What Emotional Labor is: A Review of Literature

Sushanta Kumar Mishra

W.P. No.2006-12-05
December 2006

The main objective of the working paper series of the IIMA is to help faculty members, Research Staff and Doctoral Students to speedily share their research findings with professional colleagues, and to test out their research findings at the pre-publication stage

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD-380 015
INDIA

What Emotional Labor is: A Review of Literature

Sushanta Kumar Mishra
(Email: sushantam@iimahd.ernet.in)
Organizational Behavior Area
Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad

Abstract

The dominance of customer over the production/service employee, and as a result of this, increasing use of emotional labor in the workplace furthers the need to understand what emotional labor is. In this regard, the present paper reviews the literature to explain the concept 'emotional labor'. In explaining emotional labor and its nomological network, the paper discusses the factors that affect and are affected by it. This paper contributes to the existing literature by assimilating different works done in this domain and providing a comprehensive understanding of emotional labor. This paper focuses on some of the critical issues, about which, the existing literature on emotional labor is silent and thus, providing a platform for further research.

Introduction

The relative intangibility, heterogeneity, perishability and inseparability of production of service from its consumption (Cowell, 1984 as cited in Lashley, 1998) create difficulty for the customer to isolate service quality from the quality of the interaction during service delivery (i.e. service interaction). As a result, customer's evaluation of the nature of the service interaction, rather than just of the separate product (service) being delivered, becomes central to the evaluation of the overall service experience (Korczynski, 2001). Most often, as the service employee works on the boundary of the organization and performs boundary spanning roles (Tushman, 1977: 587; Friedman & Podolny, 1992), the organization has high stake on how the service employee behaves in service interactions. Organizations, therefore, attempt to manage and control interaction between their employees who provide the service (i.e. service employees) and customers. As a result service employee has become the focus of considerable managerial intervention. Recent accounts of organizational initiatives in various service sector organizations have focused on the managerial attempts to mobilize the commitment of service employee to the delivery of quality customer service (Kinnie, Hutchinson, & Purcell, 2000). Since customer's perception of the service quality is influenced by how the service employee expresses her/his emotion in service interactions (Pugh, 2001), organizations expect the service employee to present emotions that are desired by their organizations apart from the high level of competence/expertise in the job (Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005b). As felt emotions are different from organizationally desired emotions, it requires effort on the part of the employee to display appropriate emotions as specified by the organization. This type of labor is called emotional labor. Increasing use of emotional labor in the workplace has raised interest

among researchers. Therefore a clear understanding of the concept and its place in the nomological network is warranted. This paper explains the concept of emotional labor and elaborates the factors associated with the concept. Based on the understanding of the literature some research gaps are explained for future study.

Emotional Labor

Emotion work is the starting point for the understanding of emotional labor. Hochschild (2003) used the term emotion work to refer to any attempt to modify the experience or expression of a consciously felt emotion. When the individual performs emotion work as a required part of her/his actual job performance it is called emotional labor. Callahan and McCollum (2002) interprets that the term emotional work is appropriate for situations in which individuals are personally choosing to manage their emotions for their own noncompensated benefits. The term emotional labor is appropriate only when emotion work is exchanged for something such as a wage or some other type of valued compensation. In her definition of emotional labor, Wharton (1993 as cited in Callahan & McCollum, 2002) remarks that not only such actions are performed for a wage; they are also under the control of others. Thus, in organizational settings, emotional labor is under the control of organizations. Various scholars have conceptualized emotional labor in various ways. In the next section these conceptualizations of emotional labor has been reviewed.

Conceptualization of Emotional Labor

Hochschild's (2003) conceptualization of emotional labor involves impression management of service employees. These employees put effort to express emotions acceptable by customers. According to this perspective, the discrepancy between felt and expressed emotion is related to job stress and burnout.

Mumby and Putnam (1992: 472) conceptualized emotional labor as the way individuals change or manage emotions to make them appropriate or consistent with a situation, a role, or an expected organizational behavior. According to this view, expression of wider range of emotions at work is desirable, not to enhance productivity but to foster subjective well-being of the organizational members and their families.

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993: 90) defined emotional labor as the act of displaying appropriate emotions, with the goal to engage in a form of impression management to foster social perceptions of her/himself as well as to foster an interpersonal climate (Gardner & Martinko, 1988). This conception of emotional labor focused mainly on the effectiveness of the behavior.

Morris and Feldman (1996: 987) conceptualized emotional labor as the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions. This definition of emotional labor includes the organizational expectations for employees in their interactions with the customers, as well as the internal state of tension that occurs when a person displays emotions that are discrepant from her/his true feelings. They proposed that emotional labor consists of four dimensions: (a) frequency of interactions, (b) attentiveness (intensity of emotions, duration of interaction), (c) variety of emotions required and, (d) emotional dissonance. According to this perspective emotional labor is a characteristic of the job.

Liu, Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Kachmar, (2004) interpreted emotional labor as the attempt by individual to reduce the discrepancy between felt and displayed emotions. From the perspective of the individual service employee, emotional labor involves individual differences as well as individuals' (re)interpretations of their emotional experiences when examining the causes and consequences of emotional labor. Individual differences may predispose individuals to feel and perceive stimuli in certain ways. This

conceptualization emphasizes individual differences as the influencing factor on emotional labor.

