a social relationship suggests that the affiliative nature of the relationship is not as prominent as it is in a social relationship characterized by a high level of involvement. A low level of involvement in a work relationship would suggest that the functions of the work relationship, namely task accomplishment, are not as high of a priority as they would be in a work relationship characterized by a high level of involvement. In short, involvement moderates the extent to which a relationship is more or less dominant and more or less affiliative. Involvement thus plays a crucial role in complex blended relationships, because the level of involvement in a work relationship is not necessarily indicative of the level of involvement in a social relationship.

A core assumption of RFT is that although dominance and affiliation are two separate dimensions, people cannot simultaneously use both frameworks to guide their judgments and subsequent behaviors in any given situation (Solomon, Dillard, & Anderson, 2002). In most situations, one frame is more prominent than the other. However, even at times when one frame is more prominent, the less

prominent frame is not entirely absent, a phenomenon referred to as *differential salience.* Solomon et al. (2002) found that the effect of differential salience was consistent regardless of the sex composition of a dyad.

Although Dillard and Solomon (2005) suggest that these frames are largely mutually exclusive, Solomon et al. (2002) found that anxiety over relationships correlated positively with both the dominance and affiliation frames when examining the function of relational frames in attachment relationships. More specifically, they found that increased anxiety was associated with a greater level of awareness of "relationship information in general" (p.149). Individuals with attachment anxieties placed a high level of importance on both dominance and affiliation frames. According to the authors, individuals who developed an anxious attachment orientation to their romantic partner often "consider themselves unworthy of relationships and question others' motives for becoming involved in them," (p. 140). As a result, individuals with attachment anxieties become more vigilant in their evaluations of the relational information exchanged in their relationships. Solomon et al. (2002) suggest that an inability or reluctance to dismiss one of these two competing relational frames hinders people's ability to understand social situations, thereby creating higher levels of anxiety. Solomon & McLaren (2008) echoed this in their clarification of the role of RFT in how people process ambiguous relational messages in a variety of circumstances, asserting that attempts to incorporate both frames as guides for individual behavior

"undermine efficient processing" (p. 107), thus becoming more cognitively taxing and uncomfortable for the individual.

This suggests that although RFT predicts that only one relational frame guides behavior at a time, there are some times when individuals view both frames as having high levels of importance. Furthermore, when individuals who place high levels of importance on both frames encounter a situation in which they feel they must choose either the dominance or affiliation frame to guide their behavior, they experience higher levels of anxiety. Herein lies one of the primary limitations of RFT; it does not address the speed with which one relational frame becomes more relevant, nor does it address individuals' ability to shift between frames (Solomon & McLaren, 2008).

The dual nature of workplace relationships provides an ideal context for examination of this limitation for two reasons. First, there is a need for frequent shifts between work and social tasks during the course of the work day. Second, and perhaps more importantly, individuals have a general tendency toward selection of the affiliation frame (Tusing, 2000). Furthermore, Tusing (2000), in examination of a variety of feedback scenarios, found that across all manipulations, affiliation was seen as more relevant that dominance. In other words, there is a preference for the affiliation frame to guide our behaviors. This same preference may be found in the workplace.

As noted above, people spend a majority of their waking hours in the

workplace with their colleagues. It would seem logical that the relational frame guiding individuals' behavior in the workplace may shift more frequently between the dominance and affiliation frames than in other types of interpersonal relationships. Additionally, in light of the affiliation bias noted above, employees may find themselves "defaulting" to a social relationship until a situation presents itself that indicates that the dominance frame is more relevant. Once that situation is resolved, they then return to their social "default." For example, during the course of the day, Jo's behavior is not necessarily immediately directed by her supervisor Riley. She may see their relationship as more social on a general basis, but momentarily shift to a work relationship with faced with situations that highlight the power difference, such as a performance review or workplace conflict.

Conceptualizing Blended Relationships at Work

Despite organizational barriers employees develop social relationships in addition to the work relationships they already have with one another (Gibbons & Olk, 2003; Sias & Cahill, 1998). The increased number of hours people spend at work also increases their proximity to and time spent with colleagues. As they interact more frequently with each other, most employees likely also disclose private issues, go out for lunch or happy hour with one another, and gossip about unrelated events (e.g., colleagues or social events). Extensive research demonstrates that factors such as prolonged time spent together in close proximity

and increased self-disclosure facilitate friendship formation (Hays, 1984; 1985).

Developing a social relationship with a colleague is beneficial for a number of reasons. As Tukuno (1986) noted, friendships are important sources of support, especially during difficult economic times. Gibbons and Olk (2003) found that shared experiences contributed to friendship formation among graduate and professional students. In instances where similarity in experience began to differ, those friendships waned. For instance, employees are in the proverbial same boat when it comes to suffering under a difficult supervisor and these kinds of stressful events experienced at work are often difficult to explain to intimate partners and family members, who do not know the supervisors and who might therefore not empathize that well with the employee. It would seem then, that blended relationships offer the best of both relational worlds: Employees receive support from and affiliate with the same people with whom they accomplish tasks.

However, blended relationships may also be a source of distress as is illustrated in the *Dear Margo* letter. Employees may experience a conflict between the expectations associated with the task that needs to be fulfilled (i.e., the functions associated with the work relationship) and the expectations associated with the social function of that relationship (i.e., providing support, sharing experiences, socializing). This functional dissonance may cause emotional stress (Bridge & Baxter, 1992; Solomon, 2006). Consider, for instance, two

people in a blended relationship: an employee, Pat, and a superior, Chris. Pat and Chris work together to meet deadlines and complete projects. The dominance-submissiveness frame dictates that Pat's status as Chris's superior overrules disagreements in decision-making on the task and that Chris would comply with Pat. But Pat and Chris are also friends. Consequently, the affiliation frame also guides their interactions.

So long as the RFT dimensions guiding Pat and Chris's interactions are clearly defined, there is no dissonance. However, as this example illustrates, there are times when identifying which relational frame is most relevant is not an easy task in blended relationships. RFT suggests that when people encounter messages that generate conflicting relational frames, they will access the one relational frame that is relevant for that particular relationship. It is this frame that will guide message perception, interpretation, and creation. In the organizational context, it is most likely the social dimension of a blended relationship that is affected, because it is that frame that is least guided by organizational norms and expectations. Returning to the example of Pat and Chris, let us imagine that Pat learned that the organization will downsize and that Chris could potentially be laid off. If this relationship were solely a work relationship, the dominance frame would dictate that Pat not say anything to Chris because it may violate organizational policy or may be perceived as favoritism of Chris over other employees with whom Pat does not have a blended relationship. If this

relationship were purely a social relationship, the affiliation frame would suggest that Pat be supportive of Chris and indicate there may be layoffs in the company so that Chris could be prepared for that possibility. However, because this is a blended relationship that serves both a work and social function, Pat cannot be guided entirely by the expectations of work relationships, nor can she be guided entirely by the expectations of her social relationship with Chris. The dominance-submission frame that defines work relationships, as well as the affiliation-disaffiliation frame that defines social relationships characterizes Chris and Pat's relationship. This dual-frame relationship has now become problematic because dominance and affiliation are, for the most part, mutually exclusive relational frames (Dillard & Solomon, 2005). When employees in blended relationships experience relational frame ambiguity or dissonance, they are faced with the challenge of determining which frame should guide their subsequent behavior. In short, Pat needs to determine which relational frame to access to guide any subsequent behaviors; a process that poses several relational dilemmas and that causes immense emotional stress.

This study focuses on novel, nonrecurring conflicts in blended relationship. Research indicates that repeated exposure to recurring situations prompts people to develop scripts to manage those situations (Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Huesmann, 1988). Scripts are routinized cognitive-behavioral patterns people use in response to recurring events. When conflict

situations are frequently experienced, individuals are more likely to refer to the relevant script to guide behavior. Reliance on cognitive scripts creates a lack of variance in responses, particularly with respect to emotion coping strategies (i.e., deep and surface acting). For example, imagine that Joe has a blended relationship with his supervisor Andy. Joe frequently experiences conflict in this blended relationship because Andy always asks Joe to pick up his personal mail while Joe is out on his lunch break. Because Joe has experienced this conflict with Andy frequently, he knows that the easiest response is to just "grin and bear it." Joe has developed a surface acting script for approaching this conflict based on Andy's past responses.

However, when employees are faced with novel conflict situations, incongruence between the work and social functions of a blended relationship becomes particularly problematic because there are no definitive rules (or scripts) that indicate how to cope with the incongruence. Incongruence between relational frames coupled with uncertainty of how to respond to a novel conflict heightens the potential for emotional stress. As a result, employees must now attempt to manage the conflict and cope with emotional stress concurrently. The behaviors employees use to cope with emotional stress are referred to as emotion work, a construct I will discuss next.

<div style="text-align:center">Emotion Work</div>

Hochschild (1979) first used the construct "emotion work" as a means of

describing the way in which people attempt to modify their expressions of felt emotions to meet normative expectations for emotional expressions. Hochschild (1983) focused on corporate contexts and asserted that management of emotional expression in the workplace was necessary in order for employees to meet certain goals of the organization. Research on emotion work has continued to evolve in a variety of organizational contexts, including examination of the antecedents of emotion work (Grandey, 2000), the negative effects of emotion work (Giardini & Frese, 2006), moderators of emotion work (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005), and a variety of outcomes of emotion work such as emotional exhaustion (Grandey, 2003; Richards, 2004).

Much like physical work, emotion work requires a significant amount of effort on the part of the employee. In order to reach organizational goals, employees must constantly be aware of whether their emotional expressions are in line with the organization's expectations. Not only must employees work to reconcile incongruence between their emotional experiences and expressions, but employees are also faced with the unpleasant realization that, at least for the duration of their time at work, their employer has the right to govern "something as personal as emotions" (Grandey, 2000, p.96). Hochschild (1983) proposes that the effort required to express unfelt emotions and to engage in a task as unpleasant as emotion work can cause employees to feel stressed and burned out at their jobs.

The stress that results from the incongruence between the felt emotions and those expressed is referred to as emotional dissonance (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Zerbe, 2000). For example, imagine that the expectations for emotional expression at Adrian's organization are to express a cheerful, upbeat, and positive attitude at all times. When Adrian is already feeling this way, these expressions are in line with organizational expectations, and there is no emotional dissonance. However, when Adrian does not genuinely feel cheerful, upbeat, or positive, she must still express these emotions if she wants to effectively meet organizational goals. At this point, organizational expectations for emotional expression are no longer consistent with what she is feeling and Adrian is likely to experience emotional dissonance.

This example illustrates an important point about emotional dissonance: Because emotional dissonance occurs when there is a discrepancy between emotional experiences and expressions, not all employees who engage in emotion work will experience emotional dissonance (Morris & Feldman, 1997; Zerbe, 2000). For example, if Ryan does not perceive a discrepancy between the emotions he experiences at work and the way he is able to express those emotions, he will not experience emotional dissonance. However, if his employer expects him to convey a cheerful, happy demeanor in a situation where he is actually experiencing a great deal of frustration and annoyance, Ryan would experience emotional dissonance. Moreover, the way in which Ryan attempts to

manage his emotions can contribute to his experience of emotional dissonance. Specifically, the two primary coping mechanisms that are used to engage in emotion work, deep acting and surface acting, have different effects on emotion work (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Whereas deep acting strategies attempt to address and change the actual experience of emotion, surface acting strategies merely try to "cover emotion up." As a result, deep acting strategies have the potential to reduce any perceived discrepancies between the experience and expression of emotion because they focus on changing that emotional experience, whereas surface acting strategies do not attempt to change the experience of emotion. As a result, any felt discrepancy between the experience and expression may persist, thereby potentially exacerbating the amount of emotional dissonance experienced by an employee.

