

**Abstract**

Previous research points to numerous benefits of positivity, overlooking potential downsides of workplace positivity prescriptions. Grounded in organizational culture theory, we introduce and differentiate organizational positivity expectations as a distinct organizational norm requiring cognitive, affective, and behavioral positivity demonstrations in intra-organizational interactions. Drawing on conservation of resources and emotional labor theory, we examine surface acting as an immediate instrumental response to such expectations and test whether psychological safety buffers this effect. **In an online vignette experiment with an international sample ( $N=241$ ), we found that employees in the positivity expectations conditions reported stronger intentions to act more positive than they felt, regardless of whether they perceived the workplace as psychologically safe.** Our results advance positive organizational scholarship by demonstrating that well-intended positivity initiatives may inadvertently encourage inauthentic emotional expression. Our study further contributes to conceptual refinement in organizational culture research and extends work on the implications of organizational norms for individuals, the antecedents of emotional labor in the intra-organizational context, and the limits of personal resources under strong situational pressures for desirable behaviors. We discuss avenues for future research and provide practical recommendations for designing healthier positivity practices.

*Keywords:* organizational positivity expectations, organizational culture and norms, surface acting, intra-organizational interactions, psychological safety, resource limits

**Impose and I'll pose? A vignette experiment examining organizational positivity expectations: a conservation of resources and emotional labor perspective**

Positivity, a multifaceted phenomenon encompassing positive affect, cognitions, and behaviors (Caza, 2021), has been associated with benevolent outcomes such as subjective wellbeing, job satisfaction, work engagement, or social support, as evidenced by positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship (e.g., Seligman, 2019). Yet, the focus on the bright side while neglecting the negative potential of positivity (Spreitzer et al., 2021) hinders its holistic understanding. Specifically, the possible downsides of organizationally prescribed positivity in intraorganizational interactions (i.e., with leaders and colleagues) remain largely unexplored. Critical perspectives have proposed that when positivity becomes an expectation, it may carry unintended consequences (Brinkmann, 2017). While this concern is supported by adjacent empirical evidence pointing to repercussions of an excessive emphasis on positivity for individual wellbeing and organizational interactions (e.g., Ilies et al., 2020; Zerwas & Ford, 2021), direct empirical evidence on organizationally mandated positivity has not been established, warranting investigation.

We frame organizational positivity expectations as the assumption that employees should demonstrate positivity in their work in the intra-organizational context and argue that such expectations hold the risk of unintended consequences. Grounded in organizational culture theory (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Schein, 2010), we position such expectations as organizational culture norms, which are “socially created standards emerging from an organization's values that help group members interpret various events and set expectations about appropriate behaviors” (Chatman et al., 2014, p.787). Norms represent expressions of a group's central values and beliefs, such as how to interact with one another, and help people

1  
2  
3  
4 understand what behaviors are likely to be valued or useful within their organizational context  
5  
6 (Chatman et al., 2014). Organizational culture research often conflates the content, consensus,  
7  
8 and intensity of organizational norms, making it difficult to isolate specific norms and examine  
9  
10 their individual-level consequences in specific contexts (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). We focus  
11  
12 on the *content* of norms, which reflects “appropriate behaviors and attitudes described through  
13  
14 the norm” (Chatman & Choi, 2022, p. 100), to examine expectations to demonstrate positivity in  
15  
16 intra-organizational interactions.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Further, existing research has largely focused on broad organizational emotional display  
22  
23 rules, mandating appropriate emotions and their expressions, both positive and negative, in  
24  
25 various contexts (e.g., Lee et al., 2025). Such rules can prompt emotional labor, requiring  
26  
27 individuals to manage own emotions (deep acting) or their expressions (surface acting) to  
28  
29 exhibit desired displays (Grandey, 2000). Yet, the impact of specific organizational expectations  
30  
31 that reach *beyond* emotions to prescribe also cognitive and behavioural positivity in intra-  
32  
33 organizational settings remains less understood (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). This  
34  
35 distinctiveness within the broader class of organizational norms warrants examining how a  
36  
37 specific norm content (positivity) influences employees in a specific context (internal workplace  
38  
39 interactions), addressing the call for greater precision in identifying which norms affect which  
40  
41 behaviors (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We therefore first define and differentiate organizational positivity expectations from  
49  
50 similar constructs by focus, scope, emphasis, context, and manifestation across apparency and  
51  
52 intentionality dimensions. We blend the prisms of conservation of resources and emotional labor  
53  
54 theory (Hobfoll et al., 2018; Grandey, 2000) to understand the immediate effect of organizational  
55  
56 positivity expectations on individuals and the role of one's resources. Specifically, we aim to  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 examine surface acting in intra-organizational interactions as an instant instrumental response to  
5  
6 organizational positivity expectations, motivated by resource protection and acquisition. We  
7  
8 further seek to identify whether psychological safety, a resource denoting the belief about safety  
9  
10 of one's work environment for genuine and repercussion-free self-expression (Edmondson,  
11  
12 1999), shields against organizational positivity expectations. We test our hypotheses in an online  
13  
14 vignette experiment with an international sample of employees.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Our contribution to the literature is multifold. First, we conceptualize positivity as an  
20  
21 externally established expectation acting as a resource threat and examine the unintended impact  
22  
23 of organizational positivity expectations in intra-organizational interactions. As such, we  
24  
25 advance positive organizational scholarship largely focused on the benefits of positivity as an  
26  
27 individual disposition or experience, or as or an outcome of supportive organizational practices  
28  
29 (e.g., Cunha et al., 2020). By isolating positivity as a specific norm content in intra-  
30  
31 organizational interactions, we address the norm dimension conflation in organizational culture  
32  
33 research (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016), and extend previous research that has studied specific  
34  
35 organizational norm content domains such as collaboration and integrity (O'Reilly et al., 2021),  
36  
37 ethics (Roy et al., 2024), or growth (Murphy, 2024). Examining surface acting as an immediate  
38  
39 outcome of organizational positivity expectations adds to the literatures on the implications of  
40  
41 organizational norms for individuals (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016) and the antecedents of  
42  
43 emotional labor in the intra-organizational context (Gabriel et al., 2023). By investigating the  
44  
45 role of psychological safety, we contribute to the literatures on the construct's impact in the  
46  
47 workplace (Newman et al., 2017) and the limits of personal resources (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Our  
48  
49 study informs organizational practice by identifying the risk that well-intended positivity  
50  
51 practices may inadvertently prompt surface acting, with implications for employee wellbeing.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### Defining and Differentiating Organizational Positivity Expectations