Although these works have defined emotional labor differently, and focused on different outcomes, they all have the same underlying theme: individuals can regulate their emotional expressions at work. Emotional labor is thus the process of regulating the expression of emotions for achievement of organizational goals and the employee is paid for this labor.

As emotional labor is the process of managing the expression, it is similar to many concepts like deception, impression management, and dramaturgy.

Related Concepts

Though the concepts are similar in nature there are conceptual differences between these terms. Kagle (1998) described deception as an interpersonal act which involves at least two actors: the deceiver and the deceived. It is defined as a deliberate attempt to mislead others (DePaulo, Lindsay, Malone, Muhlenbruck, Charlton, & Cooper, 2003). Buller and Burgoon (1996, as cited in DePaulo et al., 2003) noted that when people try to deceive, they attempt to convey their deceptive message, and at the same time, they continually monitor the target of their deception for signs of suspiciousness and then adapt their behavior accordingly. When people deceive others they usually make effort to seem credible. This deliberate attempt to manage impressions, including impressions of credibility, is deception. In impression management, the focus of the deliberateness is typically limited to the content of the performance and not its credibility (Fisk & Grove, 1996). Thus, there is an overlap between impression management and deception. In dramaturgy each participant is considered to be "on stage" and "acting" in ways specifically chosen to create the most favorable impression (Fisk & Grove, 1996). This seems true of almost any organizational events - particularly in service organizations.

This process of acting, through which individuals attempt to influence the perceptions of other people, is called impression management. Conceptually, there is no difference between impression management and dramaturgy (Gardner III, 1992). The central point of impression management is the recognition that people's comprehension of a phenomenon can be directed by others (Fisk & Grove, 1996). Though impression management is typically a means of personal influence, it may occur in any circumstance which affects an audience's attitude, opinion and, consequently its behavior (Shoemaker, 1991 as cited in Fisk & Grove, 1996). When the audience's perception is influenced by displaying appropriate emotions it is called emotional labor (Hochschild, 2003). Gardner and Martinko (1988) explained that emotional labor is the act of displaying appropriate emotions, with a goal to engage in a form of impression management, for the organization. Thus, emotional labor is a subset of impression management (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). In order to show the appropriate emotions for a situation, sometimes service employees must exhibit or conceal feelings. This exhibition and concealment of emotions is referred to as emotional display (Rosenberg, 1990). It includes processes that may or may not tax the individual's resources (Gross, 1998). Rosenberg (1990: 8) argued that emotional display is a purposive human activity, which focuses on producing intended effects on other people's phenomenal worlds. Cote and Morgan (2002) described emotional regulation as the conscious manipulation of one's public display of emotion. Though different nomenclature is used by different researchers, emotional display and emotion regulation are conceptually the same. Walden and Smith (1997, as cited in Pugliesi, 1999) argued that the concept of emotion work is very similar to concept of emotional regulation used by social psychologists. Both refer to efforts that create a normative emotional state, mask feeling in order to present a certain emotional state, and control the expressions of emotional states. Thus, emotional labor, emotional display, and

emotional regulation are conceptually similar in the sense that individuals manage their display of emotions.

Emotional Labor and Display of Emotion

Qualitative research shows that all employees find their true feelings do not always conform to their roles (Ashforth & Toumiuk, 2000). As feelings do not erupt spontaneously or automatically employees modify their display of emotions either by deep acting or by surface acting (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Hochschild, 1979, 2003). Both deep acting and surface acting represent different intentions. When engaged in deep acting, an actor attempts to modify feelings to match the required display rules whereas in surface acting employees modify their displays without shaping inner feelings (Ashforth & Humprey, 1993; Hochschild, 2003). Deep acting has been called 'faking in good faith' as the intent is to seem authentic to the audience. Surface acting is called 'faking in bad faith' because the employee conforms to the display rules to keep the job, not to help the customer or the organization (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). According to Cote and Morgan (2002), emotions may be regulated either at the input from the environment (antecedent-focused emotion regulation) or at the output after emotion response tendencies have been triggered (response-focused emotion regulation). Grandey (2003) argued that both antecedent-focused emotion regulation and response-focused emotion regulation correspond to deep acting and surface acting, respectively.

Antecedent-focused emotion regulation occurs when an individual modifies a situation or the perception of the situation in an attempt to alter her/his felt emotions (Gross, 1998). It is similar to deep acting as it focuses on modifying feelings, which subsequently impacts expressions (Grandey, 2003). Gross (1998) identified four different types of strategies that could be used to engage in antecedent-focused emotion regulation. These are: situation selection (choosing or avoiding certain situations), situation

modification (physically changing the situation), attentional deployment (changing the focus of one's attention in the situation), and cognitive change (reappraising the situation so it is interpreted differently). The first two involve changing the situation, and the second two involve changing one's perception of the situation. Because many jobs involving emotional labor do not have much flexibility regarding the situation, situation selection and modification are not as relevant to emotional labor as the remaining two strategies (Grandey, 2003).

Attentional deployment refers to changing the attention focus of personal thoughts about the situation, and may involve such strategies as calling to mind events, that bring about the emotions needed in a certain situation (Gross, 1998). Cognitive change refers to changing the appraisal of the situation, and may involve interpreting events more positively than they are in reality (Gross, 1998).

