University of Groningen

Let it be and keep on going! Acceptance and daily occupational well-being in relation to negative work events

Kuba, Katharina; Scheibe, Susanne

Published in:
Journal of Occupational Health Psychology

DOI:
[10.1037/a0040149](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040149)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kuba, K., & Scheibe, S. (2017). Let it be and keep on going! Acceptance and daily occupational well-being in relation to negative work events. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(1), 59-70.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040149>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Let It Be and Keep on Going! Acceptance and Daily Occupational Well-Being in Relation to Negative Work Events

Katharina Kuba and Susanne Scheibe
University of Groningen

Negative work events can diminish daily occupational well-being, yet the degree to which they do so depends on the way in which people deal with their emotions. The aim of the current study was to examine the role of acceptance in the link between daily negative work events and occupational well-being. We hypothesized that acceptance would be associated with better daily occupational well-being, operationalized as low end-of-day negative emotions and fatigue, and high work engagement. Furthermore, we predicted that acceptance would buffer the adverse impact of negative work events on daily well-being. A microlongitudinal study across 10 work days was carried out with 92 employees of the health care sector, yielding a total of 832 daily observations. As expected, acceptance was associated with lower end-of-day negative emotions and fatigue (though there was no association with work engagement) across the 10-day period. Furthermore, acceptance moderated the effect of negative event occurrence on daily well-being: Highly accepting employees experienced less increase in negative emotions and less reduction in work engagement (though comparable end-of-day fatigue) on days with negative work events, relative to days without negative work events, than did less accepting employees. These findings highlight affective, resource-saving, and motivational benefits of acceptance for daily occupational well-being and demonstrate that acceptance is associated with enhanced resilience to daily negative work events.

Keywords: acceptance, occupational well-being, negative work events, negative affect, fatigue, work engagement

The working day can be full of stressful situations. A conflict with a colleague, having to deliver bad news to a client or patient, or a malfunctioning electronic device are examples of daily negative work events that represent constant challenges to people's day-to-day routine (Ohly & Schmitt, 2015). Negative work events are defined as changes in work circumstances to which people react emotionally (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and often lead to short-term strain, such as negative affect or fatigue (Zohar, Tzischinski, & Epstein, 2003). Over time, this strain may accumulate to cause more serious mental or physical health problems (Charles, Piazza, Mogle, Sliwinski, & Almeida, 2013; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and a decline in job performance (Lepine, Podsakoff, & Lepine, 2005). Identifying factors that protect people from the adverse consequences of negative work events is important because it may signal opportunities to intervene before serious health and performance consequences arise.

It is increasingly recognized that the adverse consequences of negative work events depend to a large part on the way in which people deal with their emotions (Lawrence, Troth, Jordan, &

Collins, 2011). Recently, researchers as well as practitioners have emphasized the value of acceptance for mental health and effectiveness at work (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Hayes, Strosahl, & Wilson, 1999). Acceptance describes the willingness to experience unwanted emotions and associated thoughts and physical sensations without trying to control or regulate them and without letting them determine one's actions (Hayes et al., 1999). For example, when a physician is anxious about delivering bad news to a patient, she would allow herself to be anxious but would nevertheless initiate the conversation rather than delaying it or asking a colleague to take over. High trait levels of acceptance have been associated with numerous positive occupational outcomes (e.g., more positive affect and job performance, less depression, burnout, and sickness absence; Bond & Bunce, 2003; Bond, Flaxman, & Bunce, 2008; Hayes, Luoma, Bond, Masuda, & Lillis, 2006), and worksite stress management interventions that increase acceptance have proven effective in enhancing mental health and personal effectiveness over the course of 1 month (Brinkborg, Michanek, Hesser, & Berglund, 2011), 10 weeks (Stafford-Brown & Pakenham, 2012), or 1 year (Bond et al., 2008).

Notably, while prior work on acceptance in work settings has demonstrated the long-term benefits of acceptance for occupational well-being and performance, acceptance has only rarely been investigated in relation to the daily dynamics of employees' occupational well-being (for an exception, see Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012). As such, short-term effects of acceptance and its association with daily variation of events and well-being are not well-understood. A better understanding of these issues would help clarify when and how acceptance facilitates well-being. In the

This article was published Online First February 25, 2016.

Katharina Kuba and Susanne Scheibe, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Katharina Kuba, who is now at the Department of Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, University Medical Center Leipzig, Philipp-Rosenthal-Strasse 55, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. E-mail: Katharina.Kuba@medizin.uni-leipzig.de

present study, we examined the hypothesis that acceptance (as a habitual way to deal with emotions) relates positively to daily occupational well-being and alleviates the adverse effects of negative work events, helping people to maintain well-being especially on days when negative work events occur. To ensure demanding job conditions and the occurrence of frequent negative work events, the study was conducted with employees from the health sector who tend to face high emotional job demands (Glomb, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Rotundo, 2004).

Adverse Effects of Negative Work Events on Daily Occupational Well-Being

Affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) highlights the role of work events as an important determinant of fluctuations in daily employee well-being. According to affective events theory, events occurring at work are appraised for whether they impede or facilitate the achievement of goals, such as goals to finish a task, solve a problem, or maintain a positive self-view. Negative work events are those events that impede goal achievement; these usually trigger immediate negative emotional reactions (Elfering et al., 2005), which in turn may prompt destructive behaviors and negative job attitudes (Fuller et al., 2003; Rodell & Judge, 2009). The emotional effects of negative work events are not only apparent immediately after the event occurred, but tend to affect employees' affect still in the evening. Negative work events and the negative emotions they elicit can lead to subsequent rumination on their circumstances and consequences, which maintain negative affect for some time after the event has passed (Wang et al., 2013). For example, it has been found that end-of-day mood fluctuates in relation to distress experienced in response to negative work events during the day (Zohar et al., 2003).

In addition to causing negative emotions, negative work events also deplete regulatory (cognitive-energetic) resources (Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid, 2005; Lavalley & Campbell, 1995). When faced with negative emotions, people often attempt to down-regulate their emotional responses (J. J. Gross, 2007), which consumes regulatory resources (Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007). It has been found, for example, that regulating emotions after mood induction impedes the performance on a concurrent cognitive task, likely because emotion regulation requires cognitive resources that can no longer be directed at the concurrent task (Richards & Gross, 2006). Regulatory resources are also needed to redirect attention from the emotional experience back to the work task (Beal et al., 2005). Regulatory resources are regarded as a limited capacity that is diminished each time it is drawn upon (Baumeister et al., 2007). It is thus not surprising that negative events at work have been associated with increased fatigue after work (S. Gross et al., 2011; Zohar et al., 2003). Fatigue is a state of reduced alertness and energy and extreme tiredness because of depleted regulatory resources at the end of a working day (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005). If resources cannot be replenished after work, negative health-related consequences can arise (Meijman & Mulder, 1998).