We ground the concept of organizational positivity expectations in organizational culture theory (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Schein, 2010), outlining in this section what the expectations constitute and how they differ from seemingly similar constructs including emotional display rules, emotional job demands, and toxic positivity (see Table 1 for a summary).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Organizational positivity expectations represent the assumption that employees should demonstrate positivity in their work and interactions with colleagues and leaders. Emphasizing cognitive ('Think positive!'), behavioral ('Be positive!'), and affective ('Show enthusiasm!') demonstrations, not necessarily experiences, of positivity at work, positivity expectations may vary in *apparency*, ranging from explicit directives to subtle cues. *Explicit* positivity expectations may appear in formal organizational communications, including a job advertisement requiring 'passionate, high-energy team players', or a performance review criterion assessing 'positive attitude and can-do spirit.' *Implicit* positivity expectations may emerge through subtle cultural cues, including distinguishing 'positive' employees, motivational posters with positive messages, or energetic demeanour in team meetings. Positivity expectations may also vary along the *intentionality* dimension, reflecting the extent to which the expectations are deliberately implemented (e.g., leadership competency frameworks listing 'demonstrates optimism' or 'inspires positive outlook' qualities) or arise without prescriptive intent (e.g., casual 'Look on the bright side' messages or social media images and hashtags) but may inadvertently create pressure to exhibit positivity and suppress authentic concerns.

Organizational positivity expectations prescribe how employees should demonstrate positivity in intra-organizational contexts, including interactions with colleagues and leaders.

1  
2  
3  
4 These expectations may be codified in organizational documents, such as leadership frameworks  
5  
6 and job advertisements, or expressed verbally in interpersonal interactions (e.g., through  
7  
8 managerial discourse), as well as used without the intent to enforce but also without  
9  
10 consideration given to potential backfire (e.g., ‘Cheer up!’). Such externally defined, rather than  
11  
12 self-initiated, prescriptive standards dictate specific ways of thinking, feeling, or behaving,  
13  
14 suggesting that employees are deficient in meeting these norms (Higgins, 1987), which may  
15  
16 exert unintended pressure, preventing employees from internalizing organizational positivity  
17  
18 expectations.  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24         Organizational positivity expectations correspond to the level of norms and values about  
25  
26 appropriate attitudes and behaviors of organizational culture (Schein, 2010) in representing  
27  
28 standards about how employees should behave in intra-organizational contexts. Organizational  
29  
30 positivity expectations also fall under the "content" dimension of organizational culture, as they  
31  
32 define what employees are expected to demonstrate in terms of cognitive, affective, and  
33  
34 behavioral displays (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2016). As organizational culture functions as a social  
35  
36 control system, shaping member behaviors through informational and normative influence  
37  
38 (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2016), organizational positivity expectations too can influence employee  
39  
40 behavior. Yet, our understanding of how specific prescriptive norms, such as organizational  
41  
42 positivity expectations, affect employees in intra-organizational settings remains limited  
43  
44 (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2016).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51         Applying exclusively to intra-organizational contexts, organizational positivity  
52  
53 expectations differ from emotional display rules. The latter reflect broader organizational  
54  
55 guidelines about which emotions are appropriate and how they should be expressed, in other  
56  
57 words, pertain to both the experience and expression of emotions in various contexts, although  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 they have been originally and predominantly studied in customer-facing settings (Elfenbein,  
5  
6 2023). Unlike organizational positivity expectations, such rules, concerned only with emotions,  
7  
8 are often deliberate, yet implicit, existing as unwritten norms rather than explicitly stated (Zapf et  
9  
10 al., 2021). Further, they prescribe both positive and negative emotion displays, such as flight  
11  
12 attendants' warmth and debt collectors' anger (Elfenbein, 2023). As such, organizational  
13  
14 positivity expectations represent a distinct form of prescriptive organizational norms, regulating  
15  
16 not only emotion but also the general orientation of positivity in organizational life.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21       Organizational positivity expectations are also different from emotional job demands, an  
22  
23 umbrella term for the psychological requirements around managing and regulating one's  
24  
25 emotions as part of one's job, which encompass emotional display rules, situations that elicit  
26  
27 emotions, emotional labor, and care for others' emotional wellbeing (Diefendorff et al., 2016).  
28  
29 Extending to task- and job-specific emotional experiences and responses, for instance, in  
30  
31 healthcare, sales, or service jobs, these demands differ from organizational positivity  
32  
33 expectations emphasising the display of various forms of positivity at work in intra-  
34  
35 organizational interactions.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41       Finally, organizational positivity expectations should also be distinguished from toxic  
42  
43 positivity, which is a mindset enforcing constant positivity as the standard while dismissing or  
44  
45 suppressing the negative, even at the risk of overlooking genuine concerns (Lecompte-Van  
46  
47 Poucke, 2022). Examples of toxic positivity include attributing illness or poverty to insufficient  
48  
49 positivity, dismissing emotional distress with positivity directives, or framing workplace  
50  
51 concerns as 'negativity' requiring correction. While organizations may not necessarily aim to  
52  
53 exert pressure through positivity expectations, toxic positivity, holding individuals accountable  
54  
55 for their own wellbeing and success and viewing "negativity" as a flaw needing correction, often  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

deliberately and overtly imposes positivity on oneself or others (Lecompte-Van Poucke, 2022). While toxic positivity actively invalidates negative experiences, positivity expectations prescribe positivity without delegitimizing the negative. Finally, unlike positivity expectations defined externally and applying to intra-organizational interactions, toxic positivity can be both externally established and self-generated, extending to any domain of life.

In sum, organizational positivity expectations represent a distinct form of organizational norms, prescribing cognitive, affective, and behavioral demonstrations of positivity for employees in the intra-organizational context. Yet, their influence on employees is not well understood.

### **Conservation of Resources and Emotional Labor Perspective on the Consequences of Organizational Positivity Expectations**

Conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll et al., 2018) provides an explanation for potential consequences of organizational positivity expectations. Principles and corollaries of COR theory outline people's motivation to protect and acquire resources, including objects, conditions, skills, traits, or energy (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Resources can have intrinsic value (e.g., self-esteem, good health) or enable obtaining other resources (e.g., networks, money) (Hobfoll et al., 2018).