From the above discussion it may be concluded that emotional labor involves active strategies to modify, create, and alter the expression of emotions in the context of paid employment. Individuals perform the emotional labor either by deep acting (modifying the feeling) or by surface acting (modifying the expression). However, emotional labor is not a recent phenomenon. As social beings, individuals display certain emotions irrespective of their felt emotions. Also as part of their occupation individuals perform emotional labor. In the following section the paper discusses the factors that influence emotional labor.

<div align="center">Antecedents of Emotional Labor</div>

<div align="center">*Social Factors*</div>

Individuals do not always express their real feelings in social settings. Hochschild (1979) argued that individuals may learn to feel according to the situation cues, and strategically use their emotional expressions to achieve certain goals. Emotional display is

demanded by society even in the absence of a corresponding emotional experience (Hochschild, 1979). The feeling rules that obtain at a funeral demand that we feel sad. Both social situations and social roles impose emotional demands on people (Rosenberg, 1990). In addition, emotional display serves as an important means for the attainment of one's ends. A customer may feign anger in order to elicit better service in a restaurant and a good natured sales-person sells more goods than their peers (Rosenberg, 1990). Emotional concealment is as much a feature of emotional display as is emotional exhibition and it plays an equally important part in enabling people to realize their objectives in society (Shott, 1979 as cited in Rosenberg, 1990). The above discussion suggests that in the society individuals display emotions irrespective of their feelings. Sometimes occupations demand expression of certain emotions.

Occupational Factors

The display of positive emotions is required in many service occupations, including restaurant workers and flight attendants. Funeral directors in contrast are required to display negative emotions (i.e. sadness). Some job requires display of neutrality i.e. those of the judges (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). In service organizations, service employees are often the only contact that customers have with the organization and projection of right emotions is important in enhancing the organization's public image. Therefore, organizations are increasingly influencing emotional labor of the service employees. With the growth of service industry emotional labor has gained momentum both in the workplace and in the academics. This paper concentrates on the role of emotional labor in organizational context. There are many organizational factors that shape the display of emotions. The following section elaborates the organizational factors that influence the emotional labor.

Organizational Factors

The service employees represent the organization to the public. Therefore organizations have vested interest in impressions being managed well by the service employee. Thus, organizations increasingly offer display rules for the employees.

Display Rules

Display rules refer to the organizational expectations about the appropriate emotional expressions on the job. Perceptions of display rules may develop from social, occupational, and organizational norms (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989). Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) identified three ways in which organizations create and maintain these norms. These are recruitment and selection processes, socialization practices, and rewards and punishments. Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) remarked that apart from display rules the emotional labor involves constant comparison of one's emotional displays with display rules.

Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, (2005) argued that it is not the display rule but the type of display rule that affects emotional labor. They found that positive display rules correlate positively with deep acting and negative display rules correlate positively with surface acting. This pattern of findings suggest that when individuals perceive requirements to display positive emotions at work they focus more on trying to experience a positive emotional state and when individuals perceive requirements to hide negative emotions, they are more likely to fake necessary emotions. Consistent with this argument Grandey (2003) show that awareness of display rules is positively related to deep acting but not related to surface acting. This supports the idea that deep acting is a response to work demands (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) and surface acting occurs in response to work events rather than general rules. Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) suggested that

the relationship between awareness of display rules and emotional displays may be mediated by surface acting and deep acting.

In another study Gosserand & Diefendorff (2005) argued that, mere presence of display rules is not enough and commitment to display rules may have important effect on the display of emotions. They define commitment to display rules as a person's intention to extend effort toward displaying organizationally desired emotions, persist in displaying these emotions over time, and not abandon these display rules under difficult conditions. They found that the commitment to display rules moderates the relationships between display rule perceptions and acting strategies: these relationships are strong and positive when commitment is high and weak when commitment is low. Gosserand & Diefendorff (2005) conclude that perceiving high levels of display requirements combined with high commitment to those display rules is associated with more use of emotional regulation strategies and positive affective delivery.

Interaction Characteristics

Apart from display rules, the frequency, duration, and routines of interpersonal interactions influence emotional labor. Morris & Feldman (1996) proposed that individuals will have a greater need to regulate their emotions, in jobs requiring frequent contact with others. In an empirical study, Diefendorff et al. (2005), found no relationship between frequency of interaction and acting. Routineness is the extent to which customer interactions are repetitive and scripted. Routineness of interaction is related positively with deep acting (Diefendorff et al, 2005), but Rafaeli and Sutton (1990) commented that when routine interactions occur customers may prefer impersonal but cordial interactions. This creates little incentive to deep act. Duration refers to how long typical customer interaction lasts. Studies found that duration of interaction correlates positively with deep acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Morris & Feldman, 1996). Technology changes the way

individuals interact with each other. The introduction of computers into the workplace provides an excellent example of how changes in technology can change social norms and the display rules that govern manager – subordinate interactions (Humphrey, 2000).

Job Characteristics

Job characteristics influence the formation of display rules and social norms. Pugliesi (1997) showed that the impact of job characteristics and emotional labor appear to compound rather than interact. Job autonomy has been defined as the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individuals in determining the procedures to be used in performing the job. Job autonomy is a predictor of job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1976 as cited in George and Jones, 1999). Research suggests that those with high job satisfaction perceive higher person-job fit and are more likely to have positive moods and emotions in the workplace (Fisher, 2000 as cited by Grandey, 2003). Grandey, Fisk, Steiner, (2005a) found that job autonomy moderates the relationship between response-focused emotion regulations and burnout. The relationship is weaker for employees with high job autonomy than employees with low job autonomy.