Negative work events further tend to diminish work engagement (Crawford, Lepine, & Rich, 2010; Garrick et al., 2014). Work engagement is a three-dimensional concept that entails vigor (i.e., energetic and resilient work attitudes), dedication (i.e., strong involvement in one's work and experiencing enthusiasm and chal-

lenge) and absorption (i.e., being able to immerse in one's work; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In other words, work engagement denotes an active and positive work-related state characterized by a commitment to and mental involvement with work tasks. Engaged employees tend to direct all their attention toward organizational goals, feel connected to their work, and sense that they can deal with the demands of the job (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). According to Beal et al. (2005), emotional reactions to negative work events cause an off-task focus which is inconsistent with high levels of work engagement. While the emotional episode unfolds, appraisal processes surrounding the meaning of the emotion-eliciting event (primary appraisal) and the person's coping potential (secondary appraisal) occur (Lazarus, 1991), which together with emotion-regulatory processes direct attention away from the work task (Beal et al., 2005). The off-task focus can persist for some time after the event has passed because of subsequent rumination on the circumstances and consequences of the emotional experience (Wang et al., 2013). Overall then, we propose that at the within-person level, the occurrence of negative work events negatively affects multiple indicators of daily occupational well-being.

Hypothesis 1: Daily negative work events are associated at the within-person level with increased end-of-day negative emotions (H1a) and fatigue (H1b), and reduced daily work engagement (H1c).

Benefits of Acceptance

Given the potential adverse consequences of negative work events on well-being, it is important to identify factors that help people deal with the negative emotions arising from these events. Recently, acceptance has been identified as an important personal resource for mental health and effectiveness at work (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Hayes et al., 1999). Acceptance is defined as the tendency to openly receive one's emotions and cognitions, including negative ones, and maintain a focus on pursuing current goals and tasks (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Hayes et al., 2004). Acceptance forms the adaptive counterpart of experiential avoidance, a concept that describes the unwillingness to face internal experiences like negative emotions or memories (Hayes, Wilson, Gifford, Follette, & Strosahl, 1996) and has often been found to increase psychological distress (Chawla & Ostafin, 2007; Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000). Acceptance is defined as a two-component process: First, it involves consciously and nonjudgmentally perceiving one's emotions, no matter whether they are positive or negative (Segal, Williams, & Teasdale, 2002). As such, any internal state is accepted the way it is without an attempt to regulate or control it. Second, acceptance involves goal commitment: Cognitive resources that would otherwise be used for regulating unwanted emotions and thoughts are diverted toward controlling overt behavior consistent with current instrumental goals and tasks (Bond et al., 2008; Hayes et al., 1996). According to Hayes and colleagues (1999), acceptance promotes mental health by reducing the impact of negative stimuli and by remaining committed to pursuing personal goals (see also Bond & Bunce, 2003). The

crucial point is to be aware of (negative) mental states, while not letting these experiences determine one's actions.¹

Acceptance forms the basis of acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT; Hayes et al., 1999), in which people are taught to notice emotions and thoughts but to base their behavior on their values and goals instead of letting internal states influence them (Hayes et al., 1996). The goal of ACT is to break up habitual tendencies to avoid negative emotions and replace them with new ways of reacting to negative emotions consistent with the principles of acceptance and commitment. Since its development in 1999, ACT has received much empirical support. Learning the skills of acceptance and commitment has proven helpful for patients suffering from a wide range of mental disorders like depression (Folke, Parling, & Melin, 2012), anxiety, or borderline personality disorder (Linehan, 1993).

Given the numerous positive treatment effects of ACT, it is not surprising that organizational researchers have become interested in applying acceptance-based interventions to the work context. Bond and Bunce (2000) were the first to develop an ACT program for stress management at work and found that about one year after the intervention, employees receiving ACT had better general mental health, less depression, and reported more innovative behavior compared to the control group. Notably, it was shown that the employees improved in these domains *because* ACT enhanced their habitual acceptance. In a later, two-wave longitudinal study, the same authors showed that the beneficial effects of perceived job control were higher for participants with high levels of acceptance (Bond & Bunce, 2003). The authors argue that accepting employees are better able to notice the control they have in a given situation and through trial and error will learn how to use this control most effectively in order to reach their goals. Similarly, taking part in an adapted version of the acceptance-based stress management intervention increased general mental health and decreased stress levels in social workers in Sweden two weeks after the intervention (Brinkborg et al., 2011) or in psychologists in training 10 weeks after the intervention (Stafford-Brown & Pakenhams, 2012).

The studies described previously emphasize the beneficial effects of habitual acceptance in occupational contexts. However, with one exception (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012), all prior studies of acceptance in occupational contexts have relied on global, retrospective assessments of mental health and distress. As a consequence, it remains open whether acceptance also helps employees navigate the more mundane emotional experiences arising in daily work life. In the current study, we examined acceptance in relation to fluctuations in daily occupational well-being across 10 work days. In the following, we put forward arguments why acceptance should have affective, resource-saving, and motivational benefits at a daily level.

Affective benefit. Even though acceptance entails recognizing and embracing any emotions and associated thoughts, even negative ones, the positive effects of accepting internal experiences are well-established: In numerous studies individual differences in acceptance have been shown to be negatively associated with anxiety (Feldner, Zvolensky, Eifert, & Spira, 2003; Karekla, Forsyth, & Kelly, 2004), depressive symptoms (Shallcross, Troy, Boland, & Mauss, 2010, Study 2), and general negative affect (Campbell-Sills, Barlow, Brown, & Hofmann, 2006; Shallcross et al., 2010, Study 1). Providing causal evidence for the affective

benefits of acceptance, Campbell-Sills and colleagues (2006) instructed a sample of clinical patients to either accept or suppress their emotions while watching a negative mood-inducing movie. Acceptance was superior to suppression after the movie was shown such that the acceptance group showed lower negative emotions than the suppression group. However, during the movie both groups reported similar levels of negative emotions. The authors concluded that acceptance does not decrease the initial experience of negative emotions, but instead diffuses negative emotions quickly so that it ultimately leads to less negative affect. Similar results were obtained in two subsequent experimental studies employing mood induction procedures (Alberts, Schneider, & Martijn, 2012; Shallcross et al., 2010, Study 1). Based on these findings, we assumed that any negative emotions occurring during the work day should be less long-lasting in highly accepting employees relative to less accepting employees.

Hypothesis 2: Acceptance is related to lower levels of end-of-day negative emotions.

Resource-saving benefit. Next to an affective benefit, acceptance also appears beneficial in terms of protecting regulatory resources, which should be evident in reduced levels of fatigue at the end of the work day. People high on acceptance tend to refrain from controlling negative emotions and other internal states and thus do not employ cognitive control when negative emotions occur (Hayes et al., 2004). Empirical research on this fundamental proposition is scant, but one recent study suggests that acceptance indeed draws on fewer regulatory resources. The authors compared cognitive performance after exposure to a sad movie for which participants were instructed to either suppress emotions, accept emotions, or received no instruction (Alberts et al., 2012). Participants in the acceptance group performed better on the subsequent cognitive task than participants in the suppression or the control group. Moreover, one recent study investigated acceptance as an alternative to the two traditionally studied emotional labor strategies surface and deep acting (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012). Emotional labor describes the process of tailoring the display of emotions to the demands of the job. Participants reported on their habitual use of acceptance, deep acting, and surface acting in a general survey, and reported daily emotional exhaustion—a construct related to fatigue—across 3 consecutive work days. Results indicated that acceptance was associated with lower levels of emotional exhaustion, controlling for surface acting and deep acting. We expected to find similar beneficial effects of habitual acceptance on fatigue experienced in the evening.

Hypothesis 3: Acceptance is related to lower levels of end-of-day fatigue.