### **The Relationship Between Organizational Positivity Expectations and Surface Acting**

Failing to adhere to organizational positivity expectations may jeopardize such resources associated with positivity displays as favourable appraisals, promotions, job security, social approval, and acceptance, because organizations sanction deviation from norms and reward desirable displays and behaviors (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Grandey & Melloy, 2017). Consequently, employees engage in self-serving tactics to increase their likeability and improve

access to organizational resources, including self-promotion, impression management, and the management of emotions or their expressions (Grandey, 2000; Hu et al., 2022; McFarland et al., 2023).

Research on emotional labor, traditionally centred on the service context, is increasingly examining it in employee interactions with coworkers and leaders (see Gabriel et al., 2023 for a review), particularly, in interactions with managers having discretion over resources and employee performance evaluation and career outcomes (Yang et al., 2021). While the focus has largely been on the impact of emotional labor (e.g., Deng et al., 2020), some studies have shown that in the intra-organizational context employees may feel compelled to modify emotional expressions to exhibit desired emotions without internalising them, known as surface acting (Grandey, 2000), for practical reasons. These include the motives of acceptance, social influence, goal achievement, or perceptions of political processes in organizations (Bindl et al., 2022; Ozcelik, 2013). We extend this line of research by building on COR theory's principles that the risk of losing resources can encourage instrumental behaviors (Hobfoll et al., 2018).

We focus on the emotional expression in response to organizational positivity expectations as research indicates its instrumental potential for effective communication and signalling immediate adherence (Van Kleef & Côté, 2022). We argue that in the short term, organizational positivity expectations can prompt engagement in surface acting to deliberately portray a positive image. Even where organizational expectations are congruent with how the person thinks or feels, they are likely to feel compelled to regulate self-expression to exhibit the "right" amount of emotions in "appropriate" ways (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Further, as organizational positivity expectations can strain already limited cognitive and affective resources, such as attention or energy (Baumeister et al. 2024), employees may immediately

1  
2  
3  
4 modify emotional expressions, which is a routine process not necessarily involving elaborate  
5  
6 conscious efforts (Zapf et al., 2021). This is supported by research indicating that employees  
7  
8 experiencing shortage of resources do tend toward surface acting (e.g., Shoshan et al., 2022).  
9  
10 Therefore, in the short term, surface acting, rather than more resource-intensive deep acting  
11  
12 involving reflection and reappraisal, may be a pragmatic adaptive strategy (Grandey, 2000; Sayre  
13  
14 et al., 2025). We thus expect a positive relationship between positivity expectations and surface  
15  
16 acting:  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 *Hypothesis 1: Organizational positivity expectations are positively associated with*  
22  
23 *surface acting.*  
24  
25

### 26 **The Buffering Effect of Psychological Safety**

27  
28 One's resources may influence how individuals perceive and respond to environmental  
29  
30 demands (Hobfoll et al., 2018). We focus on perceived workplace psychological safety as a  
31  
32 resource that could potentially buffer the resource threat represented by organizational positivity  
33  
34 expectations, reducing the likelihood of surface acting in response. Psychological safety denotes  
35  
36 a belief that the workplace is safe for being oneself and expressing one's opinions without fear of  
37  
38 repercussions for the image, status, or career (Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety is linked  
39  
40 to numerous learning, performance, and wellbeing outcomes (Newman et al., 2017). By fostering  
41  
42 a sense of security and support, it allows individuals to express themselves genuinely, report  
43  
44 errors, take risks, and challenge organizational practices without fearing negative consequences  
45  
46 (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). As such, psychological safety can act as a protective resource  
47  
48 enabling one to oppose group norms and act in line with one's attitudes and beliefs (Stühlinger et  
49  
50 al., 2021), but, when low, employees might feel compelled to protect themselves, avoiding risk-  
51  
52 taking and challenging behaviors (e.g., Kızrak et al., 2023). We argue that when employees feel  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

safe, they are less likely to interpret positivity expectations as threatening and behave inauthentically.

Specifically, we expect that individual perceptions of workplace psychological safety mitigate the influence of organizational positivity expectations for two reasons. Due to the associated sense of security and trust (Newman et al., 2017), psychological safety may equip individuals with resistance to external demands, reducing the need to create desired impressions and enabling uncompromised self-expression. When employees feel psychologically safe, the perceived risk of missing out on resources (managerial approval, favorable evaluation, career advancement) from failing to meet positivity expectations may diminish. From an emotional labour perspective (Grandey, 2000), safety should reduce the need for surface acting because when one expects acceptance rather than judgment, they may be more likely to express themselves authentically (Sutton, 2020). Further, the positive affect engendered by feeling safe (e.g., Lin et al., 2022) may satisfy positivity expectations, rendering performing positivity unnecessary. Although research into psychological safety's role in resisting external pressure is limited, existing evidence suggests that surface acting increases in insecure environments (Gabriel et al., 2023). As such, higher psychological safety could attenuate the relationship between positivity expectations and surface acting by enabling authenticity and through the associated positive affect.

However, given that positivity expectations create an avenue for acquiring valued resources, which individuals strive to obtain, retain, foster, and protect (Hobfoll et al., 2018), surface acting, as a pragmatic strategy, can operate independently of psychological safety. While psychological safety may reduce fear of repercussions for self-expression, it may not necessarily eliminate the instrumental motivation to acquire valued outcomes through aligning with

positivity expectations. Further, as resources are finite (Hobfoll et al., 2018), they may fail to buffer against a strong situation reflecting "implicit or explicit cues provided by external entities regarding the desirability of potential behaviors" (Meyer et al., 2010, p. 122). Explicit, consistent positivity expectations tied to tangible outcomes can represent such a strong situation.

Additionally, while evidence points to psychological safety facilitating cognitive and behavioural self-expression, such as speaking up, admitting mistakes, taking risks (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023), it remains unclear whether this effect extends to affective self-expression. We therefore test whether psychological safety mitigates the effect of positivity expectations, acknowledging the possibility that it may not:

*Hypothesis 2: Perceived workplace psychological safety moderates the relationship between organizational positivity expectations and surface acting such that the relationship is weaker at higher levels of perceived workplace psychological safety.*

### **Method**

This study was conducted as part of the first author's doctoral research examining positivity in organizations. Ethical approval for the study was granted by Birkbeck, University of London, UK (the ethics committee approval number OPEA-19/20-17). In a vignette experiment, we tested whether organizational positivity expectations can prompt surface acting (Hypothesis 1) and examined the potential of psychological safety to buffer the effect of positivity expectations (Hypothesis 2). Following ethical approval, we recruited participants through the online *Prolific* platform, offering £1.25 per completion of the experiment. Participation was voluntary, with confidentiality and anonymity assured.