Emotional distress is particularly profound when employees experience a negative emotion, yet have to express a positive emotion (Lewig & Dollard, 2003, Zapf et al., 1999). This association is especially apparent when an individual tries to fake the expression of positive emotions. One explanation for this is that emotional dissonance mediates the relationship between the perception and expression of one's feelings. Individuals attempting to suppress negative emotions were more prone to feelings of inauthenticity, alienation, and irritation (Erickson & Ritter, 2001, Zapf et al., 1999).

Emotional dissonance has traditionally been measured by comparing

employees' self reported emotional experiences in a particular situation with their perception of the display rules for what emotions they were supposed to express. Specifically, individuals are asked to identify how intensely they felt a particular emotion as well as how intensely they expressed a given emotion. These assessments are compared to determine the discrepancy between emotional experience and expression; larger discrepancies are said to indicate greater emotional dissonance. However, these scales do not account for the fact that employees may not always be clear on what exactly is expected of them.

This operationalization may be problematic because reliability for display rule perception scales has generally been found to be low (Austin, Dore, & O'Donovan, 2008). Furthermore, measuring emotional stress in terms of a non-contextual measure such as mere dissonance limits the ability to compare the association of emotional stress with other contextually based outcome variables, such as job satisfaction. To ameliorate these shortcomings I choose to operationalize emotional dissonance using contextual emotional stress measures, such as emotional exhaustion, perceptions of personal achievement and depersonalization.

Employees cope with emotional stress by using either deep or surface acting strategies. When employees use *deep acting strategies*, they attempt to modify both emotional experiences and perceptions about a stress-invoking situation to subsequently match a set of normatively acceptable emotional

response reactions (Grandey, 2000). The goal of deep acting is to change one's

thoughts and feelings about an event so that the organizationally appropriate

emotional expression is consistent with the actual emotional experience. Deep

acting strategies are complex and difficult; they also usually require some form of

training and on-the-job-experience. Using the above example, if Ryan is aware

that he should be cheerful and happy while at work, he may choose to manage any

frustration he is feeling by reappraising the situation as a learning opportunity,

thereby managing his emotions via deep acting. Deep acting strategies are also

referred to as *antecedent-focused* strategies because they center on altering

perceptions about situations in order to facilitate the experience of the emotions

expected of them.

Grandey (2000) identified two antecedent-focused strategies; the first taps

emotional change, whereas the second taps perceived contextual change.

Attentional deployment involves invoking normatively appropriate emotional

responses associated with certain events and situations. The theatrical parallel is

referred to as "method acting." When using attentional deployment to cope with

the demands of emotion work, employees increase the salience of the emotions

their organization wants them to express. Thus for instance, Ryan might address

his frustration by reflecting on positive outcomes associated with a difficult

interaction, such as positive feedback from his supervisor, a promotion or raise, or

even an upcoming weekend social event. By focusing on events or outcomes that

would make him cheerful, Ryan will find it easier to express the appropriate emotional responses.

The second antecedent focused strategy, *cognitive change*, involves altering perceptions of stressful events to decrease the intensity of the emotional reaction (Grandey, 2000). Hochschild (1983) refers to the example of flight attendants who are encouraged to "appraise" indignant passengers as children. Flight attendants might then be better able to manage the stress associated with angry or rude passengers because they could view the situation as a challenge rather than source of stress.

There are several additional deep acting strategies that might be relevant for the current study. Research on relational maintenance behaviors discusses antecedent focused strategies as a means of maintaining interpersonal relationships (Stafford & Canary, 1991). For example, *positivity* is the degree to which people act cheerfully and pleasantly when interacting with their relational partner. A second relational maintenance strategy, *assurances*, focuses on the degree to which people communicate certainty about the future of the relationship to their partner. As the word "acting" suggests, there may be times when people may not genuinely feel positive or certain about the future of a given relationship. However, in order to be more effective at maintaining a relationship, both of these relational maintenance strategies require that a person to modify their perceptions about their relationship.

S*urface acting emotion work strategies* involve attempts to manipulate the expression of an emotion that has already been felt (Grandey, 2000). This form of emotion work is referred to as *response modulation* in that it serves as a form of "damage control" in response to the felt emotion (Grandey, 2000, Richards & Gross, 2000). This can be accomplished by expressing an entirely contradictory emotion, reducing the intensity of a felt emotion, or by striving to convey no emotion at all (Grandey, 2000). Because surface acting strategies do not address the discrepancy between what is actually felt and what is being expressed, these coping mechanisms do not reduce the degree to which an employee might experience emotional dissonance. Instead, they focus on the employee going through the motions to express the desired emotions and thereby meet company determined display rules.

There are four general types of surface acting, each of which involves different facial expression techniques that have been drawn from Ekman and Friesen's (1969) work on nonverbal display rules. The first, *neutralizing*, involves attempting to convey no emotion at all. For example, imagine that Catherine recently found out that she received an important promotion. Although she is ecstatic, she knows that she is expected to maintain a modest, controlled demeanor. If Catherine neutralized her emotions, she would attempt to hide her excitement about the promotion and express no emotion.

The second, *masking*, involves the expression of an emotion that one does

not genuinely feel. Imagine that Catherine had not wanted the responsibility of the promotion and was not happy she received it. Masking would involve expressing gratitude or perhaps happiness at being promoted, despite the fact that her actual response was negative. The third, *intensifying,* involves amplification of an emotion. For example, if Catherine had gotten a rather small raise, she might express a great deal more joy than she actually felt in order to appear appreciative.

Finally, the last type is *deintensifying*. Deintensifying involves muting the intensity of a felt emotion. For example, Catherine might not express a great deal of surprise at receiving the promotion because she does not want her boss to think she doesn't deserve it. Thus, her expression would convey a lower level of surprise (Ekman & Friesen, 1969). Each of these strategies, masking in particular, is representative of surface acting in that there is no attempt to reconcile cognitive perceptions of an emotional experience; only the outward expression of an emotional experience is modified.

Both surface and deep acting strategies have been associated with a variety of organizational and relational outcomes, although the specific outcomes for each strategy differ. Deep acting emotion work strategies are generally associated with positive performance outcomes. For example, the cognitive costs associated with surface acting were not significant when individuals engaged in deep acting (Richards & Gross, 2000). Grandey (2003) found that deep acting was not related to emotional exhaustion in organizations, but was related to affective

delivery, which referred to the degree to which the emotional expression was perceived to be genuine in a service interaction. Furthermore, Brotheridge & Grandey (2002) found that, unlike surface acting, deep acting was associated with a "greater sense of personal efficacy at work" (p.17). Deep acting has also been associated with emotional competence, a psychological resource related to individual's ability to effectively cope with potentially stressful affective input (Giardini & Frese, 2006).

Taken together, deep acting is associated with consistently more positive outcomes than surface acting. One explanation for this finding may be that deep acting changes an individual's assessment of an emotional experience, thereby reducing the experience of emotional dissonance associated with the event. (Grandey, 2003; Richards, 2004). One assumption of the effects of deep acting is that individuals are aware of and understand the display rules associated the appropriate emotional expressions in a given environment and are thus able to engage in the reappraisal process associated with deep acting. In contrast, surface acting does not reduce the discrepancy between the experience and expression of emotion. As a result, employees would continue to experience emotional dissonance.

Surface acting emotion work strategies are frequently associated with negative outcomes. For example, Richards and Gross (2000) found that engagement in surface acting was associated with cognitive costs such as

impaired memory and decreased ability to perform concurrent tasks. Further, faking the display of emotions not actually felt is stressful and emotionally exhausting, and has also been associated with decreased job satisfaction (Grandey, 2000; 2003; Richards, 2004). Emotion work via surface acting has also been associated with poor health and impaired coping ability (Grandey, 2000). A particularly interesting point raised by Richards and Gross (2003) is that the negative impact of surface acting on memory may have implications for social relationships in general, as poor memory for social interactions may be associated with greater misunderstanding and relational dissatisfaction. This sentiment is echoed by Lopes, Salovey Côté, and Beer, (2005), who found that individuals who were better at emotion work were rated by their peers as being more interpersonally sensitive and that interactions with these individuals were rated as being of higher quality.

Although the benefits of deep acting emotion work strategies outweigh the benefits of surface acting emotion management strategies, it is important to note that there are some situations in which surface acting may be preferable. For example, employees who have tried to engage in deep acting and failed to successfully change their perceptions may become frustrated and resort to surface acting emotion work as a last resort. Surface acting may also be beneficial when individuals are required to move from a positive emotion to a negative or neutral emotion. For example, if Riley finds out that she is getting a promotion, she is

likely to experience a lot of positive emotions. However, when she is around coworkers who wanted that particular promotion and did not get it, Riley's expression of positive emotions may convey arrogance or immodesty about her achievements, which may cause her coworkers to view her more negatively.

Summary

Thus far, I have discussed how relationships frequently serve multiple functions in organizational settings. That is, these blended relationships serve both a work and social function for employees. I presented Relational Framing Theory as a framework for understanding the different dimensions of the work and social functions. In particular, relationships that serve a work function were associated with a dominance-submission frame and relationships that serve a social function were associated with an affiliation-disaffiliation framework. The third frame in RFT, involvement, moderates the relationship between dominance-submission and affiliation-disaffiliation. When involvement in the dominance frame is high, dominance will have a greater influence on subsequent verbal and nonverbal behavior. Similarly, high levels of involvement in the affiliation frame result in increased influence of the affiliation frame on verbal and nonverbal communication. I have also considered how examination of workplace relationships can help address a primary limitation of RFT, in that is does not provide for how quickly or frequently shifts occur between the use of different relational frames.

I have also discussed the influence of novelty of experience with incongruence between work and social functions of relationships, emphasizing the complications that arise when employees form blended relationships with their superiors. Specifically, I discussed how the experience of emotional dissonance causes emotional stress in blended relationships, particularly when an employee of lower organizational status encounters a novel experience of incongruence between the work and social functions of their blended relationship with a superior. Finally, existing literature on emotion work was presented and two specific styles of engaging in emotion work, namely deep acting and surface acting. What is missing from the existing literature on emotion work, however, is consideration of how emotion work might occur in blended relationships, which is what I will discuss next.

<div align="center">Emotion Work in Blended Relationships</div>

Blended relationships are those relationships that consist of both a task and a social dimension. As discussed earlier, research has examined the formation of blended relationships and has also used blended relationships as a way in which to study perceptions of equity in relationships. However, there has been no examination of what functions blended relationships serve for the people in them. This study attempts to provide a theoretical framework for understanding the functions that blended relationships serve for employees. Thus I advance two research questions:

RQ1a: Is dominance positively correlated with the work function of a blended relationship?

RQ1b: Is affiliation positively correlated with the social function of a blended relationship?

As noted earlier, involvement is a variable that intensifies high levels of dominance and high levels of affiliation. In other words, it is highly correlated with the relational frame that is currently active (Dillard et al., 1999). Therefore, when dominance is high, involvement is positively related to dominance. As a result, dominance then guides an employee's verbal and nonverbal communication. Likewise, when affiliation is high, involvement is positively correlated with affiliation, thereby causing employees to access the affiliation frame as a guide for their verbal and nonverbal communication as opposed to the dominance frame.

Much of the research conducted using RFT (Dillard et al., 1996, Solomon et al., 2002, Tusing, 2001) has primarily focused on the use of relational frames to guide behavior in non-workplace interpersonal relationships. When a particular relational frame is clearly relevant, involvement should have a larger correlation to that frame (Dillard et al., 1999). In blended relationships, however, it may not always be clear how and in what ways involvement intensifies the two relational frames. It may be that involvement intensifies dominance in particular, a frame that may be activated more frequently in status-different work relationships than

in intimate relationships. It may also be that involvement plays an important role when the affiliation frame is activated. Rajan and Wolf (2003), for instance, note that organizational hierarchies have become flatter over time thus potentially reducing the impact of dominance on superior-subordinate relationships. In addition, increased amount of time spent at work may further facilitate blended relationships (and thus the formation of social relationships) between people of different organizational status. Because it is unclear how involvement intensifies the two relational frames in blended relationships at work, the following research questions are proposed:

RQ2a: How does involvement influence the dominance frame in a status-different blended relationship?

