UNIVERSITY OF
BATH

Citation for published version:
Stevens, L 2018, Gender, Marketing and Emotional Labour: A Critical, Feminist Exploration of the Ideological Helix that defines our working worlds. in M Tadajewski, M Higgins, J Denegri-Knott & R Varman (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing.* Routledge, London, pp. 415-429.

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication

University of Bath

~~Chapter Twenty-Five~~25

GENDER, MARKETING, AND EMOTIONS

A critical, feminist exploration of the ideological helix that defines our working worlds

Lorna Stevens

Introduction

This chapter offers a critical discussion of gender in marketing, arguing that binary thinking continues to reinforce traditional gender roles, despite the much anticipated '~~feminisation'~~ feminization' of marketing in the 1990s. The chapter reviews the services marketing literature, specifically the role of 'feeling bodies' in the workplace, and the gender issues therein. This then leads to a review of the emotional labor literature, and a focus on the higher education sector, which increasingly draws on a services marketing paradigm to better serve its customers. The discussion then turns to the education sector, which now draws on the values and managerial practices of private industry in order to be more marketing-oriented and productive. This new managerialism or marketization, it will be argued, has reinstated more 'masculine' models of management, and has led to a reinforcement of the binary division of labor along gender lines. One of the arguments that this chapter will therefore make is that sex-typing and gender-typing ~~is~~ are alive and well, deeply ingrained in institutional ideologies, and perhaps no~~where~~ more tellingly than in the higher education sector, where research shows that women as 'feeling bodies' do most of the hard (emotional) labor. Finally, I will argue that by applying a more critical lens, we can sensitize ourselves to that which is assumed and taken for granted as the norm in relation to gendered marketing in the workplace. Furthermore, if we interrogate and critique the

underlying ideologies and assumptions behind this binary system and its underlying ideologies and assumptions, we can challenge and begin to change our working worlds.

Gender in ~~Marketing~~marketing

When we consider the evolution of marketing as a discipline it is hard to ignore the gender discourse at its heart. This was manifest in the emergence of consumer culture in the nineteenth century when the binary system of male producers and female consumers was born. The Cartesian split within marketing reflected the mind/body dichotomy in Western thought and other binaries arising from it such as men/women and culture/nature (e.g. Paglia, 1990). Embedded within these dichotomies are privilege and power (Squires, 2002), with the mind, cognition and rationality (the masculine) privileged over the body, emotions and feelings (the feminine). In marketing, the Cartesian split is visible in terms of marketing roles assigned to men and women in the workplace. This binary power equation has persisted in institutional sexism and biased work practices in education (Leathwood, 2005).

Our attention was drawn to the male/female dialectic in marketing in a number of key studies in the 1990s (Bristor & Fischer, 1991; Fischer & Bristor, 1994; Hirschman, 1991, 1993; Joy & Venkatesh, 1994; Peñaloza, 1991, 1994). The ACR conferences on gender, marketing and consumer behavior from 1991 onwards, ably led by Janeen Costa, also provided an ideal space within which to consider issues around gender, marketing and consumer behavior. In their 1994 article, Joy and Venkatesh unmasked the conflation (and trivialization) of women and consumption in marketing discourse, arguing that despite the fact that consumption was a bodily act, it was positioned as needing to be disciplined and contained, the rationale for this being that since the mind made the body consume, it was not necessary to deal directly with the body. The consequence of this was that consumer behavior and consumption itself came to be perceived as a disembodied phenomenon. This was particularly apparent in the consumer buying behavior model, which conceptualized consumer buying behavior as a logical and sequential process of problem solving. Furthermore, transcendence of the body tended to be a privilege of the male in marketing discourse, with female consumers defined as being at the mercy of their needs, wants and desires, all of which could be satisfied by careful segmentation,

targeting and positioning on the part of astute marketing managers (see also Tadajewski, this volume, and Patterson, this volume). Across the Atlantic, the publication of *Marketing and Feminism: Current Issues and Research* by Catterall, Maclaran and Stevens (2000) also encouraged more critical research into the gender dichotomy in marketing theory and practice. The result of women's identification with consumption has served to devalue both women and consumption (Hollows, 2000).

