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Abstract

This study examined how personality characteristics affect job performance, and the mediating effects of job performance in the personality interaction-emotional exhaustion relation. Specifically, I hypothesized that neuroticism and conscientiousness would have an interactive effect on emotional exhaustion and that job performance would mediate that relation. Customer service employees employed in a Chinese call center participated and completed a questionnaire assessing personality and emotional exhaustion. As expected, analyses revealed that conscientiousness predicted job performance. Findings also showed that customer service employees higher in conscientiousness or lower in neuroticism experienced a lower level of emotional exhaustion than those lower in conscientiousness or higher in neuroticism. Data supported the hypotheses that conscientiousness and neuroticism had an interactive effect on job performance. People higher in conscientiousness but lower in neuroticism achieved better job performance than those higher in both conscientiousness and neuroticism. Data did not support my hypotheses specifying that job performance mediated the conscientiousness-neuroticism interaction with emotional exhaustion.
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1. Introduction

Customer service employees represent their organizations to the public (Adams, 1976; Chung & Schneider, 2002). They are a critical asset of service organizations because they can influence customer experiences and gather information about those experiences to help their organizations succeed in meeting customer needs (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996). Indeed, service quality is a tactic companies employ to gain a competitive advantage over others (Schneider & White, 2004).

High quality customer service is related to business performance. For example, researchers found a positive link between service quality and customer loyalty. Customers who believe they received good quality service are more likely to remain customers of an organization than those who didn’t receive satisfactory service (Bell, Auh & Smalley, 2005; Rust & Zahorik, 1993; White & Schneider, 2000). The importance of customer loyalty is also due to its relation with organizational success. Loyal customers increase the likelihood of organizational success by providing it with a steady stream of revenue (Rust & Zahorik, 1993; Schneider & White, 2004). Indeed, 90% of customer repeat decisions are heavily determined by the quality of the service they had received (Oliva & Lancioni, 1996). On the other hand, failure to deliver high service quality can lead to a permanent loss of customers (Babakus, Yavas, Karatepe, & Avci, 2003).

The following example highlights the importance of customer retention.
Assume that a supermarket owns 70 chains and that each location loses two customers each week. Also assume that each customer spends $50 a week at the store. Given those parameters, the annual revenue loss for this company is almost $19 million (Blanding, 1991). Given the importance of service quality to organizational success, it is critical that we understand the factors affecting service quality performance.

Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager (1993) describe a performance model that may serve as a useful framework for understanding customer service performance. They specify in their model that performance is a function of three major determinants: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge and skills, and motivation. Declarative knowledge refers to an understanding of a specific job task’s requirement, or knowing what to do. Procedural knowledge and skills are achieved when knowing what to do is combined with knowing how to do it. They define motivation as a combined effect of choice to expend effort, choice of level of effort to expend, and choice to persist at the level of effort. The combined effects of factors under these categories determine performance. Antecedents of these performance determinants also affect performance through their direct influence. Organizational antecedents of performance determinants include reward systems, training, and management practices, etc. Individual difference antecedents include personality, abilities, interests, and personal experience (Johnson, 2003).

There is a large body of literature on factors affecting customer service performance. Research on external factors affecting customer service performance has focused primarily on organizational factors. For example, employees’ perceptions of
favorable HRM practices, such as work facilitation and supervision, were positively related to customers’ positive service experience (Schneider & Bowen, 1993). Conducting a study in fast food restaurants, Waldersee and Luthans (1994) found that positive performance feedback improved customer service employee performance more than corrective feedback. In addition, Schneider, Parkington, and Buxton (1980) reported that the organization’s service-oriented practices and procedures (e.g. enthusiastic orientation of service, attempts to actively retain customers) related to positive customer perceptions of service quality.

Some believe that companies need to hire the right person to fit the customer service position (Oliva & Lancioni, 1996). To that end, the second stream of customer service performance literature focused on identifying individual differences that distinguish between people who perform well on customer service jobs from those who don’t perform well. For example, Caldwell and O'Reilly (1982) found that self-monitoring predicted the job performance of field representatives in a franchising organization. Alge, Gresham, Heneman, Fox, and McMasters (2002) found that interpersonal skill exhibited a positive relation with self-reported job performance of bus transit operators. Pugh (2001) conducted a study in bank settings. Results revealed that there was a positive relation between the tellers’ display of positive emotions and customers’ perceptions of service quality.

There has been increasing interest in the influence of employees’ personality traits on customer service quality (Schneider & Bowen, 1995). For example, Hurley (1998) conducted a study in retail stores. The results indicated that extraverted
customer service providers performed better than less extraverted employees. People higher in agreeableness also performed better than those lower in that dimension. Frei and McDaniel (1998) pointed out that emotional stability, conscientiousness, and agreeableness were strongly and positively associated with customer service measures. Liu and Chen (2006) reported that people higher in introversion were usually not recruited as frontline employees in the hospitality industry.

Despite calls to expand models of personality-performance relations to include the interactive effects of personality traits on performance (Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996; Hough & Ones, 2001; Wright, Kacmar, McMahan, & Deleeuw, 1995), there is limited research examining the impact of personality interaction effects on job performance. Witt, Burke, Barrick, and Mount’s (2002) research is one notable exception. They stated that interaction among certain personality traits may lead to either desirable or undesirable work behaviors. Results indicated that highly conscientious employees with poor interpersonal skills were less effective than people possessing both qualities.