## Sample and Procedure

We included participants aged 18 and above, employed globally by formal organizations (not self-employed) for at least three months, and speaking English. A total of 276 individuals volunteered to participate in the study, the final sample (once incomplete data removed) comprised 241 individuals (43% female, 76% employees, and 83% in full-time positions) working in the private (62%), public (34%), and non-profit (4%) sectors. Most participants (54%) were in the 25-39 age group, 23% in the 18-24, 22% in the 40-60, and 1% in the 60 plus age groups. Participants' self-reported geographic regions included Europe (62%), UK (31%), North America, South America, Asia Pacific, and Africa (7%).

In a 2x2 between-subject online experiment, participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions (low vs. high psychological safety x positivity expectations vs. no positivity expectations). In each condition, they were instructed to imagine themselves joining a large project with career advancement opportunities and were given a bespoke vignette scenario describing organizational positivity expectations and individual perceptions of psychological safety in the work environment (Table 2). After reading the scenario, they were asked to report their likely surface acting in the situation where they are not inclined to demonstrate positivity, and respond to manipulation check and demographic questions.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

## Manipulation and Measures

To manipulate the independent variables, we used textual vignettes presenting short realistic scenarios about hypothetical characters in specific situations related to the research topic, inviting participants to respond (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). We developed the vignettes based on conceptual definitions and measures of the constructs under study (Podsakoff et al.,

2013). This included diverse conceptualizations of positivity and expectations for employee positive behavior, cognition, and affect, such as enthusiasm, confidence, or passion (e.g., Caza, 2021; Collinson, 2012; Grandey & Melloy, 2017). We used the literature on psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999; May et al., 2004) to inform the respective paragraph about the individual's perceived workplace psychological safety.

Manipulation checks ensured that vignette scenarios were interpreted correctly (Hauser et al., 2018). This involved requesting to indicate on a 7-point Likert scale after experiment completion the extent to which participants agreed that (a) there were organizational positivity expectations in the scenario and (b) that the project described was a psychologically safe workplace, subjected to analysis of variance. The positivity expectations manipulation ( $F(1,237)=15.35, p<=.001, Ms=5.04$  vs.  $5.71, \eta^2=.06$ ) but not psychological safety one ( $F(1,237)=0.20, p=.65, Ms=5.36$  vs.  $5.40, \eta^2=.001$ ) had a significant main effect on the positivity expectations check. The psychological safety manipulation had a significant main effect on the psychological safety check ( $F(1,237)=27.71, p<.001, Ms=3.64$  vs.  $4.57, \eta^2=.10$ ) and the positivity expectation manipulation did not ( $F(1,237)=1.20, p=.27, Ms=4.03$  vs.  $4.19, \eta^2=.004$ ).

We measured the outcome variable operationalized as surface acting with the respective five-item scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .85$ ) (Ozcelik, 2013) using 7-point Likert scales (1 = *Extremely unlikely* to 7 = *Extremely likely*). Example items included: '*In this scenario, how likely is that you would resist expressing your true feelings to your manager?*' and '*In this scenario, how likely is that you would pretend to have emotions that you do not really have when interacting with your manager?*'

## Results

We conducted a 2 (organizational positivity expectations: present vs. absent)  $\times$  2 (psychological safety: high vs. low) between-subjects factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) with surface acting as the dependent variable using IBM SPSS 29 software.

### Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and sample sizes) for surface acting across all four experimental conditions. Across the full sample ( $N = 241$ ), the overall mean for surface acting was 4.29 ( $SD = 1.29$ ) on the 7-point scale. Descriptive statistics (Table 3) revealed that participants in conditions with organizational positivity expectations (C1 and C2) reported higher surface acting ( $M = 4.48$ ) than those in conditions without such expectations (C3 and C4;  $M = 4.10$ ). The highest mean for the surface acting score (4.52) occurred when positivity expectations were present and psychological safety was low (C2). The lowest mean (4.00) was in the condition involving no positivity expectations and high levels of psychological safety (C3). Participants in high psychological safety conditions (C1 and C3;  $M = 4.22$ ) reported similar surface acting levels to those in low psychological safety conditions (C2 and C4;  $M = 4.36$ ).

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

### Hypothesis 1: Organizational Positivity Expectations and Surface Acting

Hypothesis 1 predicted that organizational positivity expectations would be positively associated with surface acting. Table 4 presents the complete ANOVA results, including sums of squares, mean squares,  $F$  statistics, significance levels, and effect sizes for all main effects and the interaction term. The results of a factorial ANOVA (Table 4) showed a significant effect of organizational positivity expectations ( $F(3, 237) = 6.3, p = 0.01, M = 4.48$  vs. 4.10), where

participants exposed to positivity expectations ( $M = 4.48$ ) reported significantly higher surface acting than those not exposed to such expectations ( $M = 4.10$ ), supporting Hypothesis 1. The effect size ( $\eta^2_p = .03$ ) indicated that positivity expectations explained approximately 3% of the variance in surface acting.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

### **Hypothesis 2: Moderating Role of Psychological Safety**

Hypothesis 2 predicted that perceived workplace psychological safety would moderate the relationship between organizational positivity expectations and surface acting, such that the relationship would be weaker at higher levels of psychological safety. The main effect of psychological safety on surface acting was not significant ( $F(3, 237) = 0.3, p = 0.57, \eta^2_p < .001$ ), such that participants in high psychological safety conditions ( $M = 4.22$ ) reported statistically equivalent levels of surface acting to those in low psychological safety conditions ( $M = 4.36$ ). More critically for Hypothesis 2, there was no significant interaction between positivity expectations and psychological safety,  $F(3, 237) = 0.01, p = 0.94$ , indicating that the effect of positivity expectations on surface acting did not differ depending on levels of psychological safety. As such, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Analyses revealed no significant differences in surface acting responses across demographic groups (gender, age, employment type) or geographic regions, suggesting the effects of organizational positivity expectations were consistent across the sample. In sum, employees exposed to organizational positivity expectations reported higher surface acting regardless of psychological safety level, with the results supporting Hypothesis 1 but not Hypothesis 2.