¹ Acceptance, by definition, includes openness toward positive and negative emotions and associated cognitions and physical sensations (Hayes et al., 1999). While it is more easily interpreted when applied to negative internal states, it can also be applied to positive states. Note, however, that the measure of acceptance used in the current study focuses more on negative than positive states; eight out of 10 items explicitly target negative states (see sample items in the measures section). The remaining two items, "Emotions cause problems in my life" and "My thoughts and feelings do not get in the way of how I want to live my life," do not specify negativity.

Motivational benefit. As noted, accepting individuals refrain from investing regulatory resources into controlling emotions and negative affect tends to dissipate more quickly than it is the case when using emotion regulation strategies such as suppression (Alberts et al., 2012; Campbell-Sills et al., 2006). Cognitive demands that would usually arise from emotion-regulation processes and subsequent ruminative thoughts leading to an off-task focus are thereby reduced and cognitive resources can be invested into the task at hand (Beal et al., 2005). Bond and colleagues (2008) called this increased capacity to notice and to react on goal-related opportunities “goal-related context sensitivity”: When acceptance levels are high more attentional resources are available to notice goal-related opportunities. As a consequence, behavior can be tailored as needed to the pursuit of current work goals (Bond et al., 2008; Hayes et al., 2004). In fact, acceptance per definition entails a continued commitment to ongoing tasks despite negative emotions and associated cognitions and sensations (Hayes et al., 1999). We propose that this constitutes the motivational benefit of acceptance and manifests in high levels of work engagement in daily work life. Hence, we expected the following:

Hypothesis 4: Acceptance is related to higher levels of daily work engagement.

Acceptance and Resilience to Negative Work Events

The benefits of acceptance should be especially apparent on days on which employees face negative work events. As noted above, negative work events have the potential to trigger negative emotions, rumination, and emotion-regulation processes, which deplete regulatory resources and reduce engagement with ongoing work tasks (Beal et al., 2005). It is in the context of daily negative work events that acceptance should matter most, by buffering the adverse consequences of negative work events. In contrast, acceptance may be less relevant on days without any notable negative work events when employees presumably experience fewer negative emotions, thoughts, and sensations that need to be regulated and potentially distract from work-related goal pursuit. Establishing that acceptance increases resilience to negative work events will help to illuminate a possible mechanism linking acceptance with longer-term occupational outcomes.

There is indeed evidence that acceptance enhances resilience when people face stressful situations. In their experimental study, Shallcross et al. (2010, Study 1) found that highly accepting persons experienced a smaller increase in negative emotions than low accepting persons after a negative mood induction, relative to a neutral mood induction. Furthermore, longitudinal field research showed that acceptance diminishes the adverse effects of stressful life events on depressive symptoms (Shallcross et al., 2010, Study 2) and general psychological functioning (Plumb, Orsillo, & Luterek, 2004). Two studies found that acceptance-based work stress interventions were beneficial for people experiencing high levels of general distress prior to the intervention, but had minimal effect on people experiencing low levels of general distress (Brinkborg et al., 2011; Flaxman & Bond, 2010). Most relevant to the current study, Biron and van Veldhoven (2012) showed that habitual acceptance attenuated the link between daily emotional job demands, including the frequency of difficult client interactions, and daily exhaustion across 3 work days. Based on these findings, we expected the following:

Hypothesis 5: Acceptance buffers the effect of negative work events on daily occupational well-being. The positive within-person relationship of negative work events with end-of-day negative emotions (H5a) and fatigue (H5b) and the negative within-person relationship between negative work events and work engagement (H5c) is weaker for highly accepting employees than for less accepting employees.

Method

Participants

The sample included 95 adults working in the health care sector from the greater rural area of a medium-size German city. To participate in the study, respondents had to be employed in the health care sector and have daily contact with clients. The most frequent occupations were (hospital and geriatric) nurses, doctor's assistants, and physicians. Three respondents dropped out of the study after completing the general questionnaire and were excluded from analyses with a resulting sample size of 92. Participants' age ranged from 17 to 64 years with a mean age of 43 years ($SD = 11$); 18% of the sample was male. Of the final sample, two thirds completed junior or secondary high school as highest education and one third held a college or university degree. Job tenure ranged from less than 1 year to 32 years, with an average of 8.83 years ($SD = 7.80$). Participants interacted with clients on average 5.44 hr a day ($SD = 2.41$). The mean working time was 7.36 hr per day ($SD = 1.91$).

Procedure

Participants were recruited by contacting health care organizations including private physician practices, pharmacies, ambulant nursing, physiotherapy practices, or practices offering dietary advice; and through the researchers' private social network. Some participants were referred by colleagues or friends who heard of the study or participated themselves. In exchange for participation respondents received personalized feedback about their emotion regulation. Furthermore, participants could win one of two 100€ Amazon vouchers if they completed at least 7 daily entries.

The study consisted of a Web-based general survey, which was followed by a sequence of Web-based daily entries. The general survey assessed demographics, acceptance, and further variables not included in this report. At the end of the survey, participants indicated their usual work days on which they received e-mails containing a link for the daily survey starting at the next work day after completion of the general survey. The daily survey included measures of momentary emotions and fatigue, daily work engagement, and daily work events. Participants were emailed links for the daily surveys at 10 a.m. and were instructed to fill out the surveys after work but before going to bed. The study plan intended the completion of 10 daily entries. Most participants had flexible working times because of shift work and part-time employment. Therefore, participants were sent links for the diary on their usual working days up until they had completed 10 daily surveys. However, because of a system error, 25 participants were sent more links and filled out up to 17 daily surveys on up to 17 consecutive working days. The number of completed daily entries ranged from 2 to 17 ($M = 10.05$, $SD = 2.39$). In addition, some

participants filled in two ($n = 61$) or three diaries ($n = 4$) at 1 day, presumably to make up for not filling in the surveys on previous days. These additional responses were deleted from the dataset and only the last entry of a day was used for analyses resulting in a sample of 832 daily entries (901 – 69).

Measures

Acceptance. Habitual acceptance was measured using the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire II (AAQ-II; Bond et al., 2011). The AAQ-II has been developed in collaboration with 12 ACT-experts from research and practice to capture both constituting components of acceptance, not regulating unwanted states and goal commitment, and has been shown to have strong psychometric properties (Bond et al., 2011; Gloster, Klotzsch, Chaker, Hummel, & Hoyer, 2011). Specifically, for the German translation of the AAQ-II, which we used in this study, Gloster et al. (2011) reported reliabilities ranging from .84 to .97 across three studies and a test–retest reliability ranging from .74 to .85. Participants rated their agreement with 10 statements on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never true*) to 7 (*always true*). Examples of items are “My painful experiences and memories make it difficult for me to live a life that I would value,” “It’s OK if I remember something unpleasant,” or “Worries get in the way of my success.” Cronbach’s alpha indicated adequate reliability ($\alpha = .84$).

End-of-day negative emotions. Participants indicated for six negative emotions to what extent they experience these currently. Ratings were given on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very slightly or not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). Items represented low-arousal (“droopy,” “dull,” “sluggish”) and high-arousal negative emotions (“annoyed,” “nervous,” “anxious”) and were taken from an established German affect checklist (Kessler & Staudinger, 2009). We measured current emotions in the evening rather than affect during the work day because we were interested in the lasting effects of negative work events on end-of-day well-being. Moreover, reports of current affect have been shown to be less prone to bias than retrospective reports of affect (Robinson & Clore, 2002). Scale scores were derived by aggregating daily ratings across the six negative emotions; internal consistency across 12 days was satisfactorily high ranging from .62 to .84 ($M = .74$).²

End-of-day fatigue. State fatigue was assessed with a measure by Nitsch (1976), which has shown good psychometric properties (e.g., Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005). This five-item measure was presented as part of the affect checklist. The items were “spent,” “exhausted,” “in need for recovery,” “rested,” [recoded], and “recuperated” [recoded]. Reliability across the 12 days was sufficiently high, with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .83 to .91 ($M = .86$).