O*NET Online, an occupational information website, lists the various skills and abilities customer service employees should possess to meet customer service job requirements. Characteristics include dependability, persistence, self-control, and stress tolerance. People higher in conscientiousness and lower in neuroticism tend to have these characteristics. What remains unclear is the level of employees’ performance when they are high in either conscientiousness or neuroticism but lower
in the other characteristic. In this study, I will examine the interactive effect of conscientiousness and neuroticism on job performance of customer service employees.
2. Review of Literature

2.1. Personality and Performance

2.1.1. Neuroticism.

Neuroticism or emotional stability refers to the tendency to experience negative affect such as depression, anxiety, and anger. People who scored high on neuroticism scales tend to be worrying, insecure, nervous, depressed, and vulnerable (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conversely, people who scored low on neuroticism are characterized as calm, relaxed, secure, and hardy (McCrae & Costa, 1987, 2003). Emotional stability is positively related to customer service performance (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). This makes sense because employees need to control their emotions to maintain positive relations with customers (Hochschild, 1983; Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989). Thus, employees need to hide certain emotions when interacting with customers to perform well (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Wharton & Erickson, 1995). Given that emotionally stable people tend to control their emotions and show appropriate emotions across time and situations, I expect that people higher in neuroticism will perform more poorly in customer service settings than those lower in neuroticism will perform.

**H1**: Neuroticism is negatively related to job performance.

2.1.2. Conscientiousness.

People with higher conscientiousness are achievement striving, hardworking, self-disciplined, reliable, persistent, efficient in work, and pursue excellence in most
everything they do (McCrae & Costa, 2003). Compared with lower conscientious people, people higher in conscientiousness are more likely to perform job tasks correctly, stay focused on job tasks, and commit to good job performance (Witt, et al., 2002). Meta-analyses have shown that conscientiousness exhibits a positive relation with job performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hough, Eaton, Dunnette, Kamp, & McCloy, 1990; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Moreover, conscientiousness consistently relates to all job performance criteria for all occupational groups (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Frei and McDaniel (1998) found that customer service employees need to be dependable as well as friendly and stable.

**H2**: Conscientiousness is positively related to job performance.

### 2.1.3 Interaction of Conscientiousness and Neuroticism.

Hobfoll’s Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory (Hobfoll, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1998; Hobfoll, Lilly, & Jackson, 1992; Hobfoll & Shirom, 1993) has been used to explain the stress process (e.g., Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Wilk & Moynihan, 2005; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004). It is a theory that explains behavior and performance in terms of resource expenditure and acquisition. The central theme is that people with greater amounts of resources are less vulnerable to resource loss, and more capable of resource gain, than those possessing fewer resources (Hobfoll, et al., 1992). The theory may also useful in explaining how personality variables and their interactions affect workplace performance and stress.

People have to invest resources to protect against resource loss, offset resource loss, and gain more resources. There are four resource categories: 1) objects (e.g.,
transportation, home), 2) conditions (e.g., good marriage, tenure, seniority, being healthy), 3) energies (e.g., time, money, knowledge), and 4) personal characteristics (e.g., hardiness, internal locus of control). Personal characteristics are aspects of the self that are either valued or that aid in the achievement of goals. They also affect the ability to withstand the demands from threatening environments (Hobfoll, 1988, 1998). One example of a personal characteristic related to job performance is intelligence (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Examples of personal characteristics related to stress resistance include internal locus of control (Spector & O’Connell, 1994), positive affectivity (Spector & O’Connell, 1994; Spector, Chen & O’Connell, 2000), and hardiness (Toscano & Ponterdolph, 1998).

Personality variables and the interactions among them are resources required to meet job demands. Emotional stability is one resource that may be critical for customer service personnel because these people must be able to control their emotions in what is typically a stressful working environment. For example, customer service representatives occasionally deal with irate customers. The ability to control one’s emotions may either have a calming effect on unhappy customers or prevent the escalation of the customer’s anger. On the other hand, it may be difficult for people higher in neuroticism to distribute their energy and attention effectively because they need to expend a good deal of effort controlling their emotions and this, in turn, may adversely affect other aspects of behavior on the job (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Thus, people higher in emotional stability would use less personal resources than those who are lower in emotional stability would use.
I believe conscientiousness can contribute to and detract from resource accrual. On one hand, conscientiousness is a key personal resource because the extra effort expended and persistence conscientiousness people demonstrate may lead to resource outcomes they may not have acquired had they not put forth as much effort or persistence. People with insufficient personal resources to do the job are more vulnerable to a resource deficit as the outcomes they receive are not equivalent to the resources expended to obtain desired outcomes. However, high conscientiousness may also lead to resource depletion.

I expect resource depletion to accelerate for conscientious people who lack other critical personal resources for successful job performance. An emotionally unstable, conscientious person is but one illustration. People low in a critical personal resource such as emotional stability may rely on or tap in to other personal resources such as contentiousness to stop resource depletion. Unfortunately, because these people lack the key personal resource of emotional stability merely persisting with the wrong behaviors is unlikely to lead to successful job performance. Indeed, this scenario results in an even greater resource loss for these employees than they would have experienced had they not tried so hard because a downward spiral may occur when the conscientious employees try even harder after repeated failure. No matter how much effort is invested the cost of resource investment outstrips demands (SchÖnpflug, 1985) and the result of repeated failure is an increasing level of resource deficit. I propose that conscientiousness is the predictor and neuroticism is the moderator because conscientiousness is one of the best non-cognitive predictors of
**H3**: Conscientiousness and neuroticism have an interactive effect on customer service performance. Specifically, the positive relation between conscientiousness and neuroticism will be stronger for people lower in neuroticism than those higher in neuroticism.