The much heralded 'return to the body' across all disciplines from the 1990s reflected a growing impetus to disband dualistic thinking in recognition that the mind and body were interconnected in consumption acts (Bordo, 1993; Fırat & Venkatesh, 1995; Joy & Venkatesh, 1994). Indeed, this interest in the interconnectedness of mind and body in consumption, based on embodied theory and the premise that we experience the world through our bodies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), went some way to reconcile the mind/body dichotomy that previously dominated in relation to how consumption was conceptualized. The work of Cayla and Cova (2017), Joy and Sherry (2003), Peñaloza (1999), Sherry *et al.* (2001), Thompson and Hirschman (1998), and Von Wallpach and Kreuzer (2013) has added to our understanding of embodied processes in marketing and consumer behavior. However, this challenge has not yet addressed gender stereotyping or affected marketing discourse, which continues to privilege the mind over the body, and, I will argue, continues to be deeply dichotomous. I point to the persistence of the military metaphor in marketing theory and practice as evidence of this.

The military metaphor invoked a mechanistic and masculine discourse which that drew on military language to emphasize its 'cut and thrust' values. The military strategist model of the marketing manager intent on targeting, penetration, conquest and mastery (see Kotler & Singh, 1981) was memorably deconstructed by Desmond (1997). Likewise, most strategic models of marketing have traditionally drawn on military analogies such as 'frontal attacks', etc., to reinforce this masculinist discourse. The concept of customer service work as 'front-line' work is also consistent with this military strategy rhetoric, and reveals a gender issue: women are typically much more likely to be at that front line, in the direct line of fire, so to

speak, and are more likely to have to deal directly with customer conflict (e.g. Kerfoot & Korczynski, 2005; Rutherford, 2001; Taylor & Tyler, 2000).

Throughout the 1990s and into the early 'noughties', a body of literature emerged that considered the 'feminizsation' of disciplines and of the workplace, and urged a more relational approach. This was characterized by teamwork, relationship building, intuition and collaboration (Cameron & Gibson-Graham, 2003), and reflected the shift from manufacturing to service industries (Bradley, 1999; Rosener, 1990). The growing numbers of jobs based on '"serving and caring'" led to a trend towards less hierarchical and more participative management styles, and a re-evaluation of "essentialised feminine attributes" that had previously been discouraged (McDowell, 1997, p. 11). However, the rise of service jobs also reflected a gender dichotomy, in that most jobs were gender-coded along traditional lines, and a "dichotomous economy of gender" (Knights & Thanem, 2005, p. 40), or sex role socialization (Claes, 1999, 2001) was implicit in this. According to Tynan (1997), the relationship marketing paradigm marked the '"feminine'" turn in marketing, so that '"soft'" skills, such as emotional and social skills replaced the '"hard'" skills, such as rational and task oriented work, which had previously dominated. It therefore built itself upon a prior ideological binary system, rather than digging up the foundations, levelling the site, and starting afresh.

In their study of women marketing managers, Maclaran, Stevens and Catterall (1998) drew attention to the lived experiences of women marketing managers, finding that many such women felt pigeonholed and consigned to servicing roles, without any opportunity to break through the 'glass ceiling' into more strategic roles in the organizations they worked in. They felt themselves consigned to '"decorative'", '"cosmetic'" and '"smiling'" roles, such as customer service and PR. Needless to say, these PR, sales, publicity and customer service front-lineline roles were considered to be of less lower status, and offered less remuneration than the more strategic managerial roles performed by their male colleagues.

In 2000, Maclaran and Catterall built on their earlier study, observing that the increase of women into the marketing profession had not changed the kinds of roles they were taking, which were primarily in customer service and customer-facing roles such as market research and PR. They were hopeful that the rise of relationship

management might impact on this gender coding in marketing, but the study also expressed concern about the lack of progress that had been made, and they called for greater critique of the underlying discourses that dictated men's and women's marketing roles in organizations. The continued lack of representation of women in all roles in advertising agencies illustrates the gender-typing and sex-typing that takes place in the marketing workplace. Women still find themselves in account management and administration roles, rather than in more creative or strategic roles that have higher status and pay (see, for example, the body of work published in *Advertising & Society Review* under the editorship of Linda Scott; Baxter's (1990) study of women in advertising; Klein's (2000) follow-up study; and Grow and Broyles' (2011) work). So, we see little change in the gender-typing that takes place in the marketing workplace. The gender dichotomy within marketing is very apparent in the services marketing literature, and so I now turn to this body of work to explore its ideological underpinnings and gendered implications.