Daily work engagement. We used a shortened version of the state-level Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Hetland, 2012) to measure daily work engagement. To reduce participant burden, we selected one item from each of the three subscales of the state-level UWES, vigor (“Today, I felt strong and vigorous at my work”), dedication (“I am proud of the work I did today”), and absorption (“Today, I was immersed in my work”). A multilevel confirmatory factor analysis by Breevaart et al. (2012) shows that all three items load highly on their respective factor (i.e., factor loadings from .73 to .88), indicating that they are robust indicators of the three constituting components of work engagement. Participants indicated for the

three items the extent to which they agreed with them on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not agree at all*) to 5 (*agree completely*). We combined the three items into one overall work engagement score. Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .73 to .93 across the 12 days indicating high reliability ($M = .85$).

Daily negative work events. To assess daily negative work events, an open answer format was chosen. Participants were asked to list up to six events of the work day that they considered “straining” or “pleasant” and to describe them shortly (see S. Gross et al., 2011, for a similar approach). We chose this format to capture work events that are perceived as meaningful by participants and to avoid unnecessarily restricting the types of events that can be reported. We explicitly asked for negative as well as positive events to counteract a possible negative bias that would arise when only negative events would have been made salient. Participants were asked to rate the valence of each reported event as *slightly negative*, *negative*, *neutral*, *slightly positive*, or *positive*. This valence scale has been used in earlier research (Brose, Scheibe, & Schmiedek, 2013) to identify negative daily events as those rated slightly negative or negative. On average, 2.2 work events were listed on each day of which 33% were categorized as negative (58% were categorized as positive and 9% as neutral). Negative work events represented interpersonal events (e.g., “conversation with a repeatedly complaining colleague,” “talked to a father about the son’s cancer diagnosis”), events related to the task and work environment (e.g., “fourth dying patient in a row,” “had to make up for previous day mistakes from colleagues”), and events related to personal issues (e.g., “I was sick which impacted my work ability,” “Due to private events I lost my temper and cried at work”).

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with multilevel modeling using MLwiN (Rasbash, Charlton, Browne, Healy, & Cameron, 2005). Days (Level 1) were nested within individuals (Level 2). The count of negative events per day was strongly right-skewed, with very few days (17.8%) on which more than one negative work event was reported. In order to tailor the variable to the demands of a multilevel analysis, the variable was dichotomized so that “1” represented at least one negative event experienced on that day and “0” represented that no negative event was experienced (Zohar et al., 2003). The three outcome variables indexing well-being—negative emotions, fatigue, and work engagement—were predicted in three separate models. The Level 1 outcome variable represents one well-being variable reported by participant j on day i and is predicted by the expected level on the outcome variable when no negative work event was encountered that day (β_{0j}) and the expected change in the outcome variable when at least one negative work event was encountered (β_{1j}). The Level 2 model takes into account individual differences in habitual acceptance and estimates the regression coefficients for the Level 1 model. The Level 2 predictor acceptance was grand-mean centered, so that respective effects need to be interpreted relative to the sample mean.

² Internal consistencies were computed for the first 12 days for the variables assessed during the diary phase because too few entries (<6) were obtained for subsequent days to obtain meaningful reliability estimates. The number of survey entries that were used for calculating internal consistencies per day ranged from 92 at Day 1 to 11 at Day 12.

In line with recommendations (Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013), we always controlled for the number of diary entry (β_2). Furthermore, in all models we controlled for different possible confounders at Level 2, including age, gender, and number of negative event days, and at Level 1 including working hours and positive event occurrence. The main analysis examined the between-person relationship between habitual acceptance and daily well-being and the cross-level moderating effect of habitual acceptance on the within-person relationship between event occurrence and daily well-being. The simple slopes for high (1 *SD* above the mean) and low levels (1 *SD* below the mean) of acceptance were examined making use of a tool developed by Preacher, Curran, and Bauer (2006). Significance tests were carried out as one-way tests on the 5%-level, because directional hypotheses were proposed. However, with regard to recent recommendations to shift toward estimation procedures (Coulson, Healey, Fidler, & Cumming, 2010), 95% confidence intervals are reported as well.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

End-of-day negative emotions, fatigue, work engagement, negative event occurrence, and working hours were averaged for participants across all measurement points to obtain the between-person correlations of all variables that are listed in Table 1. Acceptance was moderately negatively correlated with average levels of negative emotions and fatigue and moderately positively with average levels of work engagement. Furthermore, acceptance was positively related to age, a finding to which we return in the discussion. However, acceptance was uncorrelated with negative event occurrence. Women and men reported equal levels of acceptance, $t(90) = .23$, 95% confidence interval (CI) $[-.61, .39]$.

Before testing hypotheses, we calculated null models to assess the proportion of variance that is accounted for by person and day level, respectively. These revealed that between 45% and 49% of the total variability in the daily occupational well-being indicators was located at the person level, indicating that multilevel modeling is an appropriate procedure for analyzing the data (Nezlek, 2001). The control variables education and positive event occurrence were nonsignificant predictors of all three occupational well-being indicators and their inclusion did not change results in any of the models. For matters of simplicity, we excluded these variables from the final models. The remaining control variables—age, gender, mean number of negative event days (all at Level 2), working hours, and number of diary entry (both at Level 1)—were retained.

Acceptance, Negative Event Occurrence, and Daily Well-Being

The first hypothesis predicted that the occurrence of negative work events would be associated with a drop in daily occupational well-being. This was indeed found. Experiencing a negative event at work was related to increased end-of-day negative emotions ($\gamma = .32$, 95% CI $[.24/.40]$), increased end-of-day fatigue ($\gamma = .30$, 95% CI $[.20/.40]$), and decreased daily work engagement ($\gamma = -.67$, 95% CI $[-.83/-.52]$). An overview of results from the

Table 1
Means, SDs, and Intercorrelations of Central Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Person-level (Level 2)									
1. Acceptance	5.26	.94	—						
2. Gender ^a	.18	.39	.04 $[-.16/.25]$	—					
3. Age	43.47	11.14	.36** $ [.16/.52]$	.24* $ [.03/.42]$	—				
Day-level (Level 1) ^b									
4. Event occurrence	.46	.28	-.16 $[-.37/.02]$	.05 $[-.15/.25]$	-.09 $[-.29/.12]$	—			
5. Negative affect	1.71	.49	-.43** $[-.58/-.24]$	.03 $[-.18/.23]$	-.05 $[-.26/.16]$	.39* $ [.20/.55]$	—		
6. Fatigue	3.04	.69	-.31** $[-.48/-.11]$	.23* $ [.03/.44]$	.11 $[-.09/.31]$	.34** $ [.14/.50]$	—		
7. Work engagement	5.23	.88	.34** $ [.14/.51]$	-.03 $[-.24/.17]$	.16 $[-.04/.36]$	-.39** $[-.55/-.19]$	-.52** $[-.65/-.35]$	-.48** $[-.62/-.30]$	—
8. Working hours	8.12	2.00	-.18 $[-.39/.02]$	.38** $ [.20/.61]$	-.11 $[-.30/.10]$	.11 $[-.10/.30]$	.18 $[-.02/.39]$	.21* $ [.01/.40]$	-.22* $[-.02/.37]$

Note. $N = 92$. Numbers in box brackets represent the 95% confidence intervals of the correlation coefficients.