2.2. *Emotional Exhaustion*

I expect deficient key personal resources needed for job performance reduces the level at which people perform which in turn impacts the likelihood of the employee experiencing emotional exhaustion. That is, job performance mediates the personality interaction-emotional exhaustion relation.

Customer service employees need to manage emotions to foster a positive organization-customer relation. However, managing emotions is stressful and can lead to stress-related outcomes such as emotional exhaustion (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). Emotional exhaustion, the central dimension of burnout, refers to the feeling of being emotionally overextended (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maslach, 1993; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). As one of the more extreme varieties of work-related strain (Gaines & Jermier, 1983), it involves feelings of fatigue, frustration and tension, and a reluctance to go back to work (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Emotional exhaustion occurs in people-oriented occupations that require interpersonal interactions such as police, counselors, physicians, social workers, and customer service employees (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Shirom, 1989;
Singh, Goolsby, & Rhoads, 1994). Codes and Dougherty (1993) proposed that customer-contact employees as well as social workers, teachers, and nurses might suffer the highest levels of emotional exhaustion in jobs requiring inter-personal interaction because these workers experience both high intensity and a high frequency of interpersonal contact.

Emotional exhaustion has been consistently linked with both the quality of work life and many organizational consequences (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). From an employee’s perspective, emotional exhaustion is related to a variety of mental and physical health problems, such as depression, helplessness, irritability, colds, headaches, and sleep disturbance (Belcastro, 1982; Belcastro & Hays, 1984; Jackson & Maslach, 1982). From the organization’s perspective, emotionally exhausted employees are more likely to show reduced work performance, lower organizational commitment, absenteeism, higher turnover rate, and job dissatisfaction (Babakus, Cravens, Johnston, & Moncrief, 1999; Firth & Britton, 1989; Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986; Maslach & Jackson, 1985; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to subsequent job performance (e.g. Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003; Leiter, Harvie, & Frizzell, 1998; Nowack & Hanson, 1983; Quattrochi-Turbin, Jones, & Breedlove, 1983; Witt, Andrews, & Carlson, 2004; Wright & Bonett, 1997; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). However, some researchers (Holgate & Clegg, 1991; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998) proposed that poor performance might lead to high level of emotional exhaustion.

Researchers have used COR Theory to explain how emotional exhaustion
occurs (e.g. Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Wilk & Moynihan, 2005; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Wright, Larwood, & Denney, 2002; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004) and as a way to understand the relation between performance and subsequent emotional exhaustion. Customer service employees use available resources to meet the job’s emotional demands. Frequent and intense interpersonal involvement tends to be emotionally taxing (Maslach, 1982). Emotional exhaustion occurs when there is an imbalance between the emotional demands of work and the emotional, personality, social or status resources available to fuel the energy to meet such demands (Wilk & Moynihan, 2005; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004). When employees’ resource investment does not lead to expected and desired resources such as good job performance, the employees experience resource depletion that, in turn, leads to emotional exhaustion.

**H4**: Poor performance is related to subsequent emotional exhaustion.

### 2.3. Personality Interaction, Job Performance, and Emotional Exhaustion

Research on emotional exhaustion has attempted to identify environmental factors, group differences, and individual differences contributing toward emotional exhaustion. Environmental variables include quantitative workload (Codes, Dougherty, & Blum, 1997), role conflict and unpleasant contacts with supervisors (Leiter & Maslach, 1988). Researchers have also investigated the effects of group differences such as age and marital status on emotional exhaustion. For example, Maslach and Jackson (1981) found that younger people experienced a higher level of emotional exhaustion than older people. Married people reported less emotional
exhaustion than single individuals.

Personality traits are also related to emotional exhaustion. People with negative affectivity (Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & Chermont, 2003; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), an external locus of control (Brookings, Bolton, Brown, & McEvoy, 1985; Kalbers & Fogarty, 2005; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992), low agreeableness (Piedmont, 1993; Zellars, Perrewe, & Hochwarter, 2000), or low hardiness (Toscano & Ponterdolph, 1998) generally reported a higher level of emotional exhaustion than people who were either an internal locus of control, higher in agreeableness, or higher in hardiness.

Neuroticism has been widely studied in the occupational stress research domain because of its association with indices of well-being (Hart, Wearing, & Headey, 1995). The rationale for the link between neuroticism and stress is that people with high neuroticism experience more negative emotions than people lower in neuroticism. The increased negative emotions lead to increased stress (Nasurdin, Ramayah, & Kumaresan, 2005). Stress is a physiological and psychological response to demands that are perceived to be challenging or threatening (Spector, 1996). Ganster and Schaubroeck (1991) argued that emotional exhaustion is a type of stress outcome. Specifically, emotional exhaustion is a chronic emotional response pattern to a stressful work environment characterized by a high level of interpersonal contact (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Given that customer service representatives engage in frequent contact with others, it is only appropriate to assess emotional exhaustion as an outcome variable. Researchers have reported a relation between neuroticism and
emotion exhaustion (e.g., Deary & Blenkin, 1996; Piedmont, 1993; Zellars, et al., 2000). Indeed, Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) indicated that neuroticism was one of the strongest personality variables that positively related to emotional exhaustion.