Gross & John (2003) remarked that emotional regulation is neither inherently good nor bad. The same strategy that permits bill collectors to perform his duty will not be appreciated in customer service. So, situational factors are very important in displaying emotions particularly in service industries.

Situational Factors

Display rules provide ground rules for transaction between role occupants and target persons, the people with whom they interact. But, cues associated with a transaction can further shape display of emotions. These transaction–defining cues come from either the setting or the target person (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990). Cues from the setting are transient

aspects of the context in which a transaction occurs, including the time of day or year, the temperature, and the interpersonal context. Cues from target persons include gender, age, and apparent social status.

Store busyness. Busyness is the extent to which a store is rapidly paced and crowded with customers. A negative relationship between store busyness and employee display of positive emotion has been demonstrated in supermarkets in Israel (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990), convenience stores in United States and Canada (Rafaeli, 1989; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988), and banks in the United States (Pugh, 2001). Rafaeli and Sutton (1990) note that the clerks were apparently cognitively overloaded during the busy times, which affect their emotional display. However, Tan, Foo, Chong, & Renee, (2003) in the study of cashiers in the fast food chains in Singapore found no relation between store busyness and display of positive emotion. The difference may be due to different cultures at national and organizational levels.

Customer demand is the extent to which a transaction requires a prolonged and complex response from a service employee. It is positively related to the display of positive emotion during transactions with customers (Pugh, 2001; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990; Tan et al, 2003). This supports the general assumption that employees use positive emotions to gain control over demanding customers.

Work intensification. Ogbonna and Harris (2004), in a university context, found that when the work intensifies, the lecturers are attempting actually to experience occupationally and organizationally expected emotions. This is a form of deep acting and it is noticed that university lecturers frequently exhibit spontaneous emotions as an everyday part of their working lives to cope with work intensification.

Liu et al. (2004) argued that emotional labor will vary as individuals perceive and interpret the interaction cues with the customer differently. Tan et al. (2003) found that

the relative effect of personality over the situation is almost as strong as that of the situation over personality. Thus, the study of emotional labor warrants the role of individual differences to surface. The following section describes the effect of individual personality variables on display of emotions.

Personality Factors

Neuroticism and extraversion. Grandey (2000), suggests that individual differences in felt emotions may impact emotional regulation. Consistent with this idea, research has shown that negative affectivity (neuroticism) is positively related to emotional labor (Liu et al., 2004). Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that negative affectivity is positively related to surface acting. Kokkonen and Pulkkinen (2001) argued that neuroticism and extraversion play different roles in the deployment of emotional regulation strategies. They found that neuroticism is related to the reduction in attempts to repair or maintain the emotions. Tan et al., (2003) in their study found that service employees with high extraversion traits are characterized by the display of more positive emotions than by service employees with low extraversion traits. Consistent with this finding studies show that positive affectivity (extraversion) is negatively related to surface acting (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2005). Based on the discussion it can be concluded that negative affectivity increases and positive affectivity reduces emotional labor.

Emotional expressivity. Emotional expressivity is a stable trait characterizing the extent to which people outwardly display emotion, regardless of whether it is positive or negative (Grandey, 2000). Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, (1980) conceptualized emotional expressivity as the use of facial expressions, voice, gestures, and body movements to transmit emotions. Pugh (2001) found that emotional expressivity is positively associated with the display of positive emotion by employees during their interactions with customers. Grandey (2000) found that positive emotional expressivity is

negatively related with surface acting but unrelated with deep acting. However, Diefendorff et al. (2005) found that emotional expressivity is correlated neither to surface acting nor to deep acting. Gross and John (2003) argued that there may be important individual differences that predict how emotional response tendencies are translated into behavior. Gross, John, & Richards, (2000) explained dispositional expressivity as a stable individual difference in emotion-expressive behavior and found that, for positive emotions both felt emotion and dispositional expressivity are substantially and independently related to emotion-expressive behavior. For negative emotion, apart from individual effects, both felt emotion and dispositional expressivity has interaction effect: emotion experience predicted emotion expression for dispositionally high-expressivity individuals but not for dispositionally low-expressivity individuals. So, emotional expressivity has a strong influence on emotional labor.

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness reflects the extent to which a person is careful, thorough, and responsible (McCrae & John, 1992 as cited in Witt, Andrews, & Carlson, 2004). It is anticipated that conscientious individuals would follow emotional display rules by working to be genuine in their expressions, rather than just going through the surface acting. Consistent with this argument, Diefendorff et al. (2005), in their study found that conscientiousness is negatively correlated with surface acting.

Agreeableness. Agreeableness reflects stable individual differences in the need to develop and maintain positive relationships through social behaviors. Agreeable individuals are expected to put more effort into emotion regulation so that they have positive social interactions. Also, realizing the negative effects of insincere emotional displays, agreeable individuals may try to display genuine emotions by deep acting rather than surface acting. Diefendorff et al. (2005), found in their study that agreeableness correlates positively with deep acting and negatively with surface acting.

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring is defined as the self observation and self-control of expressive behaviors according to what is appropriate for a specific situation. Diefendorff et al. (2005) found that self-monitoring correlates positively with surface acting. Abraham (1998) proposed that self-monitoring moderates the emotional dissonance-job satisfaction relationship: high self-monitors experience significantly less dissatisfaction compared to low self-monitors.