## Discussion

Our study introduced the concept of organizational positivity expectations representing an organizational norm of cognitive, affective, and behavioral positivity in intra-organizational interactions, differentiating it from similar constructs. Drawing on conservation of resources and emotional labor theory, we examined whether such expectations prompt surface acting in intra-organizational interactions (H1), and whether psychological safety moderates this relationship (H2). Our vignette experiment with an international sample of 241 employees revealed that organizational positivity expectations were significantly associated with increased surface acting ( $F(3, 237) = 6.3, p = .01$ ), supporting Hypothesis 1. Contrary to Hypothesis 2, psychological safety did not moderate this relationship ( $F(3,237) = 0.01; p = 0.94$ ). We interpret the results in relation to existing theory and research.

### The Link Between Positivity Expectations and Surface Acting

Our results suggest that organizational positivity expectations can exert normative influence on employee behaviour, supporting the premise that organizational culture shapes individual responses (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Schein, 2010). When organizations communicate expectations that employees should demonstrate positivity and link these to tangible outcomes, employees may perceive these as prescriptive standards against which their behavior is evaluated and rewarded. Our vignette manipulation, which included performance scrutiny and reward contingencies for positivity, made these evaluative implications salient. The resulting surface acting can be understood as signaling adherence to organizational expectations, consistent with the view that emotional expressions serve communicative functions in social hierarchies (Van Kleef & Côté, 2022).

1  
2  
3  
4           The observed effect size for organizational positivity expectations on surface acting was  
5  
6 small and should therefore be interpreted with appropriate caution. This effect size is comparable  
7  
8 to those observed in organizational vignette experiments examining behavioral responses to  
9  
10 organizational practices (e.g., Maaravi et al., 2023; Van Waeyenberg et al., 2023), suggesting our  
11  
12 findings are consistent with experimental research in this domain. While the effect is modest,  
13  
14 small effect sizes can have meaningful practical consequences in organizational contexts  
15  
16 (Lakens, 2013). If positivity expectations increase surface acting even marginally across  
17  
18 employees engaging in multiple daily interactions, the cumulative costs through emotional  
19  
20 exhaustion and reduced wellbeing may be considerable. Further, our vignette presented brief,  
21  
22 one-time exposure to positivity expectations, whereas sustained exposure through repeated cues  
23  
24 in real organizations may yield stronger effects over time. Therefore, even this small-scale link  
25  
26 between perceived positivity expectations and surface acting suggests that employees respond to  
27  
28 positivity cues, with potential consequences for wellbeing that warrant organizational attention.  
29  
30

31  
32           From a COR theory perspective, this finding illustrates resource-oriented behavior in  
33  
34 response to potential resource threat. Failing to meet organizational positivity expectations  
35  
36 threatens both existing resources (managerial approval, positive reputation) and potential  
37  
38 resource gains (career advancement, favorable evaluations). Consistent with COR theory's  
39  
40 premise that individuals strive to obtain and protect resources they centrally value (Hobfoll et al.,  
41  
42 2018), employees can engage in surface acting to safeguard their current standing and access to  
43  
44 future opportunities. As such, surface acting represents a pragmatic strategy allowing the  
45  
46 protection and acquisition of valued resources by projecting the expected image, even when  
47  
48 organizational expectations clash with an individual's natural inclinations (our vignette specified  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

"demonstrating enthusiasm is not your natural ability"). This suggests that externally imposed positivity standards can prompt inauthentic expression.

### **The Role of Psychological Safety**

In answer to our second research question, we did not find evidence that psychological safety buffers the effect of organizational positivity expectations. As such, in our sample, psychological safety did not appear to reduce the perceived pressure to conform when tangible outcomes were at stake. The absence of a moderating effect for psychological safety may be due to the strength of the vignette situation suppressing the effect of individual resources.

Organizational positivity expectations may represent a strong situation, where implicit or explicit signals from external entities regarding preferred behaviors (Meyer et al., 2010) constrain individual responses. Our vignette described a scenario, where positivity expectations were made explicit, consistently reinforced through organizational communication, and tied to performance evaluation.

Specifically, the vignette was high on such facets of situational strength as *clarity*, with cues being available and easy to understand (e.g., encouragement of "passion, energy, and confidence"); *consistency*, with cues being compatible with each other (multiple organizational channels reinforcing the same message), and *consequences*, with actions' implications being stressed (performance scrutiny, reward contingencies). Such strong situations may constrain behavior to a limited set of choices. It is possible that participants perceived organizational positivity expectations as particularly strong, negating a buffering effect of psychological safety.

Further, individuals may choose to align with organizational expectations even in a perceivably safe environment (as indicated by the psychological safety manipulation check), if there are clear resource protection and acquisition implications. The latter were exemplified by

1  
2  
3  
4 the explicit and substantial consequences of displaying positivity in our vignette with the  
5  
6 emphasis on performance scrutiny and rewards. Finally, psychological safety may facilitate  
7  
8 authenticity in what people say (voice, challenging status quo, admitting mistakes) but not in  
9  
10 how people emotionally present themselves when specific displays are expected or even framed  
11  
12 as performance requirements. In sum, our result may reflect the strength and implications of  
13  
14 positivity expectations, as well as the contextual limits of psychological safety, rather than its  
15  
16 ineffectiveness as a protective resource.  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Theoretical Implications** 22

23  
24 Our results advance positive organizational scholarship, largely focused on the benefits of  
25  
26 positivity (Wong & Roy, 2018), by providing empirical evidence for the unintended  
27  
28 consequences of organizational over-emphasis on positivity. More broadly, our study advances  
29  
30 theoretical understanding of positivity in organizational contexts by revealing how, when, and  
31  
32 why positivity may not be beneficial. Previous research in positive organizational scholarship  
33  
34 and positive psychology has conceptualized positivity primarily as an individual disposition or  
35  
36 experience that enhances performance and wellbeing, or as or an outcome of supportive  
37  
38 organizational practices (e.g., Cunha et al., 2020). We position positivity as an externally  
39  
40 established expectation, acquiring a regulative function and shaping behavior through normative  
41  
42 pressure.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Drawing on the COR theory, we show that organizational positivity expectations can  
49  
50 create a resource threat, prompting instrumental responses. Our result that organizational  
51  
52 attempts to instil positivity may prompt surface acting aligns with research on the drawbacks of  
53  
54 self-generated positivity, such as moral disengagement and incivility (Ilies et al 2020), and the  
55  
56 pursuit of positivity, including diminished wellbeing (Zerwas & Ford, 2021). We extend this line  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

of research by examining the impact of externally prescribed positivity in interactions with colleagues and leaders and showing that organizational efforts to promote positivity may backfire too.