While the conscientiousness and performance relation is well documented (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991), research investigating the relation between conscientiousness and stress-related outcomes such as emotional exhaustion has yielded inconsistent results. Lusch and Serpkenci (1990) found conscientiousness was negatively associated with job tension. On the other hand, others reported no relation between conscientiousness and emotional exhaustion (Piedmont, 1993; Zellars, et al., 2000). Miller, Griffin, and Hart (1999) reported that conscientiousness predicted neither psychological distress nor job satisfaction. Perhaps the mixed results can be explained by a third variable that creates a discrepancy between job performance that higher conscientious people achieve and their high performance expectation, or in COR Theory terms, when people fail to attain the desired resources they expect. Perhaps neuroticism is a variable that can help explain the inconsistent results cited above.

Conscientious people are organized and hard working. They usually put more effort at work than people low in conscientiousness. Conscientious people also think of themselves as possessing high levels of competence (McCrae & Costa, 2003). Given these characteristics, it is reasonable to expect that conscientious people have either high outcome expectations or expectations of receiving desired resources when they perform. However, effort is not the only factor causing performance.
Performance also depends on the capability and skills people have (Bandura, 1986; Campbell, et al., 1993). Unfortunately, high conscientious people cannot meet their high expectations if they lack other skills needed to do the job well. Their failure to meet their own high performance expectations may lead them to perceive that they are not obtaining sufficient desired resources given the resources they muster for job performance. That perceived discrepancy may lead to emotional exhaustion.

As proposed in Hypothesis 1, neuroticism is an important characteristic for customer service representatives. Considering both conscientiousness and neuroticism simultaneously, I believe that the amount of resources that high conscientious/high neuroticism need to spend to control their emotions they know they have to control is greater than the amount resources people who don’t care as much about expending effort to control their emotions to do a better job spend (i.e., people lower in contentiousness and higher neuroticism). I also expect that high conscientious/high neuroticism need to spend more resources to control their emotions than people lower in neuroticism regardless of the latter group’s conscientiousness level. The higher resource investment alone suggests that high conscientious/high neurotic people are more likely to experience a greater resource input/output discrepancy and hence more likely to experience emotional exhaustion than the other conscientious/neuroticism trait combination groups.

**H5:** Job performance mediates the interactive effect of conscientiousness and neuroticism on emotional exhaustion.
3. Research Methodology

3.1. Participants

Participants were customers service employees in a call center located in a large city in middle China. Of the 300 packets distributed, I received 123 (41%) completed research packets back. Of those responses returned, 98 were useable. Twenty-five people indicated that they worked more than 85 hours per week. Given their response to that question, I had a concern over the accuracy of their responses to other questions. I eliminated these 25 respondents’ data because their reported working hours seemed questionable. However, I conducted analyses on the full sample and note below where differences existed between the full and partial sample.

The partial sample consisted of 39 females, 58 males, and one non-respondent to the question asking participants to indicate their gender. Their average age was 30.5. The average years of full-time employment were 8.6 years ($SD = 7.0$ years). The average tenure in the customer service position was 5 years and 7 months (range from .5 year to 20 years). The average working hours per week were 48.3 hours. Sixty-five participants were married; 33 participants reported they were single. Of those responding, 50 people reported they didn’t have children living at home. Forty-eight participants had one or two children living at home. Seventy-one respondents were post-secondary school graduates and twenty-seven possessed their highest degree at the high school level.
3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Emotional exhaustion.

Witt, et al. (2004) developed a five-item emotional exhaustion scale. I believe this scale is preferable to other emotional exhaustion scales because the items are specifically tailored to customer service representatives. A sample item is “I find myself feeling angry or frustrated with my customers.” Scale anchors range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Two English linguists translated this scale for me. One of them translated the scale into Mandarin Chinese. The other did back-translation. After that, the three of us compared all the translated versions to original version and made some revisions after reaching consensus on the wording of individual items. Appendix B contains the scale. Witt, et al. (2004) reported that Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .72. Scale score reliability for the present study was adequate ($\alpha = .79$).

3.2.2. Conscientiousness.

I used the conscientiousness scale from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg, 1999; International Personality Item Pool, 2001) to assess conscientiousness. IPIP is a web-based pool providing alternative versions of some popular personality questionnaires. The participants read 10 items and rated each item on the degree to which the item described them. Anchors ranged from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). Goldberg listed the contact information of the person who translated (and back-translated) this scale into Mandarin Chinese on IPIP website (International Personality Item Pool, 2001). I e-mailed this person to obtain Chinese
version of the scale. Appendix B contains the scale. Goldberg (1999) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .79 for the English version. Scale score reliability for the present study was adequate ($\alpha = .70$).

3.2.3. Neuroticism.

I used the neuroticism scale from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg, 1999; International Personality Item Pool, 2001) to assess neuroticism. The participants read 10 items and rated each item on the degree to which the item described them. Anchors ranged from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). On IPIP website, Goldberg listed the contact information of the person who translated (and back-translated) this scale into Mandarin Chinese (International Personality Item Pool, 2001). I e-mailed this person to obtain Chinese version of the scale. Appendix B contains the scale. Goldberg (1999) reports the reliability coefficient for this scale is .86. Scale score reliability for the present study was adequate ($\alpha = .77$).