Services marketing and gender

Aside from the key aspects of services marketing, namely intangibility, inseparability of production and consumption aspects, perishability, heterogeneity and lack of ownership (Gabbott & Hogg, 1997, p. 137), the 7 Ps of services marketing include people and physical evidence. These aspects point to embodied elements in the service encounter, specifically the customer service qualities that the service worker 'performs'. Front-line staff are expected to be "cheerful, friendly, compassionate, sincere or even humble" (Lovelock, Wirtz & Chew, 2009, p. 281), and also need to possess empathy, courtesy and listening skills (Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman, 1996). Service workers are thus beholden to create positive feelings in their interaction with customers so that both short-term and long-term organizational objectives are met. Other studies highlighted traits such as 'competence, courtesy, knowledge, reliability and communicative abilities' (Berry, Zeithaml & Parasuraman, 1985). Aside from the above, there are additional expectations of employees working in the retail and hospitality industries, such as helpfulness, good humor, friendliness, positivity and playfulness (Warhurst & Nickson, 2007).

The relationship marketing paradigm put the emphasis on building long-term, meaningful relationships with customers, and much of the research in services

Commented [R2]: Is this quoted from Berry et al. 1985? If so, please supply the page number.

marketing has focused on how to enhance that "personal relationship" (Gabbott & Hogg, 1997, p. 145), with the expectation that service employees are empathetic and sympathetic at the "moment of truth" (Normann, 1984) when the encounter takes place.

Indeed, empathy is perhaps the quality most often cited in the services marketing literature. Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985) identified eight dimensions in their service quality measurement tool (SERVQUAL), which they later refined to five: reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness (RATER). These core attributes pointed to both physical and emotional aspects, a blended, embodied performance that necessitated service workers to be 'feeling bodies' and which comprised both intangible (mind) and tangible (bodily) aspects. More importantly, for my argument in this chapter, was that this also had gendered dimensions, as women were traditionally associated with bodies rather than minds, and with feelings rather than logic, and so culturally coded as being more likely to engage in such relationship building.

Aside from the requirement to be empathetic, there is also a recognition in the service literature that the service encounter has much in common with acting. Indeed, much of it has drawn on a dramaturgical metaphor (Goffman, 1959). Grove, Fisk and Bitner (1992) drew on this metaphor to explore the relationship between consumers (audience) and service workers (actors). Their study is one of many that has have applied a dramaturgical metaphor to conceptualize the encounter between service organizations and customers. The performative dimensions of customer service have been explored in a number of key studies (e.g. Berry, 1981; Berry, Zeithaml & Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985; Grönroos, 1985). Grove, Fisk and Bitner *et al.* (1992) referred to 'frontstage' and 'backstage' roles in this regard, with frontstage personnel carefully selected and trained to offer consistent performances with customers. They were aided by suitable props (tangibles), which helped to actualize the service quality, and prompted by 'backstage' forces to ensure their performance was consistently good and convincing, indeed being convincing and appearing to be sincere was perhaps the primary challenge of the "frontstage worker" (Grove, Fisk & Bitner *et al.*, 1992).

It was not only personality traits that were important, as this was very much an embodied performance that also required an appropriate physical appearance, such as being well-groomed and well-dressed (Grove, Fisk & Bitner *et al.*, 1992). Lovelock, Wirtz and Chew *et al.*'s (2009, p. 24) book, *Essentials of Services Marketing*, has also stressed the importance of "smart outfits and a ready smile". These "ready smiles" were more often required by women, as they were more likely to be front of stage.

Knights and Thanem (2005) write that women's perceived suitability for service roles is bound up with women's cultural positioning as relational, affective, emotional bodies, which inevitably leads to gender-typing and indeed sex-typing in the workplace: women are ideally equipped to do the 'softer' work, leaving the 'hard', strategic management work to men. This is also supported by Kerfoot and Korczynski (2005), who have studied not only women's predominance in front-line service roles, but also how this reinforces traditional gender stereotypes, roles and performativities. Drawing on Butler (1990), the word performativities refers to our acts and gestures, which are "fabrications manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means" (p. 173). As such, our external personas are assumed by us to present a certain identity to the world, and gender, Butler argues, is a primary site where such performativities occur. The re-affirmation of traditional gender stereotypes apparent in the allocation of service roles, invariably results in the normalization of embodied, gendered performances, whereby some behaviors are deemed appropriate for women, and other behaviors are deemed appropriate for men (Butler, 1999). These behaviors invariably lead to discriminatory practices in the workplace, if men or women do not conform to the gendered expectations that are embedded in their job roles and perceived competencies as men or women.