We introduce a conceptualization of organizational positivity expectations as a distinct organizational norm of cognitive, affective, and behavioral positivity in intra-organizational interactions, prescribing what employees are expected to demonstrate, which adds a nuance to the conceptual landscape of organizational culture research (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). We specifically focus on the *content* of organizational norms, rather than culture broadly conceived, which aids understanding of how organizational norms operate at the individual level (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Yip et al., 2020) and uniquely influence emotional labor in interactions with colleagues and leaders.

The evidence that not only emotional demands but also broader organizational norms targeting cognitions, affect, and behavior can prompt surface acting adds to the growing body of work on the antecedents of surface acting in the intra-organizational context (Gabriel et al., 2023). We focused on surface acting as an immediate resource-oriented response to organizational positivity expectations, extending research on its instrumental role in navigating organizational dynamics (Ozcelik, 2013).

Further, our findings inform COR theory by showing that organizational norms can act as a threat triggering individual resource-protection strategies. Additionally, finding no evidence for psychological safety's moderating effect adds to understanding of resource limitations (Hobfoll et al., 2018), suggesting that individuals may comply with resource-threatening demands despite possessing protective resources, when situational pressures are strong and tied to tangible outcomes. As such, psychological safety may be a valuable but bounded resource, effective in

some domains such as speaking up (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023), but limited in others including resisting norms and prescriptions.

### Practical Implications

Our findings suggest that organizational positivity expectations can prompt surface acting. While surface acting may serve as a short-term adaptive response (Sayre et al., 2025), sustained engagement in inauthentic emotional expression is detrimental to psychological and physical health (Humphrey, 2023). As such, paradoxically, promoting positivity may undermine employee wellbeing. We therefore propose the following practical recommendations.

First, **we recommend** organizations **should** review internal communications including leadership addresses, performance frameworks, job advertisements, onboarding materials, and internal newsletters to reduce language that prescribes positivity as a **generic** and universal requirement and add contextually appropriate guidance. Such guidance may include examples of where positivity is to be directed (e.g., task or behavior) and what specifically this would involve, to develop a reflective and contextual understanding. **For instance, this may involve specifying "maintain task-focused optimism when problem-solving" rather than "bring positive energy."**

In addition, **we suggest** organizations should undertake a participative approach tapping into employees' understandings of positivity in their specific work contexts. Engaging employees in defining what positivity means for their specific roles can generate contextually grounded and more readily internalized understandings, reducing the need for surface acting.

**We also recommend** decoupling positivity displays from performance criteria as our findings suggest that linking positivity expectations to performance scrutiny and rewards may intensify their prescriptive force. **For instance, competencies like "positive attitude" or "high**

energy" should be removed from performance frameworks unless they are genuinely job-relevant, such as in customer-facing roles requiring affective displays. Additionally, surface acting prompted by positivity expectations may erode the quality of workplace relationships. Research demonstrates that positive leader-member exchange and collegial climate are critical predictors of employee satisfaction and commitment (Kazemi et al., 2024), yet these relationships depend on authenticity and trust that surface acting may undermine.

Organizations also need to foster psychological safety specifically around emotional expression. This may require moving beyond general psychological safety messaging ("speak up") to explicit permission for emotional authenticity ("it's acceptable to express that this project feels overwhelming"). Leaders should actively communicate that expressing concerns, acknowledging difficulties, or showing non-positive reactions (frustration, disappointment, uncertainty) will not result in negative evaluation when contextually appropriate and model this by sharing their own challenges.

Finally, organizations could designate responsibility, such as wellbeing committees or HR, to track indicators that positivity expectations may backfire into emotional labor. These include declining employee voice behaviors despite seemingly positive climates, increasing burnout alongside high engagement (suggesting effortful maintenance of positive façades), or employee feedback indicating pressure to appear constantly upbeat. Engagement surveys and exit interviews could explicitly ask whether employees felt pressure to display positivity or did not raise concerns because of expectations to stay positive.

### Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

Several limitations of the study point to areas for further research. We acknowledge that

1  
2  
3  
4 despite enhancing experimental realism and internal validity (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014), the use  
5  
6 of vignettes might have undermined ecological validity by simplifying the social and temporal  
7  
8 complexity of real workplaces. The scenario presented a discrete moment of encountering  
9  
10 positivity expectations, whereas employees in actual organizations experience these norms  
11  
12 through accumulated interactions over time, embedded within broader relationship histories,  
13  
14 ongoing power dynamics, and peer influence. Consequently, the cognitive and emotional  
15  
16 processes elicited by the vignette may only approximate those that arise when employees  
17  
18 negotiate such expectations in enduring relationships with managers and peers.  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Yet, experimental approaches allow for accurate and controlled variation in  
25  
26 characteristics of culture while addressing the challenges of collecting culture data through more  
27  
28 intrusive methods (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). We therefore suggest that future studies could  
29  
30 complement experiments with experience sampling to observe daily fluctuations in perceptions  
31  
32 of organizational positivity expectations, surface acting, resources, and any contextual influences  
33  
34 on their relationship, as well as longitudinal field studies to examine how responses evolve over  
35  
36 time in organizational settings.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 By focusing on the immediate reaction to organizational positivity expectations, our  
42  
43 study provides a starting point for understanding how they influence employee behavior, paving  
44  
45 the way for future research on their impact over time. Surface acting may represent an initial,  
46  
47 rapid response to positivity expectations because modifying outward expressions is more  
48  
49 automatic and requires fewer regulatory resources than reappraising internal emotional state  
50  
51 (Zapf et al., 2021). However, longitudinal research would be required to examine if and when  
52  
53 employees, over time, internalize organizational positivity expectations, whether surface acting  
54  
55 persists, or whether individuals develop selective strategies (e.g., surface acting in high-stakes  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 interactions while maintaining authenticity elsewhere). Future research should also investigate  
5  
6 whether sustained exposure to positivity expectations and consequent surface acting predict  
7  
8 longer-term organizational outcomes such as turnover intentions and actual turnover, as  
9  
10 workplace stressors including emotional demands have been linked to employee exit decisions  
11  
12 (Hommelhoff et al., 2025).  
13