3.2.4. Job performance

I acquired each participant’s performance data from the call center’s management information system. Supervisors assess job performance on two equally weighted dimensions: quality and quantity. Supervisors rate subordinates’ quality using a global quality scale from 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) to 5 (Meet Expectations). Supervisors consider factors as conversation skill, knowledge, flexibility, and politeness when determining their rating. Company policy also requires that employees successfully handle a fixed percentage of calls.

The quantity dimension is the number of calls the employee solves; that is, the
calls where the employee handled customer’s problem successfully. Employees write a brief report for every call they receive. In each report, they describe the problem, how they handled it, and whether they solved the problem. If they need a supervisor’s help to handle the problem, they can not count the call as successfully handled. The supervisor checks each report and decides whether it can count as a solved call. The company’s representatives calculate how many calls employees receive at the end of every month. Supervisors rate their employees on how many calls the employees handle successfully on a scale from 1 to 5. For example, assume each person is required to handle 450 calls in a particular month. An employee who solves at least 405 of those calls receives a rating of 5. An employee who solves 404 to 360 calls receives a 4 rating. Receiving 359 to 315 calls warrants a 3 rating. The employee earns a rating of 2 if they successfully handled from 314 to 270 calls and a rating of 1 if the employee successfully handles less than 270 calls in the month. Supervisors then add the quality and quantity ratings. The sum of the dimension ratings is the index of job performance. The difference in the number of calls required for a specific numerical rating differs from month to month because the total number of calls the call centre received is different each month.

3.2.5. Control variables.

I measured several variables in addition to those described above because research has shown that they are related to emotional exhaustion. I assessed gender, age, marital status, working experience and education level because Maslach and Jackson (1981) found that they were all related to emotional exhaustion. I also asked
participants to indicate the number of children they had who lived at home because of its relation to emotional exhaustion (Zellars, et al., 2000). I also asked participants to indicate the number of hours they had work in a typical week to assess its possible influence on emotional exhaustion.

3.3. Procedure

I acquired permission to conduct my research from the company’s HR manager. The HR manager helped me distribute the survey packets to the participants. After agreeing to participate, participants completed the survey items. I informed participants to leave their names on their completed surveys to enable me to obtain their performance data. I picked up the completed research instruments from participants after leaving them with the participants for a few days. I provided the name list of participants to HR manager to obtain their performance data. This organization routinely collects performance data on each employee. I used that performance data in my study.

3.4. Data analysis

I employed correlation and regression analyses to test my hypotheses. I used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) method to assess whether job performance mediates the relation between conscientiousness and neuroticism interaction and emotional exhaustion. To document a mediating relation, the predictor should relate to the mediator and criterion, the mediator should relate to the criterion, and the mediator should predict criterion variance after statistical control of the predictor.
mediation occurs when the predictor does not account for unique criterion variance after statistical control of the mediator.
4. Results

4.1 Hypotheses Testing

Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics and zero-order correlation values for job performance, emotional exhaustion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and the demographic variables. Age \((r = .20, p < .05)\), marital status \((r = .35, p < .01)\) and number of dependent children \((r = .21, p < .05)\) were related to job performance. The other demographic variables were not related to emotional exhaustion.

Table 1 reveals that most participants received extremely high performance scores. The average performance score was 9.1. One possible reason for the high scores is that the company has very high performance standards. There is little tolerance for poor performance and the company routinely terminates poor performers. The effect of this range restriction is that my results are probably conservative estimates of relations I found.

I conducted hierarchical regression analyses to test my hypotheses. My sample size on the analyses with job performance was 96 because one person did not indicate his or her gender and another person did not indicate his years of working experience. The sample size for the analyses examining emotional exhaustion was 98.
Note. N=96. EE=emotional exhaustion. CS Experience=customer service experience.

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neuroticism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CS Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marital Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependent Child</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Education level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Working hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Inter correlations of Study Variables.
Hypothesis 1 posited a negative relation between neuroticism and job performance. I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis using job performance as the criterion. I entered age, martial status, and number of dependent children in the first step of the regression equation because these demographic variables were related to job performance. I entered conscientiousness in the second step of the regression equation. I entered neuroticism in the third step of the regression equation. Data showed that neuroticism accounted for 1.2% unique variance in performance above and beyond the control variables and conscientiousness but was not statistically significant. ($\Delta F (1, 90) =1.30, p >.05$). These data do not support the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2 stated a positive relation between conscientiousness and job performance. I also conducted a multiple regression analysis. I entered age, martial status, and number of dependent children in the first step of the regression equation. I entered neuroticism in the second step of the regression equation. I entered conscientiousness in the third step of the regression equation. Data showed that conscientiousness did not predict job performance above and beyond the control variables and neuroticism ($\Delta F (1, 90) =1.48, p >.05$). These data do not support the second hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3 stated that conscientiousness and neuroticism had an interactive effect on job performance. I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis using job performance as the criterion. I entered age, martial status, and number of dependent children in the first step of the regression equation. I entered
conscientiousness and neuroticism in the second step of the regression equation. I entered the conscientiousness-neuroticism interaction term in the third step of the regression equation. Table 2 presents the result of that analysis.

Table 2. Effects of Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Age, Martial Status, Number of Dependent Children, and Personality Interaction on Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Three Predictor</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>4.19**</td>
<td>4.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>martial status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Five Predictors</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>martial status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Six Predictors</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>9.48**</td>
<td>4.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>martial status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A * B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.85**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=96.
* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$.