RQ2b: How does involvement influence the affiliation frame in a status-different blended relationship?

Dillard et al. (1999) argue that high involvement in one relational frame inhibits the salience of the other relational frame. However, there is no empirical evidence supporting this assertion. Examining relational frames in blended relationships would not only test this claim, but would also provide an opportunity to examine how employees in blended relationships deal with competing relational frames. Next are predictions about the different types of blended relationships (see Appendix A).

In blended relationships where both dominance and affiliation frames are

high (HD-HA) the potential for incongruence between the dominance and affiliation frames of the blended relationship is greatest. In HD-HA relationships both the work-related goals associated with the dominance frame and the social goals associated with the affiliation frame are salient. However, these two goals are not always compatible with one other. When employees in HD-HA blended relationships experience incompatibility between the dominance and affiliation frames, they are more likely to experience emotional stress resulting from competing demands on their verbal and nonverbal communication. For example, the affiliation frame may direct an employee to disclose information and seek support from their superior while, at the same time, the dominance frame may direct an employee to remain professional and not seek that support. The employee cannot perform both behaviors effectively and must therefore choose one frame over the other. The potential for incongruence between the dominance and affiliation frames is greatest when both frames are salient. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed (Appendix A, cell 1).

H1a: Employees are more likely to report experiencing emotional stress in relationships that are HD-HA than in relationships that are not HD-HA.

Several factors influence an employee's choice to use deep or surface acting strategies to manage emotion (Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005). For example, employees' perceptions of the content of display rules can influence their choice to engage in deep or surface acting. When the perception was that

employees should hide negative emotions, they were more likely to use surface acting. Conversely, when employees perceived that they should express positive emotions they did not feel, they were more likely to use deep acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005).

Furthermore, two situational variables were found to be predictive of engagement in deep acting. The first, routineness (as opposed to novelty), refers to the degree to which interactions are repetitive or scripted. The less routine the interaction, the more likely an employee was to use deep acting to manage emotions. The second variable, duration, refers to how long an interaction lasted. The longer the interaction, the more likely employees were to use deep acting strategies.

There are several reasons why both of these variables are relevant to relationships in which the affiliation frame is high. First, increased levels of self-disclosure require increased time spent together. Employees are less likely to disclose personal information to superiors with whom they rarely interact. Second, if RFT is indeed an accurate reflection of the work and social functions of relationships, then relationships high in affiliation can be expected to serve the social function rather than the work function. Interactions associated with the social function of relationships are not goal directed and therefore less likely to be repetitive. For example, if Joe's relationship served a work function, his relationship with his superior may develop a routine because he would interact

with that superior for the same reasons as he completed the everyday tasks associated with his job. In contrast, if Joe's relationship served a social function, the goals of interaction would not necessarily be the same for every interaction. Therefore, I expect that when affiliation is high, routineness in the relationship will be low, resulting in a preference for deep acting. The following hypothesis is proposed:

> H1b: Employees who perceive their HD-HA blended relationships as stressful are more likely to utilize deep acting strategies to manage that emotional stress than employees in all other blended relationships.

> When dominance is low and affiliation is high (LD-HA), employees are more likely to rely on the behavioral expectations associated with the social function of that relationship. In this situation, the relative importance of self-disclosure, acceptance, and providing support to a superior increases as compared to the importance of accomplishing work-related tasks. In LD-HA relationships, this results in increased pressure for employees to come across as sincere when interacting with their superiors, especially in situations in which they experience emotional stress. In light of this, the following hypotheses are proposed (Appendix A, cell 2):

> H2a: Employees are more likely to report experiencing emotional stress in relationships that are LD-HA than in relationships that are HD-LA or LD-LA.

H2b: Employees are less likely to report experiencing emotional stress in

relationships that are LD-HA than in relationships that are HD-HA.

H2c: When employees in LD-HA blended relationships report

experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize deep acting

strategies to manage that emotional stress than in relationships that are

HD-LA or LD-LA.

Employees in blended relationships marked by high dominance and low

affiliation (HD-LA) would most likely rely on the behavioral expectations

associated with the work function of that relationship for two reasons. First,

behaviors associated with the instrumental nature of the work function of a

relationship become more salient. As a result, high dominance and low affiliation

increase the importance of task accomplishment in the workplace and decrease

the importance of engaging in self-disclosure and conveying acceptance for a

coworker. Second, high levels of dominance and low levels of affiliation can

convey a sense of formality, causing employees to be more aware of their roles

within the organization and increasing the likelihood that they will act in

accordance with those organizationally defined roles. For example, if Devon is

working with a superior on a work related task, Devon's relatively less powerful

position may demand deference to that superior when there is a disagreement on

how to accomplish a particular task. Therefore, the following hypotheses are

proposed (Appendix A, cell 3):

H3a: Employees are less likely to report experiencing emotional stress in relationships that are HD-LA than in relationships that are HD-HA or LD-HA.

H3b: Employees are more likely to report experiencing emotional stress in relationships that are HD-LA than in relationships that are LD-LA.

H3c: When employees in HD-LA blended relationships report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize surface acting strategies to manage their emotional stress than in relationships that are HD-HA or LD-HA.

Blended relationships in which the dominance and affiliation frames are both low in involvement (LD-LA) have the least potential for causing emotional stress. Many employees may not even consider LD-LA relationships a blended relationship because those superiors may not have any direct organizational authority over the employee, nor are they someone the employee chooses to disclose to or seek support from. Thus, this type of blended relationship would have the least impact on an employee's experience of emotional stress. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed (Appendix A, cell 4):

H4a: Employees are least likely to report experiencing emotional stress in relationships that are LD-LA than in relationships that are not LD-LA.

H4b: When employees in LD-LA blended relationships do report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize surface

acting strategies to manage that emotional stress than employees in blended relationships that are not LD-LA.

Method

Research Design

Appendix A represents the study design and reflects a 2 (high, low dominance) x 2 (high, low affiliation) factorial design. Research shows that several dispositional factors (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, self-monitoring) may influence the extent to which employees experience and cope with emotional stress at work (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002, Diefendorff et al. 2005). Therefore, I have controlled for these variables.

Sample

Subjects included 224 students enrolled in communication classes at a large Midwestern university and a moderately sized community college. Subjects at the large university received extra credit in exchange for their participation. Those enrolled in courses at the community college were given the option to enter into a raffle to receive a gift card in exchange for their participation. Sixty-nine subjects (30.80%) were male, 146 (65.18%) were female, and nine declined to respond. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 66 ($M = 24.08$, $SD = 7.99$).

Fifty-seven subjects (25.45%) were employed more than 30 hours per week an 167 (74.55%) were employed less than 30 hours per week ($M = 16.95$, $SD = 7.23$). On average, subjects reported being employed at their current job

approximately three years ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 4.73$). The most commonly held job type was customer service, which was reported by nearly half of the subjects, (45.54%). Another 24.12% indicated that they worked in management or administrative positions, and the remaining subjects reported a wide variety of fields, including technology (4.02%), security (1.34%), and other occupational areas (20.98%). More than one third of the subjects (37.95%) described their current job as career oriented (i.e., they could see themselves working in this field on a long-term basis) and 62.05% indicated that they would not describe their current job as career oriented.

Subjects were asked to identify a blended relationship with a boss, manager, or supervisor at work. Ninety-five subjects (42.41%) identified a male supervisor and 129 subjects (58.59%) identified a female supervisor. A majority of subjects indicated that this superior was older than they were (88.84%); nine indicated that their superior was younger (4.02%), and 16 indicated that their supervisor was approximately the same age (7.14%).

When asked to describe a conflict they experienced with their superior, 145 subjects described a conflict that was new to the relationship (64.73%); 72 subjects indicated that the conflict they described was not new to this relationship (32.14%), and 7 subjects declined to respond (3.13%). When asked how frequently this conflict occurred, 121 subjects (54.02%) indicated that it happened just once, 74 (33.04%) indicated that it happened occasionally, 12 (5.36%)

indicated that it happened frequently, 7 (3.13%) indicated that happened more often than not, and 5 (2.23%) indicated that it happened constantly. Seven subjects (3.13%) declined to respond to this question. Finally, 168 subjects (75.00%) indicated that the conflict was resolved, 49 (21.88%) indicated that this conflict had not been resolved, and 7 (3.13%) declined to respond.

Relational frame cell distribution and demographics

A median split for dominance and affiliation was performed to form the four relational frame cells used in this analysis. The data were normally distributed. As aforementioned, RFT cell 1 refers to blended relationships in which there are high levels of dominance and high levels of affiliation. This cell consisted of 41 total subjects; 12 of whom were employed full time and 29 who were employed part time. Slightly over one third of these employees (36.6%) indicated that they considered their job to be career-oriented. More than half of the subjects in cell 1 (56.1%) reported working for a female supervisor and 43.9% reported working for a male supervisor. A significant majority of subjects reported that their supervisor was older than them (95.1%). Slightly less than one third (31.7%) of the subjects in cell 1 were male and (58.5%) were female. The three most frequently reported job types in cell 1 were "customer service" (46.3%), followed by "other" (17.1%), and finally "management" (12.2%).

The second RFT cell refers to blended relationships in which dominance is low and affiliation is high. This cell consisted of 71 total subjects; 15 of whom

were employed full time and 56 who were employed part time. Twenty eight (39.4%) indicated that they considered their job to be career-oriented. Nearly two thirds of the subjects in cell 2 (63.4%) reported working for a female supervisor and 36.6% reported working for a male supervisor. Once again, a significant majority of subjects reported that their supervisor was older than them (80.3%). Twenty one (29.6%) of the subjects in cell 2 indicated that they were male and two thirds (66.2%) were female. The three most frequently reported job types in cell 2 were "customer service" (38.0%), followed by "other" (22.5%), and finally "administrative" (16.9%).

The third RFT cell refers to blended relationships characterized by high levels of dominance and low levels of affiliation. This cell consisted of 36 total subjects; 8 of whom were employed full time and 28 who were employed part time. Fifteen of the subjects in cell 3 (41.7%) indicated that they considered their job to be career-oriented. Over half of the subjects in cell 3 (58.3%) reported working for a female supervisor and 41.7% reported working for a male supervisor. A significant majority of subjects reported that their supervisor was older than them (94.4%). Eight (22.2%) of the subjects in cell 3 were male and 27 (75.0%) were female. The three most frequently reported job types in cell 3 were "customer service" (58.3%), followed by "other" (19.4%), and finally "technology design/repair" (8.3%).

The fourth and final RFT cell represents blended relationships with low

levels of both dominance and affiliation. This cell consisted of 76 total subjects; 22 of whom were employed full time and 54 who were employed part time. Slightly over one third of these employees (35.5%) indicated that they considered their job to be career-oriented. Slightly more than half of the subjects in cell 4 (52.6%) reported working for a female supervisor and 47.4% reported working for a male supervisor. A significant majority of subjects reported that their supervisor was older than them (90.8%). Twenty seven (35.5%) of the subjects in cell 4 reported that they were male and 48 subjects reported (63.2%) that they were female. The three most frequently reported job types in cell 4 were "customer service" (46.1%), followed by "other" (19.7%), and "management" (14.5%), followed closely by "administrative" (13.2%).