Political skill. Political skill is an interpersonal style construct that combines social astuteness with the ability to demonstrate situationally appropriate behavior (Ferris et al., 2000as cited in Liu et al., 2004). Surprisingly, Liu et al. (2004), in their study found that political skill is positively related to employee perceived emotional labor.

Psychoticism. Eysenck & Eysenck, (1976 as cited in Tan et al., 2003) conceptualized psychoticism as a personality measure that covers conscientiousness and agreeableness. Psychoticism correlates significantly with traits such as non-acceptance of cultural norms, immaturity, and anti authority attitudes. Tan et al. (2003), in their study found that the negative relationship between store busyness and the display of positive emotions will be stronger when service employees are higher in the psychoticism traits.

Emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence refers to an interrelated set of abilities that allow an individual to recognize, use, and regulate, her/his emotion in an efficient and productive manner, thereby allowing effective dealings with the environment (Barrett & Gross, 2001). The emotionally intelligent person not only perceives emotions correctly, s/he also uses emotions to help shape judgment and behavior. Emotionally intelligent person engages in efficient emotion regulation in both self and others. This monitoring makes it possible for the individual to strategically manage emotion in self and others to produce the desired outcome in a given situation. The persons who can differentiate emotions can cope with them more effectively. Barrett & Gross (2001) argued that

differentiation of negative emotional experiences is associated with a large number of emotion regulation strategies. In an empirical study Barrett, Gross, Christensen, & Conner, (2001) found that individuals with highly differentiated and more intense negative emotional experience reported greater emotional regulation. However, positive emotional differentiation was unrelated to emotional regulation.

Psychological climate. Psychological climate is defined as an employee's perception about an organization's events, practices, and procedures and the kind of behaviors that get rewarded, supported and expected (Schneider et al., 1992 as cited in Tsai, 2001). The psychological climate has many dimensions. The concept of 'climate for service friendliness' refers to employee's perception that certain practices (which are adopted by the organization) are rewarding for being warm and friendly to the customers. Tsai (2001) found that psychological climate for service friendliness is positively related to displayed positive emotions. Grandey (2003) argued that deep acting is positively related to and surface acting is negatively related to the perception of the service delivery as friendly and warm.

Grandey, Dickter, & Sin, (2004) in their study found that employees who appraise customer aggression as highly stressful use surface acting and deep acting is more likely for those who appraise customer aggression as mildly stressful in comparison with those who view them as highly stressful. Employees who feel that they have control at work feel more empowered in customer encounters, including aggressive ones and show less stress appraisal of customer verbal aggression (Grandey et al., 2004).

Gender. There is strong evidence in the literature that women and men demonstrate different patterns of emotional expression even within the same jobs (Rafaeli, 1989). Women are more emotionally expressive than men (LaFrance and Banaji, 1992 as cited in Pugh, 2002). Ogbonna and Harris (2004), in their study found that women academics

more commonly use deep acting by invoking their sentiments. In professional and management jobs Simpson and Stroh (2004), found that women are better at suppressing negative feelings and displaying positive feelings than men. Also, men report more often suppressing positive feelings and displaying negative feelings than women report.

Age. Gross, Cartensen, Tsai, Skorpen, & Hsu, (1997) argued that with age, individuals report greater emotional control and lesser negative emotional experience. They suggested that this may be the result of older participants adopting increasingly antecedent-focused strategies to influence their emotions. Consistent with this finding, Lockenhoff and Carstensen (2004) found that when time in life is limited, younger and older people alike pay more attention to the emotional aspects of situations, prioritize emotion-focused over problem-focused coping strategies. Similar effects emerge when time is limited for reasons other than chronological and there is ample evidence for a greater emphasis on emotion-focused coping strategies as people age, and this is associated with better emotion-regulatory skills and more positive and less negative emotional experience among older adults.

The above discussion agrees that dispositional factors can predict the display of appropriate emotions (Tan et al., 2003). Though emotional labor is meant to create economic benefits for the organizations, it can have negative consequences on both the physical and mental health of the employees. The following section describes consequences of emotional labor for the individual as well as the organization.

Consequences of Emotional Labor

When the discrepancy between displayed emotions and felt emotions increases it leads to emotional dissonance. Emotional dissonance is the discrepancy between displayed and felt emotions as part of the work role (Heuven & Bakker, 2003; Rafaeli &

Sutton, 1987). Simpson and Stroh (2004) suggest that the critical dimension linking emotional labor to worker well being is emotional dissonance.

Negative Consequences

Emotional dissonance. Lewig and Dollard (2003) found that emotional dissonance exacerbates the level of emotional exhaustion at high levels of psychological demands. This indicates that jobs combining high levels of demands are much more risky (Lewig & Dollard, 2003). Researchers express that, surface acting is more likely to lead to emotional dissonance (Hochschild, 2003) and emotional exhaustion (Grandey, 2003) than deep acting. Consistent with the argument, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that, surface acting is linked to burnout and lower service performance, while deep acting is positively linked to service performance. Heuven and Bakker (2003) emphasized the importance of emotion work variables on emotional dissonance. They found that emotional dissonance explains a significant amount of variance in predicting emotional exhaustion and depersonalization among cabin attendants. Lewig and Dollard (2003) found that emotional dissonance results in emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction beyond that accounted for by psychological demands. They also found that emotional dissonance fully mediates the relationship between positive emotional display and emotional exhaustion which is consistent with the results of Brotheridge and Lee's (1998, cited in Lewig and Dollard, 2003) view that the emotional demands of work do not directly lead to emotional exhaustion but do so through their relationship with emotional dissonance. Hochschild (2003: 90) argued that the effort to maintain a "difference in feeling and feigning over the long run leads to strain", ultimately posing threats to the physical well-being of employees. Similarly, self-alienation may result when the worker ceases to recognize or even feel authentic emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).