As shown in Step 2 in Table 2, neither conscientiousness nor neuroticism made unique contributions in predicting job performance above and beyond each other, and other demographic variables. Data indicated that conscientiousness and neuroticism interaction accounted for 8% unique variance in performance and was statistically significant ($\Delta F (1, 89)=9.48, p<.01$).
I conducted a simple slope analysis to identify the nature of the interaction. To conduct the analysis, I dichotomized neuroticism (lower neuroticism = 1; higher neuroticism = 2). Next, I regressed performance on conscientiousness for those lower in neuroticism. Results show that conscientiousness predicted job performance for those lower in neuroticism ($F(1, 43) = 15.0, p < .001$). I then regressed performance on conscientiousness for those higher in neuroticism. Conscientiousness was not related to job performance for these individuals ($F(1, 51) = .30, p > .05$). These data support the third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4 states that job performance is related to subsequent emotional exhaustion. As can be seen in Table 1, performance was not related to emotional exhaustion ($r = .05, p > .05$). Therefore, I did not find support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5 stated that job performance mediates the personality interaction-emotional exhaustion relation. Given that I did not find a relation between performance and emotional exhaustion, I cannot claim support for Hypothesis 5.

4.2 Post Hoc Analyses

I conducted post hoc analyses. Specifically, I examined the neuroticism-emotional exhaustion relation, the conscientiousness-emotional exhaustion relation, and the neuroticism and conscientiousness interaction effect on emotional exhaustion. I also conducted a simple slope analysis examining the neuroticism-performance relation with people low and high in conscientiousness.
Finally, I conducted these analyses using the full sample to determine where differences, if any, exist between the full and partial sample difference with sub-sample results.

To test neuroticism-emotional exhaustion relation, I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis using emotional exhaustion as the criterion. I entered conscientiousness in the first step of the regression equation. I entered neuroticism in the second step of the regression equation. Result showed that neuroticism accounted for 9.1% unique variance in emotional exhaustion and was statistically significant ($\Delta F (1, 95) = 10.28, p < .01$).

To test conscientiousness-emotional exhaustion relation, I also conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis using emotional exhaustion as the criterion. I entered neuroticism in the first step and entered conscientiousness in the second step of the regression equation. Result showed that conscientiousness did not predict emotional exhaustion above and beyond neuroticism ($\Delta F (1, 95) = 2.32, p > .05$).

I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis to test interactive effect of conscientiousness and neuroticism on emotional exhaustion. I entered conscientiousness and neuroticism in the first step and the conscientiousness and neuroticism interaction term in the second step. Table 3 presents the result of that analysis.
Table 3. Effects of Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Personality Interaction on Emotional Exhaustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Two Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.01***</td>
<td>9.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Three Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A * B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=98.

* p< .05. ** p< .01. *** p< .001.

These data showed that conscientiousness and neuroticism did not have an interactive effect on emotional exhaustion (ΔF (1, 94) = .05, p > .05).

I also did the simple slope analysis for completeness where I dichotomized conscientiousness into two groups (lower conscientiousness = 1; higher conscientiousness = 2). I regressed performance on neuroticism for each sub-group. There is no neuroticism–performance relation for those lower in conscientiousness (F (1, 43) = 1.25, p > .05). I found a negative relation between neuroticism and performance for the higher conscientious people (F (1, 51) = 6.59, p < .05). These results are consistent with what I predicted.

For completeness, I also did analyses on full sample. The results reveal no marked differences in conclusions I drew from results based on the sub-sample. Neither conscientiousness (ΔF (1, 120) =2.35, p > .05) nor neuroticism (ΔF (1, 120) =2.14, p > .05) predicted job performance above and beyond each other and other control variables. The conscientiousness and neuroticism interaction accounted for 8.1% unique variance in job performance and was statistically significant (ΔF (1, 105) = 5.97, p < .05).
I conducted a simple slope analysis to identify the nature of the interaction for the full sample size. To conduct the analysis, I dichotomized neuroticism (lower neuroticism = 1; higher neuroticism = 2). Next, I regressed performance on conscientiousness for those lower in neuroticism. Results show that conscientiousness predicted job performance for those lower in neuroticism \((F(1, 48) = 15.72, p < .001)\). I then regressed performance on conscientiousness for those higher in neuroticism. Conscientiousness was not related to job performance for these individuals \((F(1, 71) = .57, p > .05)\). I also dichotomized conscientiousness into two groups (lower conscientiousness = 1; higher conscientiousness = 2). I regressed performance on neuroticism for each sub-group. There is no neuroticism–performance relation for those lower in conscientiousness \((F(1, 56) = 1.17, p > .05)\). I found a negative relation between neuroticism and performance for the higher conscientious people \((F(1, 63) = 12.22, p < .01)\). These results are consistent with what I predicted.

I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis using emotional exhaustion as the criterion for the full sample. I entered conscientiousness and neuroticism in the first step of the regression equation and the conscientiousness-neuroticism interaction term in the second step. Neuroticism accounted for 9.4% unique variance in emotional exhaustion and was statistically significant \((\Delta F(1, 120) = 13.63, p < .001)\). Conscientiousness predicted variance in emotional exhaustion above and beyond neuroticism \((\Delta F(1, 120) = 4.02, p < .05)\).
Conscientiousness and neuroticism did not have an interactive effect on emotional exhaustion ($\Delta F (1, 119) = .27, p > .05$).