Procedures

Subjects were asked to complete an online survey containing a series of seven to nine categorical questions about the types of work and social activities they engaged in with their superior (See Table 1). Then, they were asked to complete a series of open-ended and work-related questions. Finally, subjects were asked to complete a series of scales measuring the dependent, independent, and control variables in this study (see Appendix B for a full copy of the online survey).

Table 1
Features of Blended Relationships (N = 224)

Work Tasks	n	%
This supervisor assigns some or all tasks I complete at work.	182	81.25
This supervisor has an official title that has higher status in the organization than my title.	181	80.8
This supervisor has a say in whether or not I keep my job or get fired/laid off.	171	76.34
This supervisor evaluates some or all of my performance at work.	170	75.89
I report directly to this supervisor.	168	75
This supervisor has a say in whether or not I get a raise at work.	131	58.48
This supervisor has a say in whether or not I get a promotion at work.	128	57.14
I need to work closely with this supervisor to complete some or all of my tasks at work.	84	37.5
Other	7	3.13

Social Tasks	n	%
I feel I can be myself around this supervisor.	172	76.79
I would feel comfortable talking with this supervisor about a non work-related problem.	169	75.45
I have asked (or would ask) this supervisor for advice on personal problems.	94	41.96
I enjoy spending time with this supervisor outside of work.	83	37.05
I spend time with this supervisor doing non work-related activities.	72	32.14
This supervisor and I often take lunch breaks together or go to happy hour with each other.	55	24.55
Other	10	4.46

Instruments

Job-related and open-ended questions. Subjects were asked to identify a superior with whom they interacted as both a colleague and as a friend, and to describe the nature and duration of that blended relationship. Subjects were then prompted to describe a time when their friendship with their superior conflicted with their work relationship with that superior. They were specifically asked to refrain from reflecting on relationships that were romantic in nature. The second question was intended to prompt subjects to reflect upon their responses when the social and work functions of that blended relationship conflicted. Next, subjects were asked to identify and describe in detail a new and upsetting event they experienced with the superior with whom they have a blended relationship. Upon completion of the survey, subjects were asked to complete demographic questions.

Dependent Variables

Blended relationships. Subjects were asked to respond to items from Bridge and Baxter's (1992) Blended Relationships Scale. Subjects evaluated a) the degree to which they integrate the work and social function of their relationship with four items (e.g., "We have flexible expectations about being both friends and coworkers in order to allow the roles to exist together."); b) the degree to which they experience dual role tension with six items (e.g., "Overall the friendship half and the work half of our relationship interfere with each other,

creating problems for us."); c) the selection of the work function over the social

function with four items (e.g., "When the rules or policies at work conflict with

our friendship, we temporarily "push aside" the friendship in favor of the rules or

policies."); d) the selection of social function over the work function with three

items (e.g., "While at work, my coworker and I often make plans about things to

do together when we are not at work.").

All items were evaluated on Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*does*

not at all describe this relationship) to 7 (*completely describes this relationship*).

Bridge and Baxter (1992) reported reliabilities at $\alpha = .65$ for the integration of

work and social functions, $\alpha = .85$ for dual role tension, $\alpha = .71$ for selection of

the work function over social function, and $\alpha = .69$ for selection of the social

function over work function.

In the current study only two of Bridge & Baxter's (1992) subscales were

satisfactorily reliable. The items assessing the degree to which subjects integrated

the work and social functions of their blended relationship was reliable at $\alpha = .89$,

and the items assessing the degree to which subjects experienced tension in their

blended relationship was found to be reliable at $\alpha = .72$. The items assessing

whether individuals in blended relationships prioritized the work aspects of their

blended relationship and the items assessing whether individuals prioritized the

social aspects of their blended relationship were found to be generally unreliable

at α = .53 and α = .56, respectively.[1]

Because the Bridge & Baxter (1992) scales were not sufficiently reliable, the work and social dimensions of workplace relationships were measured with two items assessing participants' perceptions of their relationship with their superior. Specifically, subjects indicated on Likert- type scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all accurate*) to 10 (*completely accurate*) the extent to which they thought their relationship with their superior could accurately be described as a) a work relationship ($M = 7.10$, $SD = 2.44$) and b) a social relationship or friendship ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 2.40$). The work relationship measure was significantly correlated with the Bridge and Baxter (1992) scale, which measured the prioritization of the work function in a blended relationship ($r = .259$, p < .001). Similarly, the social relationship measure was significantly correlated with the Bridge and Baxter (1992) scale, which measured the prioritization of the social function in a blended relationship (r = .450, p < .001). The single item measures were used in all analyses.

Relational frames. Subjects responded to items adapted from Dillard, Solomon, & Palmer's (1999) Relational Frames Scale, which tabs perceptions of relational dominance, affiliation, and involvement. The kinds of interpersonal relationships that have been examined with this scale include friendships or intimate attachment relationships with a relational partner (Solomon, Dillard, &

---

[1] Attempts to contact the second author of the previous study were unsuccessful.

Anderson, 2002). Affiliation was measured with six items (e.g. "I was interested in talking to my superior."). Dominance was measured with six items (e.g. "One of us tries to dominate the other."). Affiliation and dominance were both measured with Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*does not at all describe this relationship*) to 7 (*completely describes this relationship*). Involvement was measured with three items (e.g. "How involved were you?"). Participants evaluated the involvement items with a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Previous research reports solid reliabilities for the three RFT subscales: $\alpha = .76$ for affiliation, $\alpha = .75$ for dominance; and $\alpha = .69$ for involvement (Solomon, et al., 2002, see also Guerrero & Hecht, 2007). In the current study, the reliabilities were $\alpha = .78$ for affiliation, and $\alpha = .88$ for involvement. The reliabilities for dominance were somewhat lower at $\alpha = .66$, yet deemed acceptable.

Independent Variables

　　Emotional stress and job burnout. Emotional stress was measured with item adapted from Maslach & Jackson's (1981) Job Burnout Inventory (MBI). The MBI addresses the emotional exhaustion experienced by employees who engage in "people-work" of some kind. The scale contains three subscales, which assess a) emotional exhaustion with nine items (e.g. "I feel emotionally drained from my interaction in this blended relationship.") b) perceptions of personal accomplishment with eight items (e.g., "I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere

with my superior."), and c) depersonalization with five items (e.g. "I don't really care what happens to some coworkers."). Participants responded to these items with Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The items for each scale have been found to be generally reliable at α = .89 for emotional exhaustion, α = .74 for personal accomplishment, and α = .72 for depersonalization (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In the current research, the MBI items featured excellent reliabilities at α = .94 for emotional stress, α = .85 for perceptions of personal accomplishment, and α = .84 for depersonalization.

Emotion work strategies. The extent to which employees use deep and/or surface acting strategies was assessed with Brotheridge & Lee (1998)'s Emotional Labour Scale. This scale measures deep acting with three items (e.g. **"I make a sincere effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others."**) and surface acting with four items (e.g. "I resist expressing my true feelings."). Subjects evaluated these items using Likert scales that ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items on the deep acting and surface acting scales were found to be reliable at α = .83 and α = .74, respectively (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002).

Two additional items were used to measure specific forms of deep acting, including a) attentional deployment with two items (e.g. "I try to think of situations in which I would naturally feel the desired emotion.") b) the use of cognitive change with two items (e.g. "I make an effort to change the way I see a

stressful event.") c) positivity with two items (e.g. "I emphasize positive aspects of the relationship.") and finally, d) assurances with two items (e.g. "I make sure to focus on positive aspects of future interactions."). Each of these strategies was measured using Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Table 2.1 features correlation coefficients for deep acting strategies and Table 2.2 features correlation coefficients for surface acting strategies. As can be seen, deep acting subscales are significantly correlated with one another, with coefficients ranging from $r = .222$ to $r = .659$. Similarly, surface acting items were significantly correlated with each other, with coefficients ranging from $r = .520$ to $r = .708$.

Table 2.1
Summary of Deep Acting Subscale Correlations

	General Deep Acting	Attentional Deployment	Cognitive Coping	Positivity	Assurances
General Deep Acting	—	.469**	.319**	.420**	.407**
Attentional Deployment	.469**	—	.402**	.248**	.222**
Cognitive Coping	.319**	.402**	—	.501**	.398**
Positivity	.420**	.248**	.501**	—	.659**
Assurances	.407**	.222**	.398**	.659**	—

Note. General deep acting = three deep acting items that do not reference specific types of deep acting strategies.

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

Table 2.2
Summary of Surface Acting Items Correlations

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4
SA1	—	.509**	.643**	.531**
SA2	.509**	—	.708**	.520**
SA3	.643**	.708**	—	.618**
SA4	.531**	.520**	.618**	—

Note. SA1 = "I resist expressing my true feelings."; SA2 = "I pretend to have emotions that I really don't have."; SA3 = "I hide my true feelings about a situation."; and SA4 = "I try to refrain from showing any emotion at all."

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

To facilitate tests of hypotheses, I generated a composite measure for deep acting and a composite measure for surface acting. The deep acting scale was reliable at α = .86. The surface acting scale reliability was also reliable at α = .85. Notably, deep and surface acting subscales were not significantly correlated with one another (r = -.112, *n.s.*).

Control Variables

Dispositional factors. Subjects were asked to complete items from Snyder's (1974) Self-monitoring Scale. Self monitoring is measured using 25 items (e.g. "I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am."). These items were assessed with a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The self-monitoring scale has been found to be generally reliable at α = .70 (Snyder, 1987). The current study found the self monitoring scale to be generally reliable at α = .76.

Personality traits were measured using the Berkley Personality Profile (Harary & Donahue, 1994), which contains five subscales measuring the Big Five personality traits. Participants responded to each of five, seven items sub scales measuring a) agreeableness (e.g. "I tend to find fault with others (reverse coded)."), b) extraversion (e.g. "I am outgoing, sociable."), c) conscientiousness (e.g. "I am a reliable worker."), d) neuroticism (e.g. "I remain calm in intense situations"), and e) openness (e.g. "I value artistic, aesthetic experiences."). All items are evaluated these items on Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*strongly*

disagree) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Several attempts to locate information about past reliability for the BPP subscales were unsuccessful. However, in the current research, these subscales were found to be generally reliable at $\alpha = .74$ for agreeableness, $\alpha = .87$ for extraversion, $\alpha = .69$ for conscientiousness, $\alpha = .76$ for neuroticism, and $\alpha = .72$ for openness.

Results

Analysis Plan

The main effects of dominance affiliation on the experience of emotional stress were examined using 2 (high vs. low) x 3 (emotional exhaustion by personal accomplishment by depersonalization) factorial designs. Additionally, the main effects of dominance and affiliation on emotion work were also examined using 2 (high vs. low) x 2 (deep acting vs. surface acting) factorial designs. Then, I examined each of the hypotheses related to each type of RFT relationship with ten planned comparisons. To reduce the likelihood of a Type 1 error, I conducted a Bonferroni correction ($\alpha = .005$). Contrast coefficients associated with each planned comparison are featured in Table 3.

Table 3
RFT Planned Comparison Contrast Coefficients

Emotional Stress	LD-LA	LA-HA	HA-HA	HD-LA	t	p
H1a	-1	-1	3	-1	-1.334	0.184
H2a	-0.5	1	0	-0.5	-4.682	$< .005$
H3a	0	-1	0.5	0.5	3.487	$< .005$
H4a	3	-1	-1	-1	1.267	0.207
H2b	-1	1	0	0	-2.947	$< .005$
H3b	-1	0	0	1	1.331	0.185
Deep Acting	LD-LA	LA-HA	HA-HA	HD-LA	t	p
H1b	-1	-1	3	-1	2.088	0.038
H2c	-0.5	1	0	-0.5	3.97	$< .005$
Surface Acting	LD-LA	LA-HA	HA-HA	HD-LA	t	p
H3c	0	-0.5	-0.5	1	5.158	$< .005$
H4b	3	-1	-1	-1	1.674	0.096

Note. LD = low dominance; HD = high dominance; LA = low affiliation; HA = high affiliation.