Job satisfaction. Parkinson (1991, as cited in Pugliesi, 1999) argued that when employees' genuine feelings are masked, it lead to decrease in job satisfaction. Abraham (1998) proposed that increase in emotional dissonance reduces job satisfaction. Consistent to this argument, Cote and Morgan (2002) found that the suppression of unpleasant emotions decreases job satisfaction and increases the intention to quit. The effects of response-focused emotional labor on distress, is stronger than work complexity, demand, or control (Pugliesi, 1999). Although control and complexity are stronger determinants of job satisfaction, response-focused emotional labor diminishes job satisfaction to a greater degree than the customer demand.

Memory performance. In two experiments Richard and Gross (1999) show that suppressing felt emotions impair memory performance on a concurrent task. In an extended study, when comparing suppression with reappraisal, Richards and Gross (2000) found that only suppression hurts memory performance. They argue that as suppression occurs relatively late in the emotion-generation processes it consume greater resources than does reappraisal.

Emotional labor is not uniformly harmful to all service employees. Instead it has been found in separate studies that it is the tension and conflict arising from emotional dissonance that is significantly associated with higher emotional exhaustion and lower job satisfaction (Abraham, 1999). The act of expressing according to display rules appears to be dysfunctional for the individual only to the extent that expressed sanctioned emotions conflict with felt emotions. Studies also show that emotional labor potentially yields advantageous results for both workers and their organizations (Staw, Sutton, Pelled, 1994).

Positive Consequences

Staw et al. (1994) emphasized that service employees with positive emotions will be more successful in organizational life than employees with negative emotions. Updegraff, Gable, & Taylor, (2004) found that people with positive expectancies, not only experience more positive emotions over time, but also their overall sense of daily wellbeing is tied more to positive emotional experiences and less to negative emotional experiences. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) propose that emotional labor can increase self efficacy of the employees and also increase personal wellbeing.

Organizational Level Consequences. Pugh (2001) remarked that the display of positive emotions by the employee is positively related to the customers' positive affect and this positive affect of the customer leads to positive evaluations of service quality. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) proposed that expression of positive emotions is related to increased task effectiveness. Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) found that positive emotions of the service employee brings about immediate (increased sales), encore (customer revisit), and contagion gains (spread of good words by the customer) for the organization. Contradictory to this finding, Tsai (2001) found no support for the relationship between employee display of positive emotions and immediate gains in the context of shoe stores. However, consistent with the findings of Rafaeli and Sutton (1987), he found that when employees display more positive emotions toward customers, customers were more willing to visit the store again and pass positive comments to friends.

Individual Level Consequences. The expressions of positive emotions by service employees influence outcomes that are salient to the role occupant like financial wellbeing, mental and physical wellbeing (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Service employees with positive emotions receive favorable evaluations of their performance and get better pay compared to their coworkers (Staw et al., 1994). Staw et al. (1994) found support for

the hypothesis that service employees with positive emotion receive social support from supervisors and coworkers. Customer demand is more positively related to the display of positive emotion during transactions with customers (Pugh, 2001; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990; Tan et al, 2003). This supports the general assumption that service employees use positive emotions to gain control over demanding customers. Cote and Morgan (2002) found that the amplification of positive emotions increases job satisfaction. Staw et al. (1994) found that service employees who display positive emotions are judged by others as sociable, pleasant and likeable. Employees' display of positive emotion increases self-efficacy and psychological well-being (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).

Thus emotional labor has both positive and negative consequences. As discussed earlier, when the organization succeeds in reducing the difference between display rules and individuals' experienced emotions, better benefit can be accrued at the organizational as well as individual levels.

Research Gap

Based on the review of literature this paper identified gaps for further research. In the following section the gaps are discussed.

Organizational Identity and Emotional Labor

The existing literature (Hochschild, 2003; Pugh, 2001; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988; Tan et al., 2003) assumes that the roles of service employees are to manage their own emotions and make the clients feel good. The literature is silent about the motivation of these service employees to perform emotional labor. Ibarra (1999) noted that, organizational identity provides resources that compensates for situations that would otherwise be draining or depleting. Conforming to this idea (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002), argued that identity helps employee commitment, involvement and loyalty. Since organizations increasingly rely on customers and clients