In summary, I conducted analyses on the full sample to determine whether differences existed with results derived from the partial sample. The only difference in the two analyses occurred with emotional exhaustion. Conscientiousness made a unique contribution to emotional exhaustion in the larger sample whereas it did not in the sub-sample. The different results I found between the two samples may have been due to differences in statistical power.
5. Discussion

There is limited research on the interactive effects among personality traits on job performance. To extend the personality-performance literature, this study examined the interactive effect of conscientiousness and neuroticism on customer service performance. I found evidence for a conscientiousness and neuroticism interactive effect on job performance. At lower levels of neuroticism, conscientiousness affected performance. There was no relation between conscientiousness and performance for those individuals reporting higher levels of neuroticism. Lacking the key ability of emotional stability, dispositional tendencies regarding high effort and perseverance did not meaningfully affect performance. On the other hand, at higher level of conscientiousness, neuroticism negatively affected job performance. There was no relation between neuroticism and performance for those lower in conscientiousness. Lacking high effort and perseverance to work, the ability to control emotions did not affect performance. Therefore, to understand better customer service performance, we need to incorporate both personality predictors in the performance model.

The failure to support the relation between job performance and subsequent emotional exhaustion may be related to the way in which the company officials assessed performance. Their system combined both quantity and quality dimensions of job performance. To the degree that emotional exhaustion was related to only one dimension, the emotional exhaustion-performance estimate I obtained would not
reflect accurately the relation with each individual dimension accurately. I observed that my participants reported lower levels of emotional exhaustion than I had expected. The mean of emotional exhaustion in my study was 1.8. In Witt, et al.’s (2004) study, the mean was 2.46. While it is difficult to disentangle scale translation effects from other explanations as causes of the differences in emotional exhaustion levels reported in the two studies, there may be some cultural reasons for my observation. Chinese people are reluctant to display negative emotions to others. They are not willing to share or even admit if they have emotional and psychological problems because they consider it something to be ashamed of. Perhaps my sample view emotional exhaustion as a negative emotion and an indication of incompetence and therefore were reluctant to report that they were experiencing it to anything but a minimal degree.
6. Importance of the Study

My research extends the personality-performance and the personality-emotional exhaustion literature. I found that conscientiousness and neuroticism had an interactive effect on customer service job performance in a Chinese call center. This is the first study that I know of to examine personality interaction effects on job performance using a Chinese sample. While cultural differences between Western and Eastern societies exist, these data show that as in the West, examining patterns of personality relations present a deeper understanding of behavior in organizations than the information bivariate correlations provide.

Conscientiousness is thought to be one of the best non-cognitive predictors of performance (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Managers believe that their high conscientious employees can maintain a high level of job performance and, as a result, often pay little attention to them (Witt, et al., 2004). However, based on my findings, they are likely to achieve a lower than expected level of job performance if these conscientious people have deficits in other job related skills and abilities. This result suggests it is important to look at personality as a set rather than individually to gain a better understanding of work performance. The implication for managers is that they need to select job applicants on both dimensions during the selection process.
This study has boundary conditions that limit the generalizability of my conclusions. All participants of this study were call center customer service representatives in a single organization. Thus, the findings may not generalize to other customer service job types such as salespeople, bank tellers, and cashiers. Additional research is needed to assess these relations.

A second limitation is that there are other personal, occupational, organizational, and non-work characteristics that may influence job performance and experienced levels of emotional exhaustion that I did not assess. Variables might include locus of control (Spector & O’Connell, 1994), agreeableness (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Piedmont, 1993), role conflict (Leiter & Maslach, 1988), and work overload (Codes, et. al, 1997). There is a need for additional research controlling these factors on this topic to address better generalizability of the results.

A third limitation is that there may be the possibility that people tried to make themselves look good when completing the personality and emotional exhaustion scales because of the cultural issues that I mentioned in the discussion section. This demand characteristic could have biased the conclusions. Most Chinese people believe that having stress-related problems means they are not competent at work. As a result, they may have been reluctant to acknowledge that they may be experiencing emotional exhaustion. The effect of this range restriction is to attenuate correlations. Thus, my results may underestimate true effect sizes.
The company I surveyed had no previous experience with the academic researchers. Their employees also are relatively unaware of ethical issues in the research field, so the employees may worry that their information is not secure. Therefore, some of the participants may not have revealed the negative parts of their personality and their emotional problems.

Managers in this company and professors in the same city of the host organization told me that there is limited cooperation between academic research and participants in Chinese organizations. While I had assured participants that their company officials could not assess participant survey responses, the participants may have had concerns that their responses were not confidential. Therefore, they may have provided distorted responses to make themselves appear better than they truly feel to avoid experiencing problems with company officials.

Chinese people may be reluctant to admit that they have emotional and psychological problems because those two problems are viewed as a sign of weakness and incompetence in the Chinese culture (Huang & Hu, 2004). Social desirability represents a tendency for individuals, in test-taking situations, to indicate that they possess socially desirable characteristics and that they adhere to culturally norms and standards. In other words, it refers to people’s propensity for presenting oneself in a positive light. Some subjects in my study may have provided socially desirable responses to some survey items for cultural reasons. Social desirable responding may have affected the results I had obtained on the stress survey (Arnold, Feldman, & Purbhoo, 1986; Ganster, Hennessey, & Luthans, 1983). Future research
could employ social desirability as a control variable to reduce the possible impact that some participants report inaccurate emotional exhaustion level.