^a 0 = female, 1 = male. ^b Aggregated at the person level (across daily entries).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

three full models (one for each indicator of daily occupational well-being) is given in Table 2.

Hypotheses 2 to 4 stated that acceptance is related to lower end-of-day negative emotions, lower end-of-day fatigue, and higher work engagement across the diary period, and Hypothesis 5 stated that acceptance moderates the within-person relationships between negative event occurrence and the three outcomes. Supporting Hypothesis 2, acceptance was negatively related to end-of-day negative emotions ($\gamma = -.16 [-.26/-.06]$). Supporting Hypothesis 3, the results showed a negative association between acceptance and end-of-day fatigue ($\gamma = -.21 [-.37/-.05]$). Furthermore, diary entry emerged as a significant negative predictor of end-of-day fatigue ($\gamma = -.02 [-.04/-.01]$) indicating that participants reported decreasing end-of-day fatigue over the course of the study. The control variables age ($\gamma = .02 [.00/.04]$) and hours worked ($\gamma = .07 [.05/.09]$) significantly predicted end-of-day fatigue such that older employees reported more end-of-day fatigue than younger employees, and that on days when employees had worked more hours higher fatigue was reported than on days when they had worked less hours. With regard to the main effect of acceptance on work engagement, results failed to support Hypothesis 4. Acceptance by itself did not predict daily work engagement ($\gamma = .13 [-.05/.30]$).

Regarding the predicted interaction effects stated in Hypotheses 5a, 5b, and 5c, results are mixed. Supporting Hypothesis 5a, there was a significant cross-level interaction between negative event occurrence and acceptance on end-of-day negative emotions ($\gamma = -.07 [-.16/-.004]$). Figure 1 (left) displays graphically the moderation effect. The simple slope analysis revealed that the effect of experiencing negative work events on end-of-day negative emotions was lower (though still significant) for persons with higher levels of acceptance ($\beta = .26 [.10/.37]$) than for persons with lower levels of acceptance ($\beta = .38 [.20/.56]$). In contrast to Hypothesis 5b, the cross-level interaction between negative event occurrence and acceptance on end-of-day fatigue was nonsignificant ($\gamma = .01 [-.13/.11]$). Finally, acceptance and negative event occurrence interacted in predicting daily work engagement ($\gamma = .19 [.03/.35]$) as was stated in Hypothesis 5c. This moderation effect is depicted in the right panel of Figure 1. The simple

slope analysis revealed that negative event occurrence had a weaker (though still significant) negative effect on work engagement when acceptance levels were high ($\beta = -.50 [-.70/-.30]$) than when acceptance levels were low ($\beta = -.84 [-1.04/-.64]$). The control variable working hours also predicted daily work engagement ($\gamma = .20 [.004/.40]$). Work engagement was higher on days when employees had worked more hours than on days when they had worked fewer hours.

The relationships between negative work events, acceptance, and the three outcome variables showed significant variance in intercepts across participants, indicating that participants' well-being differed on days with and without negative events. However, the slopes varied only slightly across participants. Including the cross-level interaction in the models reduced the slope variation in all three models.

Discussion

Negative events at work can diminish daily well-being, but the extent to which they do so depends on the way in which people deal with their emotions. In the current study, we investigated the beneficial effects of acceptance—the tendency to openly receive unwanted emotions and associated thoughts and physical sensations while maintaining a focus on pursuing current goals and tasks—for daily occupational well-being. Specifically, we examined whether habitual acceptance is a positive predictor of daily occupational well-being and buffers the adverse impact of negative work events on daily well-being. We tested our hypotheses in a sample of health care workers who are known to face high levels of emotional job demands (Glomb et al., 2004). The results largely supported our predictions.

Experiencing one or more negative events during the work day was related to higher levels of negative emotions and fatigue and lower levels of work engagement reported at the end of a working day. These findings dovetail with previous research demonstrating within-person relationships between stressors—including job demands (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012; Garrick et al., 2014) and affective work events (S. Gross et al., 2011)—and strain experienced after work. Together with these prior studies, the current

Table 2
Summary of Results From Multilevel Model Analyses Predicting Indicators of Daily Occupational Well-Being

Variable	Negative affect			Fatigue			Work engagement		
	Coeff	SE	95% CI	Coeff	SE	95% CI	Coeff	SE	95% CI
Person-level (Level 2) ^a									
Acceptance	-.16**	.05	-.26/-.06	-.21**	.08	-.37/-.05	.13	.09	-.05/.30
Negative event occurrence × Acceptance	-.07*	.04	-.16/-.00	-.01	.06	-.13/.11	.19**	.08	.03/.35
Age	.01	.00	-.00/.01	.02*	.01	.00/.04	.01	.01	-.00/.03
Gender ^b	-.01	.11	-.23/.21	.19	.16	-.13/.51	-.21	.20	-.61/.19
Number of negative event days	.12	.10	-.01/.32	.17	.10	-.03/.37	-.16	.14	-.44/.12
Day-level (Level 1) ^c									
Intercept	1.47**	.08	1.31/1.63	2.40**	.11	2.18/2.6	5.50**	.14	5.23/5.77
Negative event occurrence	.32**	.04	.24/.40	.30**	.05	.20/.40	-.67**	.08	-.83/-.52
Diary entry	-.01	.01	-.03/.01	-.02**	.01	-.04/-.01	-.002	.01	-.02/.02
Working hours	.01	.01	-.01/.03	.07**	.01	.05/.09	.20*	.1	.004/.40

Note. Coeff = coefficient; CI = confidence interval. Significance tests are one-tailed as the hypotheses predicted a directional effect.

^a $df = 85$. ^b 0 = female, 1 = male. ^c $df = 825$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Figure 1. The relationship between low and high levels of acceptance, occurrence of at least one negative event at work and daily negative affect (left) and daily work engagement (right). Low acceptance is computed as 1 *SD* below the mean and high acceptance as 1 *SD* above the mean.

findings therefore show that events experienced during the work day have lasting effects on employees at least until the evening, presumably because the elicited emotional reactions lead to subsequent rumination and affect-regulatory processes that direct attention away from current work tasks and deplete regulatory resources (Beal et al., 2005). This underscores the importance of identifying factors that may diminish such adverse impact of negative work events.

We identified habitual acceptance as one protective personal resource that predicts high levels of daily well-being especially on days with negative work events. To our knowledge, the current study is the first to simultaneously test a threefold benefit of acceptance for daily occupational well-being. Namely, according to theoretical accounts of acceptance (Hayes et al., 1999), acceptance should have an affective benefit (by rapidly defusing negative emotions once these occur), a resource-saving benefit (by saving regulatory resources that would otherwise be used to down-regulate unwanted emotions), and a motivational benefit (by staying engaged with current goal- or task-related pursuits despite negative emotions). Results most clearly supported the affective benefit of acceptance. In our sample of health care workers, we found acceptance to be associated with lower end-of-day negative emotions across the diary period; the zero-order correlation between acceptance and averaged negative emotions was of moderate effect size according to Cohen's (1992) classification. More importantly, multilevel analysis revealed that acceptance buffered the detrimental impact of negative work events on end-of-day negative emotions. These results add to prior work on the affective benefits of acceptance in worker samples (Bond & Bunce, 2000; Brinkborg et al., 2011) and in groups facing elevated life stress (Shallcross et al., 2010, Study 2). The present study extends prior findings by investigating relatively short-term effects of specific work stressors (in the form of negative work events) as opposed to long-term effects of general life stress over longer periods (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Shallcross et al., 2010).