to perform their tasks, for many organizations the image of the organization seems, in fact, to be more important than the content or substantial value of the goods and services provided (Alvesson and Berg, 1992: 138). The image also introduced to capture the clients' perception of a company (Burnstein, 1984 as cited in Alvesson and Berg, 1992). Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, (1994) explained organizational identity as the degree to which a member defines her/him-self by the same attributes that s/he believes defines the organization. Alvesson (1992) defined organizational identification is one form of psychological attachment that occurs when members adopt the defining characteristics of the organization as defining characteristics for themselves. Broadly speaking, organizational identity is individuals' identification with the organization. Organizational identity affects individuals' identity in following ways. First, indicates organizational membership confer positive attributes on its members (called as perceived organizational identity) and people may feel proud to belong to the organization (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991); Second, when, members believe that outsiders see the organization in a positive light, they bask in the reflected glory of the organization (Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1976: 366; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Ibarra (1999) noted that, people enact personas that convey qualities they want others to ascribe to them. Thus, the two images influence the cognitive connection that members create with their organization and the kind of behaviors that follow (Dutton et al., 1994). Consistent with this argument Gibson and Schroeder (2002) argued that increasing one's identity in general leads to positive emotions. A person's well-being and behavior are affected both by the attributes they ascribe to themselves and the organization. Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) argued that commitment to display rules moderates the relationships between display rule perceptions and acting and these relationships are strong and

positive. However, there is no systematic research to find out the role of organizational identity on the display of emotions by the service employee.

Societal Culture and Emotional Labor

Researchers in the context of U.S. (Pugh, 2001; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988), Canada (Rafaeli, 1989), and Israel (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990) found a negative relationship between store busyness and employee display of positive emotions. Surprisingly in the context of Singapore, Tan et al. (2003) found no relation between store busyness and employee display of positive emotion. Tan et al. (2003) suggested that it may be due to the cultural difference between the two contexts. In another study, Gross et al. (1997) used culturally diverse set of samples to explore the age-related changes in emotion and emotion regulation. They found that age was associated with decreased impulse strength for European Americans but not Chinese Americans. They suggested that the broad impact of culture on the emotional behavior can not be ruled out. However, much work has not been done to explore the role of culture on emotional labor.

Leader's Emotional Expression and Group Dynamics

Lewis (1993) argued that leader's expression of emotions affects follower experience of emotion. Lewis (1993) in his study found that when the leader expresses negative emotions it results in higher low arousal and lower positive arousal among followers. He argued that when the followers observe the emotional expression of their leaders they get emotionally influenced through emotional contagion. Thus, emotions of the followers are influenced by leaders expressed emotions. However, arguing in similar lines, there may be a relationship between positive emotional expression of the leader and followers' positive emotional experience. Fredrickson (2001) in his paper argued that experience of positive emotions broaden follower's momentary thought action repertoires, which in turn serves to build their enduring personal resources, including

psychological, social, and intellectual resources. This positivity affects the connectivity among the individuals and influences the group dynamics (Losada & Heaphy, 2004). Thus, there may be a relationship between the leader's expression of positive emotion and group dynamics. The research is silent about these facets of emotional labor.

Conclusion

Thinking and feeling are indispensable part of human actions (Muchinsky, 2000). Thus the need of research on feelings of individuals in the workplace is as important as the research on cognition. As feelings are at the core of human emotions, emotion plays a vital role in organizations. In this era of intense job stress, the capacity to cope with emotions is related to interpersonal relations. Based on the literature this paper has contributed to the existing literature by assimilate different works done in this domain. This paper presents a comprehensive understanding of emotional labor. It was felt that there are many unexplored areas in the realm of emotional labor. Some of the unexplored areas are described for further research. The clarity in understanding the concept of 'emotional labor' and its place in nomological network will help in explaining many behavioral issues in the workplace.

Reference

Abraham, R. (1998). Emotional dissonance in organizations: A conceptualization of consequences, mediators and moderators. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 19(3), 137-146.

Abraham, R. (1999). The impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover. *The journal of Psychology,* 133(4), 441-455.

Alvesson, M., & Berg, P. O. (1992). *Corporate culture and organizational symbolism: An overview*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(5), 619-644.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 88-115.

Ashforth, B. E. & Tomiuk, M. A. (2000). Emotional labor and authenticity: Views from service agents. In S. Fineman (Ed), *Emotions in organizations* (pp. 184-203). New Delhi: SAGE

Barrett, L. F., & Gross, J., (2001). Emotional intelligence: A process model of emotion representation and regulation. In T. J. Mayne & G. A. Bonanno (Eds.), *Emotions: Current issues and future directions* (pp. 286-310). New York: Guilford.

Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T., & Conner, B. (2001). Knowing what you are feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 15(6), 713-724.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60, 17-39.

Callahan, J. L., & McCollum, E. E, (2002). Obscured variability: The distinction between emotion work and emotion labor. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 219-231). NewYork: M. E. Sharpe

Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 366-375.

Cote, S., & Morgan, L. M. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotion regulation, job satisfaction, and intention to quit. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 947-962.

DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(1), 74-118.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Gosserand, R. H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 945-959.

Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 339-357.

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: The role of image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 517-554.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational image and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 239-263.

Fisk, R. P., & Grove, S. J. (1996). Application of impression management and the drama metaphor in marketing: An introduction. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(9), 6-12.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56 (3), 218-226.

Friedman, R. A. & Podolny, J. (1992). Differentiation of boundary spanning roles: labor negotiations and implications for role conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 28-47.

Friedman, H. S., Prince, L. M., Riggio, R. E., & DiMatteo, M. R. (1980). Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The affective communication test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 333-351.

Gardner, III, W. L. (1992). Lessons in organizational dramaturgy: The art of impression management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(1), 33-46.