The results of the planned comparisons were organized along the dependent variables, beginning with results associated emotional stress, followed by results associated deep acting and surface acting. Finally, I conducted a univariate analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to examine the extent to which dispositional factors (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and self monitoring) moderated the relationship between employees' emotional stress and their reported use of deep acting and surface acting. Table 4 features means and SDs for all scales involved in the current analysis. Correlations for all variables on Table 4 are located in Appendix C.

Table 4

Scale Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities

Scale	M	SD	α
RFT Affiliation	4.5	1.209	.782
RFT Dominance	3.93	1.093	.655
RFT Involvement	4.606	1.618	.877
BB Integration	4.019	1.621	.887
BB Work	5.029	1.143	.531
BB Social	3.792	1.28	.563
BB Tense	2.572	1.091	.724
Des-Work	7.1	2.44	N/A
Des-Social	4.29	2.4	N/A
Deep Acting	4.331	1.028	.862
Surface Acting	3.439	1.44	.851
MBI Emotional Exhaustion	3.409	1.487	.936
MBI Personal Accomplishment	4.726	1.044	.852
MBI Depersonalization	2.826	1.338	.842
Self Monitoring	4.126	0.59	.755
Extroversion	4.601	1.089	.869
Agreeableness	4.946	0.835	.739
Conscientiousness	4.732	0.789	.686
Neuroticism	4.451	0.909	.764
Openness	4.789	0.895	.717

Research questions. Dominance was not positively correlated with the work function of a blended relationship (RQ 1a; $r = .022$, *n.s.*). However, affiliation was positively associated with the social function of a blended relationship (RQ 1b; $r = .484$, $p < .001$). As noted earlier, scale reliabilities for dominance were somewhat lower, thus potentially skewing these results.

Results indicated a significant negative influence of involvement on the dominance frame of blended relationships (RQ 2a; $r = -.142$, $p < .05$) and a significant positive influence of involvement on the affiliation frame of a blended relationship. (RQ 2b; $r = .215$, $p < .01$).

Main effects. A series of one way analyses of variance were conducted to determine the main effects of two dimensions of RFT, dominance and affiliation, on the experience of emotional stress and emotion work strategies. Dominance had a significant effect on the experience of emotional stress, $F (1, 32) = 1.96$, $p = .003$. The effect of dominance on emotion work was not significant for deep acting, $F (1, 32) = 1.61$, $p = .267$ nor was it significant for surface acting, $F (1,32) = 1.56$, $p = .037$. Affiliation had a significant effect on the experience of emotional stress, $F (1, 36) = 2.25$, $p < .001$. The effect of affiliation on emotion work was significant for deep acting, $F (1, 36) = 1.97$, $p = .002$ and was also significant for surface acting, $F (1, 36) = 1.84$, $p = .005$.

Emotional stress. Hypothesis 1a predicted that employees in high in dominance-high in affiliation (HD-HA) blended relationships would report experiencing more emotional stress compared to employees who were not in HD-HA relationships (see Table 3). This hypothesis was not supported, $t(216) = -1.33$, $p = .184$.

Hypothesis 2a predicted that employees in LD-HA blended relationships would report experiencing more emotional stress compared to employees in HD-

LA or LD-LA blended relationships. This hypothesis was supported, $t(216) = -4.68$, $p < .005$.

Hypothesis 2b predicted that employees in LD-HA blended relationships would report experiencing less emotional stress compared to employees in HD-HA blended relationships. This hypothesis was supported, $t(216) = -2.95$, $p < .005$.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that employees in HD-LA blended relationships would report experiencing less emotional stress compared with employees in HD-HA or LD-HA blended relationships. This hypothesis was supported $t(216) = 3.49$, $p < .005$.

Hypothesis 3b predicted that employees in HD-LA blended relationships would report experiencing less emotional stress compared with employees in LD-LA blended relationships. Results indicate that this hypothesis was supported $t(216) = 1.33$, $p = .185$.

Hypothesis 4a predicted that employees in LD-LA would report experiencing less emotional stress compared with employees who were not in LD-LA blended relationships. Results indicate that this hypothesis was not supported, $t(216) = 1.27$, $p = .207$.

Deep acting. Hypothesis 1b predicted that individuals when employees in HD-HA blended relationships report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize deep acting strategies to manage that emotional stress compared

with individuals who are not in HD-HA blended relationships. This hypothesis was not supported $t(217) = 2.09$, $p = .038$.

Hypothesis 2c predicted that individuals when employees in LD-HA blended relationships report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize deep acting strategies to manage that emotional stress compared with individuals who are in HD-LA or LD-LA blended relationships. Results indicate that this hypothesis was supported $t(217) = 3.97$, $p < .005$

Surface acting. Hypothesis 3c predicted that individuals when employees in HD-LA blended relationships report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize surface acting strategies to manage that emotional stress compared with individuals who are in HD-HA or LD-HA blended relationships. This hypothesis was supported $t(217) = 5.16$, $p < .005$.

Hypothesis 4b predicted that individuals when employees in LD-LA blended relationships report experiencing emotional stress, they are more likely to utilize surface acting strategies to manage that emotional stress compared with individuals who not in LD-LA blended relationships. Results indicate that this hypothesis was not supported $t(217) = 1.67$, $p = .096$.

Control variables. As noted earlier, previous research indicates that some dispositional factors may influence the manner in which employees experience emotional stress and their preference for deep or surface acting emotion coping strategies. These dispositional factors include self-monitoring, agreeableness,

conscientiousness, extraversion, and neuroticism. A univariate ANCOVA was performed to determine whether these dispositional factors mediated the relationship between blended relationships (varying in dominance and affiliation) and the dependent measures, namely emotional stress, deep acting, and surface acting,

Only neuroticism was significantly associated with employees' experience of emotional stress, $F(1, 9) = 13.417$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .061$. Furthermore, only extroversion was significantly associated with the preference for deep acting to cope with emotional stress, $F(1, 9) = 5.512$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .026$. Finally, with respect to the hypotheses associated with surface acting, only self-monitoring, was significantly associated with the preference for surface acting , $F(1, 9) = 7.936$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .037$.

<center>Discussion</center>

The purpose of this research was threefold. First, I sought to examine the nature of blended relationships in the workplace. Specifically, I sought to determine the degree to which employees viewed their workplace relationships as serving both a work and a social function. Moreover, this research attempted to identify the different activities in which people participate in their blended relationships with coworkers. Thus, the first goal of this research was to determine whether people do indeed form and maintain relationships in the workplace that serve more than purely a work function and to identify specific

behaviors in which they participate in those blended relationships. Results of this project showed that people do form blended relationships in the workplace.

The second goal of this research was to blend the study of interpersonal and organization communication in order to provide a common language by which blended relationships could be understood. To this end, relational framing theory was used to understand the functions that blended relationships serve for individuals. Specifically, the dominance dimension of RFT was posited to be representative of the work dimension of blended relationships and the affiliation dimension of RFT was posited to be representative of the social dimension of blended relationships.

The third and final goal of this research was to examine the association of the dimensions of RFT with the experience of emotional stress in the workplace and the preference for either deep acting or surface acting as a coping strategy for emotional stress. I advanced several hypotheses related to these dependent variables based on the four "types" of blended relationships that can be derived from the dimensions of RFT. Specifically, I examined each of these dependent variables in high dominance-high affiliation (HD-HA), high dominance-low affiliation (HD-LA), low dominance-high affiliation (LD-HA) and low dominance-low affiliation (LD-LA) blended relationships. My goal was to determine how the degree to which the frames of RFT guided the communication and behavior of individuals who maintained blended relationships with a

supervisor.

The data did indicate support for the affiliation bias proposed by Tusing (2000), as the affiliation frame affected both the experience of emotional stress and for both styles of emotion work. The data did not reveal a relationship between dominance and the work function of a blended relationship. However, when participants were asked what specific work-related activities they engaged in with their superior, many indicated that this person evaluated their work, assigned some or all of their tasks at work, and determined whether they were promoted, laid off, or terminated from their jobs (see Table 1). Each of these behaviors could potentially include perceptions of power and dominance. One explanation for the lack of correlation between the work function of the blended relationship and the dominance frame of RFT might be that organizational hierarchies are indeed becoming flatter, and employees are less likely to perceive a significant degree of dominance in their relationships, despite notable differences in job functions and titles,(Rajan & Wolfe, 2003).

Another explanation for the nonsignificant correlation between the dominance frame and the work function of a blended relationship may lie in the nature of the blended relationship itself. Because individuals in blended relationships access both the dominance frame and the affiliation frame, it may be that the relative importance of the affiliation frame in a blended relationship attenuates the degree to which the dominance frame is relevant or useful in

informing communicative behavior. In other words, when both frames are important in the blended relationship, the dominance frame may have less influence on informing behavior because of the presence of the affiliation frame. Thus it could also be that employees simply did not perceive their superiors as dominant, particularly when they reported high levels of affiliation.

It appears that the social behaviors employees engage in (e.g., discussing non-work related problems, spending time with their supervisor outside of work) are in fact associated with liking, affection, and the exchange of personal information in relationships. So when employees reported being involved with their superior, their reported levels of perceived dominance are low. This appears to contradict Dillard and Solomon's (2005) finding that involvement functions as an intensifier for dominance and affiliation by suggesting that involvement has an inverse relationship to dominance. Thus, higher levels of involvement are negatively associated with the dominance frame. In other words, higher levels of involvement in status different blended relationships are associated with lower influence of the dominance frame. Once again, this may perhaps be the nature of a blended relationship itself. The presence of the affiliation frame may not become as marginalized as previously thought. Subsequently, the dominance frame may be attenuated by the relative importance of the affiliation frame.

This is supported by results for RQ2b, which indicate that there is indeed a significant positive correlation between involvement and the affiliation frame of

RFT. In other words, consistent with previous research (Dillard & Solomon, 2005), people who report being more actively involved in their relationship also tend to report liking their coworker/boss more.

Emotional Stress. In general, the current research found that affiliation is typically associated with higher levels of emotional stress in status different blended relationships in the workplace. When employees perceive higher levels of affiliation in their relationship with their superior, they also report higher levels of emotional stress. This is consistent with the argument that employees in blended relationships might not have a readily available script to cope with the experience of novel conflicts with their superior. Consequently, the source of the emotional stress is twofold. First, employees may experience emotional stress because they do not believe they are equipped to manage this new conflict. Second, one of the functions of the social aspect of employees' blended relationships with superiors is receipt of support when they experience stressful events at work. However, if their superior is the source of that stressful event, then the conflict threatens not only the quality of their working environment, but also employees' social relationship with their superiors.

For example, imagine Bailey, who believes she has an LD-HA blended relationship with her superior, experiences a new conflict with this superior. She is likely to experience emotional stress in response to this conflict as she tries to determine the best way to manage the conflict. Because of the high level of

affiliation in her relationship with her superior, Bailey might be inclined to turn to her superior for support in this conflict. However, since the conflict is with her superior, there is a risk that the conflict may damage the social aspect of the blended relationship as well as the work aspect of it, if the conflict is mismanaged.

The current research also found, however, that the level of emotional stress experienced in HD-HA blended relationships is not significantly greater than that experienced HD-LA blended relationships. This suggests that high levels of dominance may have a secondary influence in blended relationships that attenuates the experience of emotional stress. One explanation for this might be that, consistent with Dillard and Solomon (2002), the dominance frame may take priority in guiding subsequent thoughts and behaviors. This could be associated with lower levels of emotional stress because it is clearer which relational frame should guide behavior.