The resource-saving benefit of acceptance was only partially supported. Acceptance was predictive of lower levels of end-of-day fatigue across the diary period; the zero-order correlation was of medium effect size (Cohen, 1992). However, acceptance did not reduce the degree of co-occurrence of negative work events and higher end-of-day fatigue. Research on links between acceptance

and fatigue is scant, but one recent study has found that habitual acceptance weakens the link between daily emotional job demands (such as difficult interpersonal situations) and end-of-day emotional exhaustion across 3 work days (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012). The divergence in findings may be partly because of the difference in outcome measures. Emotional exhaustion forms one dimension of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) and constitutes a general feeling of fatigue, irritability, and being worn-out because the employee's emotional resources become depleted. In Frone and Tidwell's (2015) recently proposed three-dimensional model of fatigue that distinguishes between emotional, mental, and physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion may be most similar to emotional fatigue. In contrast, we used a more global measure of fatigue that includes items tapping into emotional and mental fatigue. It is possible that acceptance has a moderating role between daily job demands and fatigue, but only on the emotional level. This would be consistent with the findings for end-of-day negative emotions reported above. Future studies are needed to disentangle the relationship between acceptance and different aspects of fatigue in relation to negative work events. Notably, the amount of hours worked significantly predicted end-of-day fatigue. Furthermore, including daily working hours reduced the main effect of gender (male participants had higher end-of-day fatigue) to nonsignificance. This suggests that the amount of time worked on a given day, rather than being male, is critical for end-of-day fatigue.

Interesting findings emerged regarding the motivational benefit of acceptance. Although there was a significant zero-order correlation of moderate effect size between acceptance and average work engagement across days, acceptance did not predict daily work engagement when taking into account within-person variation in the multilevel analysis. In face of negative work events, however, habitual acceptance of unwanted experiences significantly attenuated the decrease in daily work engagement. Prior studies have also found that acceptance predicts work engagement and other indicators of work motivation only under stressful conditions. Clark and Loxton (2012) found a positive effect of acceptance on work engagement but only when participants considered their job demands as high; the main effect of acceptance on work engagement was not significant. In two interventional studies in which an acceptance-based stress management intervention was

delivered to half of the participants, levels of acceptance were unrelated to intrinsic job motivation (Bond & Bunce, 2000; Bond et al., 2008). It may be that the motivational benefit of acceptance unfolds only when people are facing stressors, a proposition that should be further investigated.

A notable additional finding was that acceptance was positively related to age. This result dovetails with prior research findings that older adults report higher acceptance than young adults, which mediates the negative relationship between age and negative affect in response to negative mood induction, in daily life, and across longer time intervals (Shallcross, Ford, Floerke, & Mauss, 2013). Hence, increased acceptance was identified as one potential pathway in the well-established link between age and improved affective well-being (Scheibe & Carstensen, 2010). In this prior study, acceptance was measured in terms of the first component only, nonjudgmentally engaging with unwanted emotions; hence, our study provides converging evidence adding the goal commitment component of acceptance. Through their life experiences, older adults may have come to realize the beneficial effects of acceptance and may have accordingly adopted a more accepting approach in face of unwanted emotions. These considerations may also help explain why in this study we found age to be positively related to fatigue in the multilevel model that controls for levels of acceptance, but unrelated to fatigue at the zero-order level. Aging is generally associated with declining regulatory resources (Heckhausen, Wrosch, & Schulz, 2010), which would translate into higher levels of end-of-day fatigue. Yet, older workers may counteract such effects by adopting more resource-saving strategies such as acceptance to deal with unwanted emotions and cognitions throughout the work day. Future research may further investigate the role of acceptance in aging workers' occupational well-being.

In sum, findings confirm prior studies demonstrating the beneficial effects of acceptance and acceptance-based stress management interventions in work settings. Our study extends this research by deepening our understanding of *how* acceptance influences daily well-being in relation to negative work events, namely via a threefold (affective, resource-saving, and motivational) benefit for daily well-being in relation to negative work events. As such, this study hints at an underlying mechanism leading from acceptance to positive longer-term outcomes. It also helps clarify why prior acceptance-based interventions in the workplace have worked much better for employees with high initial levels of distress relative to employees with low initial distress.

Limitations and Future Directions

The findings of the present study should be interpreted in light of its limitations. A first limitation is our choice of the AAQ-II to measure habitual acceptance. This instrument has received criticism regarding its construct validity, based on findings that the AAQ-II is not able to distinguish between acceptance as a way to deal with unwanted states and the supposed outcome of psychological well-being (Wolgast, 2014). Nevertheless, the scale development process which involved 12 experts on acceptance supports the construct validity and makes us confident that the AAQ-II captures well the two-component nature of acceptance, including openly receiving unwanted internal states and remaining commit-

ted to goals. Still, in future research it will be useful to replicate the current results with alternative measures of acceptance.

A second limitation arises from our measure for daily negative work events. We chose an open-answer format (see S. Gross et al., 2011) rather than a checklist of events (e.g., Zohar et al., 2003) in order to capture work events that are perceived as meaningful by participants and to avoid unnecessarily restricting the types of events that can be reported. This measure might be impacted by participants' motivation and conscientiousness in filling out the daily surveys and their biased recollection of events. For example, it is possible that participants reported fewer events than have actually occurred on a respective work day. Even though the occurrence of negative events might be underestimated in the present study, the crucial finding of a cross-level interaction between habitual acceptance and negative work event occurrence in the prediction of occupational well-being would not be affected. Furthermore, even though participants were instructed to report events they considered 'straining' or 'pleasant,' in a subsequent step a minority of reported events (9%) were rated as emotionally 'neutral.' This could be the result of perceiving some events as both straining *and* pleasant, or by—upon further reflection—evaluating their impact as negligible. Because of the ambiguities in interpretation, we excluded neutral events from analyses.

Relatedly, the format of the daily events measure did not allow for distinguishing between different intensities of events. Any event that was listed and subjectively rated as negative was included in the analysis. As a consequence, all events were treated similarly, even though they might differ strongly in terms of their expected impact on well-being. In future studies it is important to overcome this drawback and to increase comparability of events, for example by using a checklist format (e.g., Zohar et al., 2003) or by qualitatively categorizing listed events. Researchers may also want to obtain consensual ratings of the severity of common negative work events, similar to procedures used to characterize stressful life events (Hobson et al., 1998). To our knowledge, such a standardized list does not yet exist for work events.