Gardner, III, W. L. & Martinko, M. J. (1988). Impression management in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 14(2), 321-338.

George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1999). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*, (Second Edition), Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Gibson, D. E., & Schroeder, S. J. (2002). Grinning, frowning, and emotionless: Agent perceptions of power and their effect on felt and displayed emotions in influence attempts. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the work place* (pp. 164-183). New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Gosserand, R. H., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2005). Emotional display rules and emotional labor: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1256-1264.

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95-110.

Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "The show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer- rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 86-96.

Grandey, A. A., Dickter, D. N., & Sin, H. (2004).The customer is not always right: Customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 397-418.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., & Steiner, D. D. (2005a). Must "service with a smile" be stressful? The moderating role of personal control for U. S. and French employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 893-904.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., Mattila, A. S., Jansen, K. J., & Sideman, L. A. (2005b). Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 96(1), 38-55.

Gross, J. J., Cartensen, L. L., Tsai, J., Skorpen, C. G., & Hsu, A. Y. C. (1997). Emotion and Aging: Experience, expression, and control. *Psychology and Aging*, 12(4), 590-599.

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative view. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 271-299.

Gross, J. J., John, O. P., & Richards, J. M. (2000). The dissociation of emotion expression from emotion experience: A personality perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(6), 712-726.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotional regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362.

Heuven, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Emotional dissonance and burnout among cabin attendants. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(1), 81-100.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3), 551-575.

Hochschild, A. R. (2003). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling* (Twentieth anniversary edition). Berkley: University of California press.

Humphrey R. H. (2000). The importance of job characteristics to emotional displays. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel, W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in Workplace: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 236-249). London: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 764-791.

Kagle, J. D. (1998). Are we lying to ourselves about deception? *Social Service Review*, June, 234-250.

Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., and Purcell, J. (2000). 'Fun and surveillance: the paradox of high commitment management in call centers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(5), 967-985.

Kokkonen, M., Pulkkinen, L. (2001). Examination of the paths between personality, current mood, its evaluation, and emotional regulation. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 83-104.

Korczynski, M. (2001). The contradictions of service work: call center as customer-oriented bureaucracy. In A. Sturdy, I. Grugulis, and H. Willmott (Eds.), *Customer Service: empowerment and entrapment* (pp. 79-101). New York: Palgrave Publishers.

Lashley, C. (1998). Matching the management of human resources to service operations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10(1), 24-33.

Lewig, K. A., & Dollard, M.F. (2003). Emotional dissonance, emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in call center workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(4), 366-392.

Lewis, K. M. (2003). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 221-234.

Liu, Y., Perrewe, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., & Kachmar, C. J. (2004). Dispositional antecedents and consequences of emotional labor at work. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 12-25.

Lockenhoff, C. E., & Carstensen, L. L. (2004). Socioemotional selectivity theory, aging, and health: The increasingly delicate balance between regulating emotions and making tough choices. *Journal of Personality*, 72(6), 1395-1424.

Losada, M., & Heaphy, E. (2004). The role of positivity and connectivity in the performance of business teams: A nonlinear dynamics model. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 740-765.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 986-1010.

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: The neglect of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 801-805.

Mumby, D. K., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded emotionality. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 465-486.

Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2004). Work intensification and emotional labor among UK university lectures: An exploratory study. *Organization Studies*, 25(7), 1185-1203.

Pugh S. D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1018-1027.

Pugh, S. D. (2002). Emotional regulation in individuals and dyads: Causes, costs, and consequences. In R. G. Lord, R. J. Klimoski, R. Kanfer (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the structure and role of emotions in organizational behavior* (pp. 147-182). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pugliesi, K. (1999). The consequences of emotional labor: Effects on work stress, job satisfaction, and well-being. *Motivation and Emotion*, 23(2), 125-154.

Rafaeli, A. (1989). When cashers meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 245-273.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 23-37.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1989). The expression of emotion in organizational life. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 11, 1-42. Greenwich CT: JAI Press

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1990). Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion? *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(3), 623-637.

Richards, J. M., & Gross, J. J. (1999). Composure at any cost? The cognitive consequences of emotion suppression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(8), 1033-1044.

Richards, J. M., & Gross, J. J. (2000). Emotion regulation and memory: The cognitive costs of keeping one's cool. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(3), 410-424.

Rosenberg, M. (1990). Reflexivity and emotions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53(1), 3-12.

Simpson, P. A., & Stroh, L. K. (2004). Gender differences: Emotional expression and feelings of personal inauthenticity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 715-721.

Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organizational Science*, 5(1), 51-71.

Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 461-487.

Tan, H. H., Foo, M. D., Chong, C. L., & Renee, NG. (2003). Situational and dispositional predictors of displays of positive emotions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 961-978.

Tsai, W. (2001). Determinants and consequences of employee displayed positive emotions. *Journal of Management*, 27, 497-512.

Tushman, M. L. (1977). Special boundary roles in the innovation process. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 587-605.

Updegraff, J. A., Gable, S. L., & Taylor, S. E. (2004). What makes experiences satisfying? The interaction of approach-avoidance motivations and emotions in well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(3), 496-504.

Witt, L. A., Andrews, M. C., & Carlson, D. S. (2004). When conscientiousness isn't enough: Emotional exhaustion and performance among call center customer service representatives. *Journal of Management*, 30(1), 149-160.