There is a need for future research to cover different types of employment because the frequency and intensity of interpersonal contact may influence employees’ job performance and levels of emotional exhaustion. Cordes and Dougherty (1993) designed a matrix to indicate people-contact employees’ different levels of emotional exhaustion based on the frequency and intensity of interpersonal interactions with clients. Future research should compare and contrast variable effects on emotional exhaustion as moderated by these occupations.

The quality of my measures might have affected the results. Organizational constraints prevented me from examining individually the two dimensions of performance. I only had access to the employees’ overall performance scores. This made the assessment of the scale score reliability and validity impossible. I also observed range restriction on the performance and emotional exhaustion measures attenuated the findings I obtained. Finally, Witt, et al. (2004) found that conscientiousness and emotional exhaustion were related to the quantity but not the quality dimension of performance. Thus, it is possible that I did not obtain the same results they found because combining aggregating these two performance dimensions into a single score may have masked possible effects that might have emerged had I been able to analyze the dimensions in separate analyses.
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Appendix

Appendix A: English Version Questionnaire

**Directions:** Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling a number on the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I find myself feeling angry or frustrated with my customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often feel drained after dealing with customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Constant effort to satisfy customers or help co-workers can become very tiresome.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many of the customers whom I try to help seem to never satisfied.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Often, near the end of the day, it gets difficult to feel sympathy for the problem of my customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling a number on the scale:

For example: If you feel the statement describe you very accurately, you could circle 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am the life of the party</th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Modestly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither Inaccurate Nor Accurate</th>
<th>Modestly Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Am always prepared.</th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Modestly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither Inaccurate Nor Accurate</th>
<th>Modestly Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Get stressed out easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leave my belongings around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Am relaxed most of the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pay attention to details.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Worry about things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Make a mess of things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seldom feel blue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Get chores done right away.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Am easily disturbed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Get upset easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Like order.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Change my mood a lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shirk my duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Have frequent mood swings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follow a schedule.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Get irritated easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Am exacting in my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Often feel blue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions or circle around the most suitable answer.

1. Gender:  1) Male     2) Female
2. Years of full-time employment: _____ years
3. Years of work experience as customer service representative: _____ years
4. Age _____
5. Marital Status (Please circle)
   1) Single
   2) Married
   3) Divorced
   4) Other
6. The number of children you have living at home (Please circle)
   1) None
   2) 1 or 2
   3) 3 or 4
   4) More than 4
7. Highest education level you have achieved (Please circle)
   1) Some high school
   2) High school graduate
   3) Some college or university course work
   4) Obtained university degree
   5) Some postgraduate work
   6) Postgraduate work
8. How many hours do you work in a typical week: _____ Hours.
9. Please write down your name or employee number __________________

Thank you for participating in my study!
请根据您的工作情况指出您在多大程度上同意以下的描述。请在相应的数字上画圈。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>完全不同意</th>
<th>部分不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>部分同意</th>
<th>完全同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 我觉得自己在面对顾客的时候很气愤或沮丧。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 在和顾客打交道以后，我总觉得很累。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 不停地迎合顾客或帮助同事，有时让人感到很疲惫。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 很多我所尽力帮助过的顾客似乎从来没有满意过。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 通常在一天结束的时候，很难对于我的顾客的一些问题再感到同情。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
下面问卷中的短句用于描述人的行为。请用 1-5 来表示这些短句在多大程度上准确地描述了你自己。请根据你现在的一般情况来描述自己，而不要根据你所希望的未来状况；请参照你所认识的、与你同性别和年龄差不多的人，来真实地描述你眼中的自己。请仔细阅读每一个句子，然后在相应的选项上划圈。

例：如果你觉得这个句子非常准确的描述了你，请在 5 上画圈。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不准确</th>
<th>不太准确</th>
<th>说不准</th>
<th>比较准确</th>
<th>非常准确</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我总是聚会上搞活气氛的人.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不准确</th>
<th>不太准确</th>
<th>说不准</th>
<th>比较准确</th>
<th>非常准确</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>总有所准备.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>很容易感觉压力过大.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>把自己的东西到处乱放.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>大部分时间很放松.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>注重细节.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>担心的事多.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>常把事情搞得一团糟.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>很少感到忧郁.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>平常的事马上就处理,不拖.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>很容易烦心.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>常忘了将东西放回原处.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>很容易不高兴.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>喜欢有条理.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>情绪变化很大.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>逃避责任.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>常常会心情起伏不定.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>按计划做事.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>很容易发怒.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>对工作要求准确无误.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
请回答以下问题或选择答案。

1. 性别（请画圈）：1) 男  2) 女
2. 工作经验：_____ 年
3. 作为客户服务人员的工作经验：_____ 年
4. 年龄_____
5. 婚姻状况（请画圈）
   1) 未婚
   2) 已婚
   3) 离异
   4) 其它
6. 您有几个孩子需要抚养（请画圈）
   1) 没有
   2) 1 或 2 个
   3) 3 或 4 个
   4) 多于 4 个
7. 教育程度（请画圈）
   1) 初中以下
2) 高中、职高
3) 大专、本科
4) 硕士及以上

8. 您一般每周工作多少个小时: _____ 小时.

9. 请留下您的员工号。你所提供的信息将会被妥善保管和保密。

员工号：__________________