Toynbee (2003) identifies the 6 'c's of women's work: namely catering, cashier or checkout, clerical, cleaning and caring. Obviously, a number of these skills are associated with the private or domestic realm, as James (1998) has pointed out. Women are positioned as having strengths associated with nurturing and the home, and their public roles in the workplace conflate with their domestic labor. This is particularly revealing in relation to mature women returning to the workplace. They might be much prized in front-line, 'motherly' roles, which are also of course typically poorly paid and part-time, because they are deemed to possess the nurturing

skills needed. Thus, they bring their supposedly 'natural' and supposedly innate 'feminine' skills into the public sphere, and indeed this often has the effect of blurring the boundaries between the private and public spheres, indeed merging them, so that there ~~may~~ might be little difference between their work at home and their work in the workplace (Nickson & Korczynski, 2009).

The perception that service roles are typically 'feminine' ones is evidenced by the fact that men ~~may~~ might be very reluctant to work in emotionally driven and female-concentrated occupations, as they ~~may~~ might perceive service work to be demeaning and servile (Nickson & Korczynski, 2009). This may vary according to education, class and age. There is a double-bind for women doing this so-called 'emotion work' in that it ~~may~~ might be experienced as a gender trap because it is associated with the 'feminine' and thus is culturally perceived to be of less value than 'masculine' work. Indeed, the '~~feminisation~~ feminization' project, which emphasized more relational, participative and non-hierarchical forms of management, has lost its battle with the more systematized, surveillance (masculine) thrust that prevails (Nickson & Korczynski, 2009).

A normalization process of gendered roles in the workplace is "embedded within marketing, advertising and consumer offerings", argue~~s~~ Bettany *et al.* (2010, p. 17). They suggest that we need to adopt a stronger, post~~-~~structuralist approach. Post structuralism defines itself in opposition to structuralism, and focuses on the multiple sources of meanings (readers, authors, texts, culture, society), and multiple interpretations. It rejects the prior focus on authors and the self, instead arguing that meaning is perceived, multiple and varied. In the context of gender, a post structuralist approach highlights the constructed-ness of gender identity, normative forces and institutional power, and thus enables us to adopt a more nuanced and indeed critical stance in relation to the study of gender. Bettany *et al*. called for a stronger, political positioning, so that long-standing feminist concerns such as equal opportunity and parity in the workplace would be addressed rather than ignored. Such work, they argued, was on-going, and we still had some way to go before they were "fully articulated and realised" (2010, p. 17).

Maclaran *et al.* (2009, p. 719) have argued that the 'femini~~z~~sation' of the marketing agenda of the 1990s caused "status insecurity" amongst~~t~~ the powers that be,

and that this has now led to a backlash, and a return to a more traditional 'masculine' value system. Fisher (2007) has also noted the persistence of a gendered discourse within marketing, suggesting that new managerialism', which extols 'masculine' values is now once again at the helm and fully in control. So, there is agreement that the ~~feminisation~~ feminization of marketing has failed to materialize, and indeed the ideological and institutional imperatives behind gendered marketing discourse and practices are still as pertinent now as they were twenty years ago. Furthermore, it seems we are in the grip of what Deem (2003) has referred to as a newly invigorated '"macho-masculinity'" in management theory and practice. Dasu and Chase (2010) perceive this as an intensive attack on the "soft side of customer management" in organizations, which bears a resemblance to the zeal with which organizations have worked "to reengineer workflow and supply chains". This re-invigoration of the 'masculine' trivializes and relegates traditional 'feminine' activities such as nurturing and caring for others, and is made manifest in the form of a mechanistic and cynical (gendered) form of emotional labor that is simultaneously expected and denigrated in the workplace, ~~whilst~~ while such labor is exploited for organizational ends (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004; Illouz, 1997).

I argue that there are strong ideological links between services marketing and emotional labor, as both engage in gendered type-casting and sex type-casting, and so I now turn to the growing literature on emotional labor in order to explore gender issues within it, and to consider where women are positioned in relation to this form of work.