14  
15  
16 Our research examined individual levels using self-report data, but examining the  
17  
18 relationships between group-levels of organizational positivity expectations and psychological  
19  
20 safety and individual levels of surface acting would be an interesting avenue. Our reliance on  
21  
22 self-reported surface acting may be subject to social desirability bias or limited self-awareness  
23  
24 about one's own emotional regulation strategies. Future research could complement self-report  
25  
26 data with manager and peer ratings of observable indicators of surface acting. Alternatively,  
27  
28 experience sampling methods capturing surface acting in real-time across multiple interactions  
29  
30 would reduce retrospective bias.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 Further, research could examine individual differences (e.g., neuroticism, extraversion)  
37  
38 and boundary conditions such as organizational politics (Andrews et al., 2016) or leadership  
39  
40 styles (e.g., authentic leadership (Lux & Lowe, 2024)) as moderators impacting perceptions of  
41  
42 organizational positivity expectations and consequent engagement in emotional labor. For  
43  
44 instance, employees high in neuroticism may experience positivity expectations as particularly  
45  
46 threatening, whereas those high in extraversion may find positivity displays more congruent with  
47  
48 their dispositional tendencies, organizational politics may intensify the resource threat posed by  
49  
50 such expectations, and authentic leadership could buffer such effects through permission for  
51  
52 genuine self-expression.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4           In this study, we focused on the *content* of organizational expectations but not their  
5  
6 *intensity*. Organizations likely differ not only in whether they hold positivity expectations, but in  
7  
8 their intensity, potentially operationalized through *explicitness* (implicit cues versus explicit  
9  
10 policy statements), *consistency* (uniform messaging across organizational levels versus mixed  
11  
12 signals), or *enforcement* (performance evaluation consequences versus informal social approval).  
13  
14 Our vignette represented relatively high-intensity positivity expectations (explicit, consistent,  
15  
16 performance-linked). Psychological safety may be more effective in contexts where  
17  
18 organizational expectations are weaker or more ambiguous, which could be tested by  
19  
20 manipulating intensity variation.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26           Future research could examine the role of the congruence between organizational  
27  
28 expectations and individuals' values (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016) in amplifying or attenuating  
29  
30 the expectations' effects. For instance, the person-organization value misfit may increase stress  
31  
32 and anxiety levels (Yip et al., 2020) and thus strengthen the effect of organizational positivity  
33  
34 expectations. Additionally, cross-cultural research examining whether positivity expectations  
35  
36 operate differently in cultures with varying display rules around emotional expression, would  
37  
38 illuminate cultural boundary conditions. We also encourage the investigation of how other  
39  
40 personal and job resources might shape the response to positivity expectations. Finally, the lack  
41  
42 of evidence for psychological safety's moderating effect suggests there may be a distinction  
43  
44 between *content* safety (what one says) and *display* safety (what expressions one shows).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

## Conclusion

We introduced and differentiated organizational positivity expectations as a distinct organizational norm prescribing cognitive, affective, and behavioral positivity in intra-organizational interactions. Drawing on conservation of resources and emotional labor theory, we examined whether such expectations prompt surface acting and whether psychological safety moderates this relationship. Our vignette experiment revealed that organizational positivity expectations are positively related to employee surface acting representing an immediate instrumental response to perceived resource threats. Notably, psychological safety did not buffer this effect, suggesting that personal resources may prove insufficient against strong situational demands tied to tangible outcomes. By establishing foundational knowledge about organizationally prescribed positivity, we advance positive organizational scholarship, organizational culture research focused on specific norm content and individual-level implications, emotional labor literature in intra-organizational contexts, and understanding of psychological safety's boundaries as a protective resource. We provide directions for future studies and recommendations for organizations looking to implement positive workplace practices.

### References

- Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 17*(4), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
- Andrews, M.C., Kacmar, K.M. & Valle, M. (2016). Surface acting as a mediator between personality and attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31* (8), 1265–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-11-2015-0414>
- Baumeister, R. F., André, N., Southwick, D. A., & Tice, D. M. (2024). Self-control and limited willpower: Current status of ego depletion theory and research. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 60*, 101882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101882>
- Bindl, U. K., Parker, S. K., Sonnentag, S., & Stride, C. B. (2022). Managing your feelings at work, for a reason: The role of individual motives in affect regulation for performance-related outcomes at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 43*(7), 1251–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2628>
- Brinkmann, S. (2017). *Stand firm: Resisting the self-improvement craze*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Caza, A. (2021). A selective review of developments in positive studies of work and organizations. In Peiro, J. (Ed.) *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1–15). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Chatman, J. A., Caldwell, D. F., O'Reilly, C. A., & Doerr, B. (2014). Parsing organizational culture: How the norm for adaptability influences the relationship between culture consensus and financial performance in high-technology firms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(6), 785–808. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1928>

Chatman, J. A., & Choi, A. (2022). Measuring organizational culture: Converging on definitions and approaches to advance the paradigm. In C. Newton & R. Knight (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods for organisational culture* (pp. 92–107). Edward Elgar.

<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788976268.00014>

Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2016). Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 199–224.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.11.004>

Collinson, D. (2012). Prozac leadership and the limits of positive thinking. *Leadership*, 8(2), 87–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011434738>

Cunha, M. P., Rego, A., Simpson, A., & Clegg, S. (2020). *Positive organizational behaviour: A reflective approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315232249>

Deng, H., Walter, F., & Guan, Y. (2020). Supervisor-directed emotional labor as upward influence: An emotions-as-social-information perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(4), 384–402. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2424>

Diefendorff, J. M., Greguras, G. J., & Fleenor, J. (2016). Perceived Emotional Demands-Abilities Fit. *Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 2–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12034>

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>

Edmondson, A. C., & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological Safety Comes of Age: Observed Themes in an Established Literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-055217>