Third, in the current study, well-being ratings were given after the work day, and therefore home issues might have biased the ratings especially of negative affect and end-of-day fatigue. Home events may weaken the effects of negative work events on daily well-being, for example when emotional reactions to home events override emotional reactions to work events. Alternatively, home events may strengthen the effects of negative work events on daily well-being, for example when emotions arising from work events spill into nonwork time and this causes conflict. Relatedly, the delayed assessment of well-being indicators several hours after event occurrence precluded the possibility to measure the *immediate* emotional, resource-depleting, and motivational effects of negative work events, and to what extent these are moderated by habitual acceptance. Future research may adopt an event-contingent sampling approach to collect ratings of emotions, fatigue, and work engagement immediately after event occurrence as well as in the evening. This would allow testing a moderated mediation model in which acceptance moderates the indirect effect of negative work *and* home events on end-of-day well-being outcomes via immediate reactions to such events.

Fourth, to reduce participant burden in the diary part of the study, only three items were used to measure work engagement (as opposed to nine items in the original state-level version of the

UWES). We used one item per dimension that loaded highly on its respective factor in prior work (Breevaart et al., 2012). Using three items might be a weak measure of work engagement. However, this short scale had satisfying reliability across the days in our study ($M = .85$). Furthermore, our three-item measure of work engagement seems valid because the positive relationship of work engagement with occupational health and acceptance replicates earlier studies (Clark et al., 2012; Hakanen, Schaufeli, & Ahola, 2008).

A further limitation is that because of a system error, participants completed varying numbers of diary entries and on 65 days filled out more than one diary per day, presumably to make up for not filling in the surveys on previous days. For a more conservative analysis, only the last entry per day was used. However, it cannot be reconstructed whether the last entry was the one filled out for that day or for a previous working day. In the latter case, the data may be subject to recollection bias.

A final limitation is the exclusive reliance on employee self-reports, which are vulnerable to social desirability and common-method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). In particular, common-method bias implies that the identified main effects may be overestimations of the true relationships between acceptance and the well-being variables. However, common-method bias does not pose a threat to interaction effect findings. In fact, it may even lead to an underestimation of interaction effects so that they are difficult to detect (McClelland & Judd, 1993; Morris, Sherman, & Mansfield, 1986) and therefore even small effects should be considered important (Evans, 1985). In this vein, we can be confident about the identified interaction effects of habitual acceptance and negative work event occurrence on daily occupational well-being.

Practical Implications and Conclusion

The present findings have some practical implications for employees in the health care sector. Because negative work events cannot always be avoided, organizations could focus on how employees handle their emotions in such situations. Employees who have a habitual tendency to openly receive their emotions and associated cognitions and maintain current goal pursuit seem to be well-equipped to maintain well-being even when confronted with negative work events. They may therefore serve as role models for low accepting employees who are at risk for low well-being and withdrawal of work engagement when facing negative work events. One way to accomplish this would be to enable employees to discuss with each other best ways to deal with emotions at work, for instance during (specially arranged) work meetings. Future research would be needed to assess whether and under which conditions this format is helpful in increasing acceptance levels in affected employees. In addition, in conjunction with earlier findings on the differential effectiveness of more formal acceptance-based interventions in the workplace, the current findings help to predict for whom such interventions may be most beneficial. Namely, those employees who perceive that they experience negative work events frequently and are low in acceptance may show the highest return-on-investment.

To conclude, the present study lends support to a threefold (affective, resource-saving, and motivational) benefit of acceptance for the daily occupational well-being of employees in the

emotionally demanding health care sector. Employees with higher levels of acceptance reported lower levels of end-of-day negative emotions and fatigue. Furthermore, they experienced less increase in end-of-day negative emotions and less of a drop in work engagement when negative work events occurred than employees with lower levels of acceptance. These findings add to the existing body of literature that emphasizes the benefits of acceptance in work settings and improve our understanding of why acceptance-based interventions work, and especially so for people with high baseline levels of distress.

References

- Alberts, H. J. E. M., Schneider, F., & Martijn, C. (2012). Dealing efficiently with emotions: Acceptance-based coping with negative emotions requires fewer resources than suppression. *Cognition and Emotion*, 26, 863–870. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2011.625402>
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 351–355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x>
- Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S. M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1054–1068. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1054>
- Biron, M., & van Veldhoven, M. (2012). Emotional labour in service work: Psychological flexibility and emotion regulation. *Human Relations*, 65, 1259–1282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712447832>
- Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2013). *Intensive longitudinal methods: An introduction to diary and experience sampling research. Methodology in the social sciences*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2000). Mediators of change in emotion-focused and problem-focused worksite stress management interventions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 156–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.156>
- Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2003). The role of acceptance and job control in mental health, job satisfaction, and work performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1057–1067. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.1057>
- Bond, F. W., Flaxman, P. E., & Bunce, D. (2008). The influence of psychological flexibility on work redesign: Mediated moderation of a work reorganization intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 645–654. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.645>
- Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Guenole, N., Orcutt, H. K., . . . Zettle, R. D. (2011). Preliminary psychometric properties of the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-II: A revised measure of psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance. *Behavior Therapy*, 42, 676–688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2011.03.007>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Hetland, J. (2012). The measurement of state work engagement. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 28, 305–312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000111>
- Brinkborg, H., Michanek, J., Hesser, H., & Berglund, G. (2011). Acceptance and commitment therapy for the treatment of stress among social workers: A randomized controlled trial. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 49, 389–398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.03.009>
- Brose, A., Scheibe, S., & Schmiedek, F. (2013). Life contexts make a difference: Emotional stability in younger and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 28, 148–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030047>
- Campbell-Sills, L., Barlow, D. H., Brown, T. A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2006). Effects of suppression and acceptance on emotional responses of individuals with anxiety and mood disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44, 1251–1263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.10.001>