Returning to the above example, if Bailey's relationship with her superior were HD-HA, a novel conflict may be stressful in the threat that it poses to the social relationship, but there is less emotional stress over the correct course of action in response to the conflict. Bailey would select the behaviors that are more in line with the organizational expectations for behavior. Alternatively, she may decide that her superior's position in the organization is a result of greater expertise and subsequently defer to her superior as a means of managing the

conflict. Finally, Bailey might rationalize that if she follows organizational expectations, this will reduce the threat to her social relationship with her superior.

Contrary to expectations, the lowest levels of emotional stress were not apparent in LD-LA blended relationships. Further consideration of this finding suggests that this may be evidence of the utility of social relationships in the workplace. As discussed earlier, one potential reason people may form friendships in the workplace is to have a source of support for stressful events experienced in the workplace. Without this support, the experience of conflict with a superior leaves an employee without a support network. For example, imagine Katie experiences a novel conflict in her LD-LA blended relationship with her superior. She may experience emotional stress as a result of the lack of clear direction for how to respond to this conflict. This is compounded by the fact that her blended relationship does not serve any of the support functions associated with the affiliation frame.

In line with this, the current research did not find that emotional stress in LD-LA blended relationships was lower than emotional stress in HD-LA blended relationships. The dominance frame of RFT may once again be highlighting which behaviors are appropriate in response to the new conflict. Therefore, when dominance is high, the expectations of the superior and employee are more clearly defined. In Katie's (LD-LA) situation above, the expectations for each party in the

conflict may be less clear, resulting in either confusion about what to do or Katie's being indignant about being told what to do by her superior, whom she perceives to have little dominance over her actions.

In sum, it appears that affiliation has a primary influence on employees' experience of emotional stress in response to novel conflict in blended relationships with their superiors. Higher levels of affiliation are associated with higher levels of emotional stress. However, this association is also influenced by the level of dominance in the blended relationship. When dominance is high, organizational expectations for behavior may be clearer and abiding by such expectations may be easier. In low affiliation blended relationships, the level of emotional stress experienced appears to be similarly related to the level of dominance.

Deep acting. The current research found that higher levels of affiliation are also associated with a preference for deep acting as a means of coping with emotional stress. One explanation for this is that engaging in deep acting emotion management strategies may be an effective means of maintaining the social aspect of a blended relationship. As noted earlier, two relational maintenance strategies were significantly correlated with other deep acting emotion management strategies. Thus, it is important to employees to maintain the relationship and be seen as honest, supportive, and genuine by their friend/superior, particularly when the affiliation frame is more prominent. For example, if Luke is in an LD-HA

blended relationship with his superior his response to emotional stress as a result of a new conflict is to act in a way that maintains the social aspect of this blended relationship.

However, if the dominance frame is more relevant, such as in an HD-HA blended relationship, Luke may not be as inclined to utilize deep acting strategies to manage emotional stress. One reason for this is that deep acting strategies may not be consistent with organizational expectations for emotional expression. Alternatively, Luke may default to organizational expectations for emotional expression as a means of demonstrating respect for his superior's higher position, thus subjugating the social nature of their blended relationship for the time being.

In sum, the preference for deep acting appears to be associated with higher levels of affiliation and lower levels of dominance in blended relationships. There may possibly be an opposing influence of dominance and affiliation with respect to deep acting. Higher levels of affiliation may motivate employees to maintain the social nature of their blended relationship. At the same time, higher levels of dominance seem to lessen the likelihood that an employee will utilize deep acting as an emotion management strategy.

Surface acting. The current research found that higher levels of dominance and lower levels of affiliation are associated with the general preference for surface acting emotion management strategies. One explanation for this is that when affiliation is low, employees may believe there is nothing to be gained from

taking the time and/or effort to change their cognitions about the conflict event.

For example, if Joe is in an HD-LA blended relationship with his superior, his

superior's higher position in the organization may dictate which emotion

management strategies are appropriate. Because affiliation is low, the social

function of the relationship does not have a large influence on the choice of

emotion management strategy. As a result, Joe would be more inclined to do what

is expected because the high level of dominance makes those expectations very

clear, thus it is relatively easier to just comply with those expectations in the short

run.

When employees are in LD-LA blended relationships, on the other hand,

their perception of dominance is not as high, so any expectations for emotional

expression may not be as clear. Moreover, employees in LD-LA blended

relationships may not be motivated to maintain any social relationship because

their level of affiliation is low. This may create a situation in which employees are

not motivated to manage their emotions at all because they see neither work nor

social consequences of managing their emotional responses. For example, if Kelly

does not feel her superior Jack has a great deal of influence over the work aspects

of her job and she also does not feel they have a social relationship (or are

friends), then there are no obvious negative outcomes of freely expressing her

emotions. As a result, she may not use deep or surface acting to manage any

emotional reactions. Another explanation for this is that in this particular type of

blended relationship, the decision to utilize deep or surface acting strategies to manage emotions may ultimately be a personal decision.

In sum, when affiliation is low and organizational hierarchy and expectations are clear, employees appear to gravitate toward the easiest means of managing their emotions, as they have little invested in their blended relationships. When dominance is low as well, the preference for surface acting strategies is lower, perhaps because of a lack of emotion work overall, or because of personal differences in the use of emotion work strategies.

Limitations

There are a few sample and research design limitations of this particular project that should be considered when interpreting the results. A primary limitation of the sample is that the majority of participants (75%) were not employed in full time positions. Thus, the likelihood that social relationship might have developed as a result of increased proximity is lower than in may be with employees who work full time. A second limitation of the sample is its relative homogeneity (e.g. predominantly Caucasian, educated, and employed in service related positions).

The current research design limitations should also be considered when interpreting the results. First and foremost, this project relied on self report data collected via an anonymous online survey. Validity of self report data is difficult to establish because participants' perceptions of situations or events is inherently

biased. Research on the generalizability of online data collection highlights both benefits and drawbacks of such methods (Weber & Bradley, 2007). A significant advantage of online surveys is time and monetary efficiency. Online data collection takes significantly less time compared with pen and paper surveys and can be collected at very little expense. More importantly, online surveys allow for a greater degree of participant anonymity and reduce potential response bias. In line with this, Lyons, Lawrence, & Gutter, (2005) argued that for sensitive topics, the quality of data collected online may actually be of higher quality and contain greater levels of self disclosure than data collected through more traditional means. An important weakness of online surveys, however, is the increased potential for sampling bias due to differential use and access to the Internet in some populations (Weber & Bradley, 2007).

A second methodological limitation of this study lies in the reliance on a one item measure of perceptions of work and social relationships, due to the unacceptable reliability of the Bridge & Baxter (1992) items. Finally, the design of this study is the cross-sectional nature of the data. Hartup and Stevens (1997) note that as social relationships develop over time, the way in which those relationships progress and the outcomes associated with those relationships change. As a result, the current study only provides information about the blended relationship at one point in that relationship and cannot account for changes that may occur as that relationship develops.

Future Directions

The present research contributes to the understanding of the nature of blended relationships in the workplace both theoretically, through the application of Relational Framing Theory, and in terms of understanding the specific behaviors in which employees participate in blended relationships, and finally in how the management of multiple functions of a given relationship influence employees' experience and management of emotional stress in the workplace.

Future research may want to examine employees who are employed in full time positions, as extended proximity to superiors with who employees have blended relationships may influence both the effectiveness of and preference for different emotion management strategies, particularly surface acting. Furthermore, the nature of the work and social activities that employees engage in may vary as a function of the number and nature of responsibilities they are assigned at work.

Another avenue for future research should examine how the experience of emotion and emotion management evolve as a blended relationship develops. As mentioned above, the current relationship can only provide insight into the experience of emotion at a single point in time. Repeated success or failure in the use of emotion management strategies in the long run may influence the experience of emotion and employees' perceptions of their ability to manage those emotions effectively.

Finally, more information is needed about the different types of blended relationships maintained in the workplace. The current research focused on status different blended relationships from the perspective of the lower status employee. Examination of status different blended relationships from the perspective of the superior may give a more complete picture of the experience of emotion and emotion management in the workplace. Furthermore, the role of dominance in peer to peer workplace relationships is likely to differ because the source of dominance in such relationships is less likely to be formally derived.

Conclusion

Limitations notwithstanding, the current study provides a solid theoretical framework to the study of blended relationships. As the results indicate, people maintain multifunctional relationships for a number of reasons. Furthermore, incongruence between the various functions of these relationships may be a source of emotional stress for employees. Examining how these functions interact with each other can provide a means of understanding variations in communicative behaviors relational development and emotion management.

References

Ashkanasy, N. M., Zerbe, W. J., & Härtel, C. E. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Managing emotions in the work place.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Austin, E. J., Dore, T. C. P., & O'Donovan, K.M. (2008). Associations of personality and emotional intelligence with display rule perceptions and emotional labour. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,* 679-688.

Bernstein, J. (2004). *The rise in family work hours leads many Americans to struggle to balance work and family*. Retrieved January 10, 2009, from http://www.epi.org/economic_snapshots/entry/webfeatures_snapshots_070 72004/.

Bridge, K. & Baxter, L.A. (1992). Blended relationships: Friends as work associates. *Western Journal of Communication*, *56*, 200-225.

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., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76,* 365-379.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hoobler, G. (2002). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & J. Daly (Ed.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 240-299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burleson, B.R. & Samter, W. (1994). A social skills approach to relationship maintenance: How individual differences in communication skills affect the achievement of relationship functions. In D .J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 61-90). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2008). Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 1062-1081.

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Multiple regression/correlation for the behavioral sciences* (3rd edition). Mahwah NJ: Erbaum.

Diefendorff, J.M., Croyle, M.H., & Gosserand, R.H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *2*, 339-357.

Dillard, J. P., & Solomon, D. H. (2005). Measuring the relevance of relational: A relational framing theory perspective. In V. Manusov (Ed.), *The*

sourcebook of nonverbal measures: Going beyond words (pp. 325-334). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Dillard, J. P., Solomon, D. H., & Palmer, M.T. (1999). Structuring the concept of relational communication, *Communication Monographs, 66,* 49-65.

Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, uses, and coding. *Semiotica, 1*, 49-98.

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

Giardini, A. & Frese, M. (2006). Reducing the negative effects of emotion work in service occupations: Emotional competence as a psychological resource. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11,* 63-75.

Gibbons, D. & Olk, P. (2003). Individual and structural origins of friendship and social position among professionals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 340-35.

Gosling, S.D., Rentfrow, P.J., Swann Jr., W.B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 508-528.

Gosserand, R. H. & Diefendorff, J.M. (2005). Emotional display rules and

emotional labor: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Applied
Psychology, 90,* 1256-1264.

Grandey, A.A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to

conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health
Psychology, 5,* 95-110.

Grandey, A.A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep

acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service
delivery. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 86-96.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G.M., & Steiner, D. D. (2005). Must "Service with a Smile"

be stressful? The moderating role of personal control for American and
French Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 893-904.

Guerrero, L.K., Hecht, M.L., (2007). *The nonverbal communication reader

classic and contemporary readings.* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL:
Waveland Press

Hara, N. & Kling, R. (2002). *IT support for communities of practice: an

empirically-based framework* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University at

Bloomington. (CSI Working Paper no. WP-02-02). Retrieved January 15,

2009, from http://rkcsi.indiana.edu/archive/CSI/WP/WP02-02B.html.

Harary, K., & Donahue, E. (1994). Who do you think you are? Explore your

many sided self with the Berkeley personality profile. San Francisco, CA:

Harper.

Hays, R. B. (1984). The development and maintenance of friendship. *Journal of

Social and Personal Relationships, 1,* 75-98.

Hays, R. B. (1985). A longitudinal study of friendship development. *Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 909-924.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure.

American Journal of Sociology, *85,* 551–575.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human

feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Howard, M. (2007). *Spreadsheets and strudel*. Retrieved December 15, 2008,

from

http://news.yahoo.com/s/dear_margo/20071129/en_dm/margo_howard200

71129

Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 14*, 13-24.