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Elfenbein, H. A. (2023). Emotion in organizations: Theory and research. *Annual Review of*  
5  
6 *Psychology*, 74(1), 489–517. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-032720-035940>  
7  
8
- 9 Gabriel, A. S., Diefendorff, J. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2023). The acceleration of emotional labor  
10  
11 research: Navigating the past and steering toward the future. *Personnel Psychology*,  
12  
13 76(2), 511–545. Portico. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12576>  
14  
15
- 16 Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize  
17  
18 emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95–110.  
19  
20  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.95>  
22  
23
- 24 Grandey, A. A., & Melloy, R. C. (2017). The state of the heart: Emotional labor as emotion  
25  
26 regulation reviewed and revised. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3),  
27  
28 407–422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000067>  
29  
30
- 31 Hauser, D. J., Ellsworth, P. C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulation checks  
32  
33 necessary?. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 9:998. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998>  
34  
35
- 36 Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological*  
37  
38 *Review*, 94(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.94.3.319>  
39  
40
- 41 Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of  
42  
43 resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their  
44  
45 consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational*  
46  
47 *Behavior*, 5, 103–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>  
48  
49
- 50 Hommelhoff, S., Keller, F., & Stemmler, M. (2025). Turnover reasons are more complex than  
51  
52 “people quit bosses”: An approach–avoidance perspective. *Journal of Vocational*  
53  
54 *Behavior*, 158, 104099. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2025.104099>  
55  
56
- 57 Hu, X., Zhan, Y., Jimenez, W. P., Garden, R., & Li, Y. (2022). Fake it till you make it with your  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

boss? Surface acting in interactions with leaders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 31(4), 596–609.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2021.2017887>

Humphrey, N. M. (2023). Emotional labor and employee outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Public Administration*, 101(2), 422–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12818>

Ilies, R., Guo, C. Y., Lim, S., Yam, K. C., & Li, X. (2020). Happy but uncivil? Examining when and why positive affect leads to incivility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 165(4), 595–614.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-04097-1>

Kazemi, A., Andersson, T., Elfstrand Corlin, T., Tengblad, S., & Wickelgren, M. (2024). How you appraise your relationship with your colleagues matters, but not as much as how you appraise your relationship with your manager: Predicting employee job satisfaction and commitment. *Psychology of Leaders and Leadership*, 27(2), 183–207.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000154>

Kızrak, M., Çınar, E., Aydın, E., & Kemikkıran, N. (2023). How psychological safety influences intention to leave? The mediation roles of networking ability and relational job crafting. *Current Psychology*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05028-8>

Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 863.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863>

Lecompte-Van Poucke, M. (2022). ‘You got this!’: A critical discourse analysis of toxic positivity as a discursive construct on Facebook. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, 2(1):

100015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2022.100015>

Lee, F. C., Diefendorff, J. M., Thornton-Lugo, M. A., & Ong, X. W. (2025). From effortful to

effortless: Conceptualizing emotional labor automaticity. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 15(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866251370353>

Lin, P. T., Vu, T. T., Nguyen, V. P., & Wu, Q. (2022). Self-determination theory and accountant employees' psychological wellbeing: The roles of positive affectivity and psychological safety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 870771. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.870771>

Lux, A. A., & Lowe, K. B. (2024). Authentic leadership: 20-year review editorial. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 30(6), 1634–1641. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2024.59>

Maaravi, Y., Hameiri, B., Gur, T., Heller, B., Confino, D., Amdor, H., & Levi, Y. (2023). Using leading questions to reduce resistance to innovation. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3), 100067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100067>

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>

McFarland, L. A., Hendricks, J. L., & Ward, W. B. (2023). A contextual framework for understanding impression management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100912>

Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309349309>

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 986–1010. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9704071861>

Murphy, M. C. (2024). *Cultures of growth: How the new science of mindset can transform individuals, teams, and organizations*. Simon & Schuster.

Nesher Shoshan, H., Venz, L., & Sonnentag, S. (2022). Being recovered as an antecedent of emotional labor: A diary study. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 21*(4), 197–207.

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000302>

Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(3), 521–535.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001>

Ozcelik, H. (2013). An empirical analysis of surface acting in intra-organizational relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(3), 291–309.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1798>

O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Doerr, B. (2021). When “me” trumps “we”: Narcissistic leaders and the cultures they create. *Academy of Management Discoveries, 7*(3), 419–

450. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2019.0163>

Podsakoff, N. P., Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Klinger, R. L. (2013). Are we really measuring what we say we're measuring? Using video techniques to supplement traditional construct validation procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(1), 99–

113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029570>

Roy, A., Newman, A., Round, H., & Bhattacharya, S. (2024). Ethical culture in organizations: A review and agenda for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 34*(1), 97–138.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2022.44>

Sayre, G. M., Chi, N.-W., & Grandey, A. A. (2025). Surface acting loss spirals: Getting unstuck

with recovery activities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 46(5), 685–700.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2859>

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

Seligman, M. E. (2019). Positive psychology: A personal history. *Annual Review of Clinical*

*Psychology*, 15(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095653>

Spreitzer, G., Myers, C. G., Kopelman, S., & Mayer, D. M. (2021). The conceptual and

empirical value of a positive lens: An invitation to organizational scholars to develop

novel research questions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 35(3), 517–534.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0056>

Stühlinger, M., Schmutz, J. B., Grote, G., Nicca, D., & Flury, D. (2021). To get vaccinated or

not? Psychological safety as a catalyst for the alignment between individual beliefs and

behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(1), 38–69.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601120983964>

Sutton, A. (2020). Living the good life: A meta-analysis of authenticity, well-being and

engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 153, 109645.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109645>

Van Kleef, G. A., & Côté, S. (2022). The social effects of emotions. *Annual Review of*

*Psychology*, 73, 629–658. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-010855>

Van Waeyenberg, T., Brebels, L., De Winne, S., & Marescaux, E. (2023). What does your i-deal

say about me? A social comparison examination of coworker reactions to flexibility i-

deals. *Group & Organization Management*, 48(1), 192–223.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011221076637>

Wong, P. T. P., & Roy, S. (2018). Critique of positive psychology and positive interventions. In

N. J. L. Brown, T. Lomas, & F. J. Eiroa-Orosa (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical positive psychology* (pp. 142–160). [Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group](#)

Yang, J., Huang, Y., & Zhou, S. (2021). Emotional labor directed at leaders: The differential effects of surface and deep acting on LMX. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(9), 2070–2089.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579253>

Yip, J. A., Levine, E. E., Brooks, A. W., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2020). Worry at work: How organizational culture promotes anxiety. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 40, 100–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2020.100124>

Zapf, D., Kern, M., Tschan, F., Holman, D., & Semmer, N. K. (2021). Emotion work: A work psychology perspective. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 8, 139–172. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-062451>

Zerwas, F. K., & Ford, B. Q. (2021). The paradox of pursuing happiness. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 39, 106–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.03.006>