- Charles, S. T., Piazza, J. R., Mogle, J., Sliwinski, M. J., & Almeida, D. M. (2013). The wear and tear of daily stressors on mental health. *Psychological Science*, 24, 733–741. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612462222>
- Chawla, N., & Ostafin, B. (2007). Experiential avoidance as a functional dimensional approach to psychopathology: An empirical review. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 63, 871–890. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20400>
- Clark, D. M. T., & Loxton, N. J. (2012). Fear, psychological acceptance, job demands and employee work engagement: An integrative moderated meditation model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 893–897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.022>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Coulson, M., Healey, M., Fidler, F., & Cumming, G. (2010). Confidence intervals permit, but do not guarantee, better inference than statistical significance testing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1, 26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00026>
- Crawford, E. R., Lepine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 834–848. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
- Elfering, A., Grebner, S., Semmer, N., Kaiser-Freiburghaus, D., Lauper-Del Ponte, S., & Witschi, I. (2005). Chronic job stressors and job control: Effects on event-related coping success and well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 237–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317905X40088>
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 305–323. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(85\)90002-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(85)90002-0)
- Feldner, M. T., Zvolensky, M. J., Eifert, G. H., & Spira, A. P. (2003). Emotional avoidance: An experimental test of individual differences and response suppression using biological challenge. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 41, 403–411. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967\(02\)00020-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(02)00020-7)
- Flaxman, P. E., & Bond, F. W. (2010). Worksite stress management training: Moderated effects and clinical significance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15, 347–358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020522>
- Folke, F., Parling, T., & Melin, L. (2012). Acceptance and commitment therapy for depression: A preliminary randomized clinical trial for unemployed on long-term sick leave. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 19, 583–594. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2012.01.002>
- Frone, M. R., & Tidwell, M.-C. O. (2015). The meaning and measurement of work fatigue: Development and evaluation of the Three-Dimensional Work Fatigue Inventory (3D-WFI). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20, 273–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038700>
- Fuller, J. A., Stanton, J. M., Fisher, G. G., Spitzmuller, C., Russell, S. S., & Smith, P. C. (2003). A lengthy look at the daily grind: Time series analysis of events, mood, stress, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1019–1033. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.1019>
- Garrick, A., Mak, A. S., Cathcart, S., Winwood, P. C., Bakker, A. B., & Lushington, K. (2014). Psychosocial safety climate moderating the effects of daily job demands and recovery on fatigue and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 694–714. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joop.12069>
- Glomb, T. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Rotundo, M. (2004). Emotional labor demands and compensating wage differentials. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 700–714. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.700>
- Gloster, A. T., Klotsche, J., Chaker, S., Hummel, K. V., & Hoyer, J. (2011). Assessing psychological flexibility: What does it add above and beyond existing constructs? *Psychological Assessment*, 23, 970–982. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024135>
- Gross, J. J. (2007). *Handbook of emotion regulation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gross, S., Semmer, N. K., Meier, L. L., Kälin, W., Jacobshagen, N., & Tschann, F. (2011). The effect of positive events at work on after-work fatigue: They matter most in face of adversity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 654–664. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022992>
- Hakanen, J. J., Schaufeli, W. B., & Ahola, K. (2008). The job demands-resources model: A three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work engagement. *Work & Stress*, 22, 224–241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678370802379432>
- Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J. B., Bond, F. W., Masuda, A., & Lillis, J. (2006). Acceptance and commitment therapy: Model, processes and outcomes. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44, 1–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.06.006>
- Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K., & Wilson, K. G. (1999). *Acceptance and commitment therapy: An experiential approach to behavior change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press Publications.
- Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K., Wilson, K. G., Bissett, R. C., Pistorello, J., Toarmino, D., . . . McCurry, S. M. (2004). Measuring experiential avoidance: A preliminary test of a working model. *The Psychological Record*, 54, 553–578.
- Hayes, S. C., Wilson, K. G., Gifford, E. V., Follette, V. M., & Strosahl, K. (1996). Experimental avoidance and behavioral disorders: A functional dimensional approach to diagnosis and treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 1152–1168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.64.6.1152>
- Heckhausen, J., Wrosch, C., & Schulz, R. (2010). A motivational theory of life-span development. *Psychological Review*, 117, 32–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017668>
- Hobson, C. J., Kamen, J., Szostek, J., Nethercut, C. M., Tiedmann, J. W., & Wojnarowicz, S. (1998). Stressful life events: A revision and update of the Social Readjustment Rating Scale. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 5, 1–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022978019315>
- Karekla, M., Forsyth, J., & Kelly, M. (2004). Emotional avoidance and panicogenic responding to a biological challenge procedure. *Behavior Therapy*, 35, 725–746. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(04\)80017-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80017-0)
- Kessler, E.-M., & Staudinger, U. M. (2009). Affective experience in adulthood and old age: The role of affective arousal and perceived affect regulation. *Psychology and Aging*, 24, 349–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015352>
- Lavalley, L. F., & Campbell, J. D. (1995). Impact of personal goals on self-regulation processes elicited by daily negative events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 341–352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.2.341>
- Lawrence, S. A., Troth, A. C., Jordan, P. J., & Collins, A. L. (2011). A review of emotion regulation and development of a framework for emotion regulation in the workplace. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being: Vol. 9. The role of individual differences in occupational stress and well-being* (pp. 197–263). Bingley, UK: Emerald. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555\(2011\)0000009010](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2011)0000009010)
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lepine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lepine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 764–775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803921>

- Linehan, M. (1993). *Cognitive-behavioral treatment of borderline personality disorder. Diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2, 99–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- McClelland, G. H., & Judd, C. M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 376–390. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.114.2.376>
- Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. D. Drenth & H. Thierry (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology: Work psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 5–33). Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Morris, J. H., Sherman, J. D., & Mansfield, E. R. (1986). Failures to detect moderating effects with ordinary least squares-moderated multiple regression: Some reasons and a remedy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 282–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.2.282>
- Nezlek, J. B. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event- and interval-contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 771–785. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167201277001>
- Nitsch, J. D. (1976). Die Eigenzustandsskala (EZ-Skala): Ein Verfahren zur hierarchisch mehrdimensionalen Befindlichkeitsskalierung. [Internal State Scale: An instrument for hierarchical-multidimensional state scaling] In J. R. Nitsch & I. Udris (Eds.), *Beanspruchung im Sport* (pp. 81–102). Bad Homburg, Germany: Limpert.
- Ohly, S., & Schmitt, A. (2015). What makes us enthusiastic, angry, feeling at rest or worried? Development and validation of an affective work events taxonomy using concept mapping methodology. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30, 15–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9328-3>
- Plumb, J. C., Orsillo, S. M., & Luterek, J. A. (2004). A preliminary test of the role of experiential avoidance in post-event functioning. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 35, 245–257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2004.04.011>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879–903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Computational tools for probing interaction effects in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 31, 437–448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/10769986031004437>
- Rasbash, J., Charlton, C., Browne, W. J., Healy, M., & Cameron, B. (2005). MLwiN (Version 2.02) [Computer software]. Bristol, UK: Centre for Multilevel Modeling University of Bristol.
- Richards, J. M., & Gross, J. J. (2006). Personality and emotional memory: How regulating emotion impairs memory for emotional events. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 631–651. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.07.002>
- Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 934–960. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.934>
- Rodell, J. B., & Judge, T. A. (2009). Can “good” stressors spark “bad” behaviors? The mediating role of emotions in links of challenge and hindrance stressors with citizenship and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1438–1451. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016752>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Scheibe, S., & Carstensen, L. L. (2010). Emotional aging: Recent findings and future trends. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 65B, 135–144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbp132>
- Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M. G., & Teasdale, J. D. (2002). Review of Mindfulness-based Cognitive Therapy for Depression. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 30, 271–274. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2002-11064-005&site=ehost-live>
- Shallcross, A. J., Ford, B. Q., Floerke, V. A., & Mauss, I. B. (2013). Getting better with age: The relationship between age, acceptance, and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104, 734–749. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031180>
- Shallcross, A. J., Troy, A. S., Bolland, M., & Mauss, I. B. (2010). Let it be: Accepting negative emotional experiences predicts decreased negative affect and depressive symptoms. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 48, 921–929. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2010.05.025>
- Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U.-V. (2005). Switching off mentally: Predictors and consequences of psychological detachment from work during off-job time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 393–414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.393>
- Stafford-Brown, J., & Pakenham, K. I. (2012). The effectiveness of an ACT informed intervention for managing stress and improving therapist qualities in clinical psychology trainees. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 68, 592–613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21844>
- Wang, M., Liu, S., Liao, H., Gong, Y., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Shi, J. (2013). Can't get it out of my mind: Employee rumination after customer mistreatment and negative mood in the next morning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 989–1004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033656>
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1–74.
- Wenzlaff, R. M., & Wegner, D. M. (2000). Thought suppression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 59–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.59>
- Wolga, M. (2014). What does the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire (AAQ-II) really measure? *Behavior Therapy*, 45, 831–839. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2014.07.002>
- Zohar, D., Tzischinski, O., & Epstein, R. (2003). Effects of energy availability on immediate and delayed emotional reactions to work events. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1082–1093. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.1082>

Received July 13, 2014

Revision received December 11, 2015

Accepted January 11, 2016 ■

See page 97 for a correction to this article.