Hunthausen, J.M., Truxillo, D.M., Bauer, T.M., Hammer, L.B. (2003). A field study of frame of reference effects on personality test validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 8,* 545-551.

Keppel, Geoffrey. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kingsley-Westerman, C.Y., Park, H.S., & Lee, H. E. (2007). Cultural differences in the effects of inequity on coworker friendships. *Human Communication, 10*, 82-102.

Lazarus, R. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, & coping*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Lewig, K. A., & Dollard, M. F. (2003). Emotional dissonance, emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in call centre workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 12,* 366-392.

Lopes, P. N**.**, Salovey, P., Côté, S., & Beers, M. (2005). Emotion regulation ability and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion, 5*, 113-118.

Lyons, A. C., Cude, B., Lawrence, F. C., & Gutter, M. (2005). Conducting research online: Challenges facing researchers in family and consumer sciences. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 33*(4), 341-356.

Maslach C, Jackson SE. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 99–113.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. 1997. Managing emotions in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 9,* 257–274.

Parker, J. D. A., Endler, N. S., & Bagby, M. (1993). If it changes, it might be unstable: Examining the factor structure of the Ways of Coping Questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment, 5,* 361-368.

Rajan, R., & Wulf, J. (2003). The flattening firm: evidence from panel data on the changing nature of corporate hierarchies. Unpublished NBER Working paper. University of Chicago and University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved August 5, 2009, from http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/papers/1240.pdf

Rexrode, K. R., Petersen, S. & O'Toole, S. (2008). The ways of coping style scale: A reliability generalization study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 68*, 262-280.

Richards, J.M. (2004). The cognitive consequences of concealing feelings. Current Directions in *Psychological Science, 13*, 131-134.

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.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group Inc.

Sias, P. M., & Cahill, D. J. (1998). From coworkers to friends: The development of peer friendships in the workplace. *Western Journal of Communication, 62,* 273-299.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *30*(4), 526–537.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: Freeman.

Solomon, D.H, & McLaren, R.M. (2008). Relational framing theory. In Baxter, L.A. & Braithewaite, D.O. (Eds.). *Engaging theories in interpersonal*

communication: Multiple perspectives (pp.103-115). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Solomon, D. H. (2006). A relational framing perspective on perceptions of social-sexual communication at work. In R. M. Dailey & B. A. LePoire (Eds.) *Applied interpersonal communication matters: Family, health, and community relations* (pp. 271-298). New York: Peter Lang.

Solomon, D. H., Dillard, J.P. & Anderson, J.W. (2002). Episode type, attachment orientation, and frame salience: Evidence for a theory of relational framing. *Human Communication Research, 28*, 136-152.

Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance Strategies and Romantic Relationship Type, Gender, and Relational Characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8*, 217-242.

Tokuno, K. A. (1986). The early adult transition and friendships: Mechanisms of support. *Adolescence, 21,* 593-606.

Tusing, K. J. (2000). Relational framing theory: Factors governing the absolute

and relative activation of relational communication frames. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol.61 (2-A), pp. 428.

Weber, J. & Bradley, K. D. (2007). Measuring individual preferences for counselor characteristics. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Chicago, IL.

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

Zapf, D., Vogt, C., Seifert, C., Mertini, H., & Isic, A. (1999) Emotion work as a source of stress: The concept and development of an instrument. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 371-400.

Zerbe, W. J. (2000). Emotional dissonance and employee well-being. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Zerbe, W. J. (Eds.). *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 89-214). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Appendix A

	High Dominance	Low Dominance
High Affiliation	Cell 1: HD-HA Highest degree of emotional stress experienced. Most likely to use deep acting strategies to manage emotional stress.	Cell 2: LD-HA Second highest degree of emotional stress experienced. Second most likely to use deep acting strategies to manage emotional stress.
Low Affiliation	Cell 3: HD-LA Third highest degree of emotional stress experienced. Second most likely to use surface acting strategies to manage emotional stress.	Cell 4: LD-LA Lowest degree of emotional stress experienced. Most likely to use surface acting strategies to manage emotional stress.

Appendix B
Survey

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

1. Informed Consent

You have been asked to complete a survey on blended relationships in the workplace. A blended relationship is on that serves more than one function for people. In this survey, we are interested in how you manage your relationship with a boss, manager, or supervisor whom you consider to be both a colleague and a friend.

More specifically, we would like to know how you manage stress in this blended relationship. Your answers will give us important information about how people manage blended relationships and help identify effective ways to manage any stress that might result from maintaining blended relationships.

The study is conducted by Stacy Fitzpatrick, a doctoral candidate under the supervision of Prof. Susanne Jones in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Minnesota, 225 Ford Hall, 224 Church St., SE, Minnesota, MN 55455. If you have questions about this survey or its results, you may contact Stacy Fitzpatrick at 952-487-7268, or send her an e-mail at fitzp057@umn.edu. You may also contact Prof. Jones at 612-626-0592 or send her an e-mail at jones344@umn.edu.

There are no right or wrong answers to the following questions. We just want to know how you experience and manage stress in blended relationships.

Your answers are completely ANONYMOUS. Your name appears nowhere on the survey, nor does this website track your name or computer IP address. So your responses are in no way associated with your identity. All responses will be analyzed in the aggregate.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships. Completing the questionnaire indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and have agreed to participate in this study voluntarily.

There are no adverse effects associated with completing this survey.

The questionnaire will take between 45 and 60 minutes to complete, so please be sure to reserve sufficient time to complete the survey.

Your instructor may give you extra credit for having completed the survey. If that is the case, please make sure that you are using a computer that has access to a printer before continuing. When you complete the survey, you should print the last page entitled "Extra Credit Form" and write your name on it. Return that sheet to your instructor so that you may be awarded extra-credit.

Please note that your instructor may NOT give you extra credit if you do not submit the extra credit form at the end of the survey. Your name is not associated with your survey and can therefore not be traced.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher (s), you are encouraged to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

Thank you so much for your participation!

Do you agree to participate in this study?

◯ Yes

◯ No

2. Declined Consent

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

You have chosen to NOT participate in this study.

3. YOUR WORK EXPERIENCE

The first set of items assess the nature of your job and ask you to identify a manager, supervisor, or boss with whom you have a blended relationship. A blended relationship is defined as one in which you consider this superior to be both a colleague and a friend.

Remember, there are no right or wrong answers and your responses are completely anonymous!

For the purpose of this survey, full time employment is defined as working an average of 30 or more hours per week. Based on this definition, please indicate your current work status

◯ I work full time.

◯ I work part time.

If you work part time, please indicate the average number of hours per week that you work.

[   ]

Would you describe your job as being career-oriented (e.g you can envision yourself working in this field on a long term basis)?

◯ Yes

◯ No

4. YOUR WORK EXPERIENCE PART 2

How long, in years, have you worked at your current job? Decimals are acceptable. For example, 15 months would = 1.25 years.

[   ]

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

We are interested in how you manage a blended relationship you have with a manager, boss, or supervisor at your workplace. A blended relationship is one that you consider to be both a work relationship and a friendship. For this survey, we would like you to reflect on a blended relationship with a superior that is not romantic in nature (either currently or in the past).

Please tell us about the work aspect of the blended relationship you have identified. Check which of the phrases below you feel would apply to the work aspect of that blended relationship.

You should check all that apply. You may use the "other" category to identify key words that you feel define the work part of your relationship.

☐ This supervisor assigns some or all of the tasks I complete at work.

☐ This supervisor evaluates some or all of my performance at work.

☐ I report directly to this supervisor.

☐ I need to work closely with this supervisor to complete some or all of my tasks at work.

☐ This supervisor has an official title that has higher status in the organization than my title.

☐ This supervisor has a say in whether or not I get a raise at work.

☐ This supervisor has a say in whether or not I get a promotion at work.

☐ This supervisor has a say in whether or not I keep my job or get fired/laid off.

☐ Other (please specify)

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

Next, please reflect on the friendship aspect of your relationship with this supervisor. Check which of the phrases below you feel would apply to the friendship aspect of the relationship you identified. You should check all that apply. You may use the "other" category to identify key words that you feel define the friendship part of your relationship.

☐ I enjoy spending time with this superior outside of work.

☐ I would feel comfortable talking with this supervisor about a non work-related problem.

☐ I feel I can be myself around this supervisor.

☐ I have asked (or would ask) this supervisor for advice on personal problems.

☐ I spend time with this supervisor doing non work-related activities.

☐ This supervisor and I often take lunch breaks together or go to happy hour with each other.

☐ Other (please specify)

5. YOUR WORK EXPERIENCE PART 3

We often have relationships with people that serve more than one purpose for us. These are blended relationships and allow us to meet multiple needs through a single relationship.

We are interested in learning a little more about your perception of your blended relationship you identified earlier. The following questions should be considered independently of each other.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

Please indicate the extent to which you think it would be accurate to describe your relationship with this superior as a work relationship.

☐ 1 - Not at all accurate

☐ 2 - A little bit accurate

☐ 3 - Somewhat accurate

☐ 4 -

☐ 5 - Moderately accurate

☐ 6

☐ 7 - More accurate than not

☐ 8

☐ 9 - Almost completely accurate

☐ 10 - Completely accurate

Please indicate the extent to which you think it would be accurate to describe your relationship with this superior as a social relationship or friendship.

☐ 1 - Not at all accurate

☐ 2 - A little bit accurate

☐ 3 - Somewhat accurate

☐ 4 -

☐ 5 - Moderately accurate

☐ 6

☐ 7 - More accurate than not

☐ 8

☐ 9 - Almost completely accurate

☐ 10 - Completely accurate

6. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR BLENDED RELATIONSHIP

Approximately how long, in years, have you and your superior maintained your blended relationship? (Decimals are acceptable).

[   ]

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

What is your superior's biological sex?

◯ Male

◯ Female

Is your superior:

◯ Older than you

◯ Younger than you

◯ Approximately the same age as you

7. CONFLICT IN YOUR BLENDED RELATIONSHIP

There may be times when you may find it difficult to both be a friend and maintain a work relationship with this superior.

Please think of a conflict between you and the boss, manager, or supervisor you identified. This conflict should be something that you don't frequently experience and that made it difficult to manage being both a friend and a subordinate of this person.

Please reflect on the following questions: What were the circumstances? How did you feel (both emotionally and physically)? How did you respond to this conflict? This may include interactions with your superior at work or with others.

Has this conflict been resolved?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Was this the first time you experienced this conflict in your blended relationship?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

How frequently have you experienced this conflict since the incident you described above?

◯ Just that once.

◯ Occasionally

◯ Frequently

◯ More often than not.

◯ Constantly/always

Approximately how long, in years, had you and your superior had a blended relationship before you experienced a conflict between your work relationship and your friendship? (Decimals are acceptable).

8. YOUR BLENDED RELATIONSHIP

We are interested in learning more about the nature of the blended relationship you have with the superior you wrote about in the previous section. We are also interested in how you typically manage this relationship.

For the following questions, please indicate how well each of the following statements applies to your blended relationship using a scale of 1 to 7.

We have flexible expectations about being both friends and colleagues in order to allow the roles to exist together.

| ◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. | ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. | ◯ 3 | ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. | ◯ 5 | ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. | ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship. |

We are loyal to the "spirit" rather than the "letter" of the expectations or requirements of our combined work-friend relationship.

| ◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. | ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. | ◯ 3 | ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. | ◯ 5 | ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. | ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship. |

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

As long as our basic commitments to our jobs and our friendship are intact, small deviations allow us to maintain both relationships.

◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

We give each other a lot of "room to maneuver" in both our friendship and work roles in order to allow the roles to exist together.

◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

When the rules or policies at work conflict with our friendship, we temporarily "push aside" the friendship in favor of the rules or policies.

◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

When we feel that we must choose between what is expected at work and what is expected by our friendship, we usually give priority to the friendship.

◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

When our friendship conflicts with the rules or policies at work, we will usually "bend" or "break" the rules or policies in favor of our friendship.

◯ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ◯ 2 Describes this relationship a little. ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ◯ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

When we feel that we must choose between what is expected at work and what is expected by our friendship, we usually give priority to work expectations.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little. ( ) 3 ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ( ) 5 ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

While at work, my superior and I often make plans about things to do together when we are not at work.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little. ( ) 3 ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ( ) 5 ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

In our conversations at work, my superior and I often discuss non-work related topics.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little. ( ) 3 ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ( ) 5 ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I refrain from discussing non-work-related topics with my superior when we are at work.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little. ( ) 3 ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ( ) 5 ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Overall the friendship half and the work half of our relationship interfere with each other, creating problems for us.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all. ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little. ( ) 3 ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time. ( ) 5 ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship. ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

Our relationship would be a lot easier if we were only friends or only work associates instead of being both.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ○ 3   ○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ○ 5   ○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Our work relationship and our friendship are often in conflict with one another.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ○ 3   ○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ○ 5   ○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Problems rarely arise because our friendship and our work relationship are so much a part of each other.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ○ 3   ○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ○ 5   ○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

It requires extra effort to maintain both the friendship side and the work side of our relationship.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ○ 3   ○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ○ 5   ○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

My friend and I have lowered our expectations about what we expect as both friend and colleague in order to maintain our relationship.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ○ 3   ○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ○ 5   ○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

9. YOUR BLENDED RELATIONSHIP, PART 2

We are also interested in how you and your superior relate to and communicate with each other in your blended relationship.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

Please read the following statements and indicate how well each describes your blended relationship with the superior you identified earlier on a scale of 1 to 7.

I communicate coldness rather than warmth toward my superior.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I am interested in talking to my superior.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I do not want a deeper friendship between us.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I create a sense of distance between my superior and me.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I feel my superior is similar to me.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

I try to move the communication between my superior and me to a deeper level.

( ) 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.   ( ) 2 Describes this relationship a little.   ( ) 3   ( ) 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.   ( ) 5   ( ) 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.   ( ) 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I consider my superior and I to be equals.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

My superior and I do not treat each other as equals.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

One of us usually controls the interaction.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

One of us tries to dominate the other.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Neither of us tries to persuade the other.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Neither of us attempts to influence the other.

○ 1 Does not describe this relationship at all.　○ 2 Describes this relationship a little.　○ 3　○ 4 Describes this relationship about half of the time.　○ 5　○ 6 Almost completely describes this relationship.　○ 7 Completely describes this relationship.

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

For the next few questions, please consider the specific event that you wrote about earlier. For the following questions, please respond using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 meaning "not at all," and 7 meaning "very much."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
How involved were you?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How attentive were you?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
How interested were you?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

10. YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE, PART 1

We are also interested in your general response to the emotions you experienced during the stressful event you described. The following questions examine how you managed this stressful event in your blended relationship.

The next set of items explores a variety of emotions that you may have experienced in response to the stressful event you described earlier.

You may want to take a minute to reflect on that event once again before responding. Again, your answers are completely anonymous, so make sure to respond as honestly as you can to each item.

I made a sincere effort to actually feel the emotions that I needed to display to my superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I tried to actually experience the emotions that I needed to show.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I really tried to feel the emotions that I needed to show as both a friend and an employee of this superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I tried to think of situations in which I would naturally feel the desired emotion.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I made an effort to associate this experience with another one in which I would feel the desired emotion.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I made an effort to change the way I understood this stressful event.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I attributed this superior's stressful behavior to factors she or he could not control.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I emphasized the positive aspects of this blended relationship.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I focused on the good aspects of my relationship with my superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I made sure to focus on positive aspects of future interactions with this superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I reassured my superior that I would be there for him/her.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I resisted expressing my true feelings.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I pretended to have emotions that I really didn't have.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I hid my true feelings about the situation.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I tried to refrain from showing any emotion at all.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

11. YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE, PART 2

The last set of questions about your emotional experience focuses on the aftermath of the stressful event in your blended relationship with your superior.

These questions will assess how coping with stress in this blended relationship has affected you over time.

I feel emotionally drained from my work.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel used up at the end of the workday.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Working with people all day is really a strain.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel burned out from my work.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel frustrated by my job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Working with my superior directly puts too much stress on me.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can easily understand how my superior feels about things.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I deal very effectively with the problems of my superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel very energetic.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel exhilarated after working closely with my superior.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3   ◯ 4 Neutral   ◯ 5   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel I treat some coworkers as if they were impersonal "objects."

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I don't really care what happens to some coworkers.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel coworkers blame me for some of their problems.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 ◯ 4 Neutral ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

12. YOU & YOUR INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS, PART 1

The last two sets of items explore in more detail how you, in general, typically interact with other people, both individually and in groups.

There are no right or wrong responses and your answers are anonymous. Please respond in terms of how you currently are and not how you would ideally like to be.

I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I would probably make a good actor.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I rarely seek the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree　◯ 2 Disagree　◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree　◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree　◯ 5 Somewhat Agree　◯ 6 Agree　◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

In groups of people, I am rarely the center of attention.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different person.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I'm not always the person I appear to be.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I have considered being an entertainer.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree ◯ 2 Disagree ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree ◯ 6 Agree ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

13. YOU & YOUR INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS, PART 2

This last set of questions also focuses on your overall personality and how you interact with others.

I am outgoing, sociable.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I tend to find fault with others.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am a reliable worker.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I remain calm in intense situations.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I value artistic, aesthetic experiences.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am reserved.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am considerate and kind to almost everyone.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I can be somewhat careless.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am relaxed, handle stress well.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I prefer work that is routine and simple.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am full of energy.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I can be cold and aloof.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I do things efficiently.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I get nervous easily.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I have an active imagination.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree ( ) 2 Disagree ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree ( ) 6 Agree ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I am sometimes shy, inhibited.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I like to cooperate with others.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I tend to be disorganized.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am emotionally stable, not easily upset.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I have few artistic interests.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am talkative.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am sometimes rude to others.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I do a thorough job.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I am depressed, blue.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am sophisticated in art, music, or literature.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I tend to be quiet.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am generally trusting.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am lazy at times.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I worry a lot.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I am ingenious, a deep thinker.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

I generate a lot of enthusiasm.

( ) 1 Strongly Disagree   ( ) 2 Disagree   ( ) 3 Somewhat Disagree   ( ) 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ( ) 5 Somewhat Agree   ( ) 6 Agree   ( ) 7 Strongly Agree

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

I have a forgiving nature.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am easily distracted.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I can be tense.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

I am inventive.

◯ 1 Strongly Disagree   ◯ 2 Disagree   ◯ 3 Somewhat Disagree   ◯ 4 Neither Disagree Nor Agree   ◯ 5 Somewhat Agree   ◯ 6 Agree   ◯ 7 Strongly Agree

14. DEMOGRAPHICS

Just a few more demographic details about you and you're done!

PLEASE MAKE SURE TO PRINT OUT THE EXTRA CREDIT PAGE ON THE NEXT SCREEN

I am (please enter your age in digits)

[ ]

I would describe my ethnic background as (please mark one box only)

◯ Caucasian/white   ◯ African American   ◯ Asian, Asian American   ◯ Pacific Islander, Alaskan, Puerto Rican   ◯ Hispanic, Latino/a   ◯ Native American   ◯ Biracial (parents are of two different ethnic backgrounds).   ◯ Ot

I am (please mark one box only)

◯ Male

◯ Female

Blended Relationships in the Workplace Survey

Please indicate your relationship status.

◯ Single

◯ In a dating relationship

◯ Engaged

◯ Married

◯ Divorced

◯ Widow(er)

◯ Other (please specify)

> [   ]

The specific tasks I do at my job are best described as being primarily which type of work? (Please choose only one)

◯ Management

◯ Administrative

◯ Security

◯ Customer Service

◯ Technology Design / Repair

◯ Building / Facilities Maintenance

◯ Other (please specify)

> [   ]

My job title is:
[   ]

My superior's job title is:
[   ]

15. EXTRA CREDIT FORM

PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT YOU PRINT THIS PAGE AND GIVE IT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR IN ORDER TO RECEIVE YOUR EXTRA CREDIT (IF IT WAS OFFERED).

Thank you again for your participation!!!

16. Survey Exit

You will now exit the survey.

Appendix C
Correlations for all variables on Table 4

	E	A	C	N	O	DW	DS	SM	MBIEE	MBIPA	MBIDP	Deep	Surface	BR-T	BR-I	BR-PW	BR-PS	Dom	Affil
E	1.00																		
A	**0.29**	1.00																	
C	*0.14*	**0.27**	1.00																
N	**0.22**	**0.21**	**0.28**	1.00															
O	0.07	*0.17*	0.12	0.09	1.00														
DW	0.02	0.07	**0.22**	0.11	**0.18**	1.00													
DS	**0.19**	0.04	0.03	-0.11	0.04	0.05	1.00												
SM	**0.22**	-0.13	-0.12	-0.11	**0.19**	-0.05	0.00	1.00											
MBIEE	**-0.18**	**-0.25**	*-0.17*	**-0.30**	0.01	-0.10	*-0.15*	0.03	1.00										
MBIPA	**0.26**	**0.22**	**0.23**	*0.16*	**0.21**	**0.19**	**0.24**	0.03	**-0.38**	1.00									
MBIDP	**-0.23**	**-0.42**	**-0.18**	*-0.16*	*-0.17*	**-0.18**	-0.12	0.04	**0.62**	**-0.28**	1.00								
Deep	**0.18**	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.10	0.08	**0.33**	0.00	-0.13	**0.43**	0.06	1.00							
Surface	**-0.18**	**-0.25**	-0.12	**-0.19**	**-0.18**	*-0.16*	*-0.14*	*0.17*	**0.33**	**-0.31**	**0.43**	-0.11	1.00						
BR-T	*-0.14*	**-0.34**	**-0.22**	-0.11	-0.08	**-0.21**	-0.06	0.10	**0.36**	**-0.20**	**0.50**	0.07	**0.34**	1.00					
BR-I	0.12	0.08	0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.07	**0.52**	0.00	**-0.24**	**0.45**	-0.10	**0.43**	-0.13	-0.04	1.00				
BR-PW	*-0.14*	0.09	*0.14*	0.07	**0.19**	**0.26**	*-0.16*	0.10	-0.09	0.10	**-0.18**	0.08	-0.03	**-0.19**	0.03	1.00			
BR-PS	0.07	-0.08	0.01	0.01	-0.09	-0.17	**0.45**	-0.02	*-0.17*	**0.32**	-0.01	**0.23**	-0.09	0.08	**0.56**	-0.14	1.00		
Dom	-0.03	-0.11	-0.02	-0.11	-0.06	0.02	**-0.36**	*0.14*	**0.35**	**-0.36**	*0.15*	**-0.23**	**0.27**	**0.18**	**-0.47**	0.11	**-0.36**	1.00	
Affil	*0.15*	**0.18**	0.03	0.03	*0.14*	0.02	**0.48**	0.07	**-0.40**	**0.50**	**-0.25**	**0.38**	**-0.32**	**-0.21**	**0.52**	0.00	**0.52**	**-0.50**	1.00
Invol	0.11	0.12	**0.18**	0.08	**0.22**	0.12	**0.27**	-0.02	-0.05	**0.32**	-0.07	**0.32**	**-0.21**	-0.02	**0.23**	*0.17*	**0.26**	*-0.14*	**0.22**

Bold   = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, 2 tailed.
Italics = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2 tailed.