Emotional ~~Labor~~labor

The term emotional labor was first coined by Hochschild in 1983 in the book *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. In it she wrote that emotional labor was the management of feeling to create a public facial and bodily display. She also refers to surface acting (one's outward behavior) and deep acting (one's inner feelings) in relation to emotional labor. The definition emphasizes that such service roles are visual performances during which employees act out an appropriate part that requires them to appear to be engaging with customers in a positive and indeed empathetic way, irrespective of how they ~~may~~ might actually be feeling beneath the surface. This demonstrates how emotional and bodily displays work together to create

a desired impression on customers (see Warhurst & Nickson, (2009), for a fuller discussion of the embodied aspects of emotional labor).

Elsewhere, England and Farkas (1986, p. 91) have described emotional labor as making efforts to understand others, including empathizing with their situation, and feeling "their feelings as a part of one's own". Koster (2011, p. 68) defines emotional labor as "merging the emotions of others (spontaneous emotion and care), as well as managing one's own emotions (surface and deep acting)". It is therefore about caring about (feeling affection) and caring for (servicing other's needs). A more functional definition is offered by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993, p. 88), who define emotional labor as "the display of expected emotions by service agents during service encounters". They also observe that there are four significant factors in relation to emotional labor and the service encounter. These are that front-line service staff represent the organization to customers; that such encounters involve face-to-face interaction; that they often have a "dynamic and emergent quality" (1993, p. 90); and that there are intangible elements. The four factors place a premium on the behavior of the service agent.

The emotional labor paradigm now dominates the study of interactive service roles, and there is a significant body of work on emotional labor across numerous sectors such as nursing, hospitality, tourism and education (e.g. Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Hochschild, 1983; Varca, 2009; Warhurst & Nickson, 2009; Leathwood, 2005). Whilest emotional labor has also been the subject of studies in leadership and organizational studies in the field of business and management, it has largely been ignored in the marketing field, with the exception of the work by Warhurst, Nickson, Witz and Cullen (2000); Warhurst, Nickson, Witz and Cullen (2000); Witz, Warhurst and Nikson (2003), Warhurst and Nickson (2007) and Warhurst and Nickson (2009) that makes reference to it, albeit that the primary focus is on aesthetic labor. There is little argument that bodies are deployed for organizational ends, but emotional labor is also an embodied 'performance', to use Hochshild's (1983) terminology. They have something else in common: both also share a pattern of discriminatory work practices, poor pay and gender -stereotyping (e.g. Pettinger, 2004, 2005, 2008).

Commented [R5]: There are two references for these authors in 2000. Which is cited here? Or both?
I cannot find another citation for these authors in 2000, so can the other ref. be deleted if the citation does not refer to both?

Macdonald and Sirianni (1996, p. 3) studied questions of power and governance at work and referred to the "emotional proletariat" in this regard, thereby emphasizing the exploitative nature of emotional labor. Grandey (2000, 2015) has also argued that emotional labor is above all a regulatory process aimed at meeting organizational goals. Furthermore, it creates a "simulacrum of community" within service work that serves management purposes (Ezzy, 2001). In other words, the more convincing emotional laborers are, the more advantageous for the organization.

Not surprisingly, this acting out of emotions can be the cause of considerable psychological stress and "emotive dissonance" for service workers, notes Hochschild (1983). Indeed, there have been a considerable number of studies that focus on the adverse effects of such work on employees. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) address the psychological challenges of emotional labor, such as pressure, dissonance and self-alienation on the part of the service agent. Varca (2009) has studied the degree of stress experienced by employees in a large communications firm call center engaged in emotional work. More recently, Hulsheger and Schew (2011) have studied the effects of surface acting on mental health, showing that such work takes its toll on employees over long periods, and often leads to ill health and job burnout. Anaza, Nowlin and Wu (2016) also discuss the negative effects of customer orientation and the imperative to have emotionally engaged employees. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argued that it is easier to comply with the requirements of emotional labor than to experience the horrors of dissonance. More recently Phillips, Wee Tan and Julian (2006) have also addressed emotional dissonance in their study of services marketing and the identity problems such work creates for service workers. It is also worth emphasizing that this is a gender issue, or at least an issue mostly felt by women, given that they do the lion's share of such work. A recent study by Walsh and Bartikowski (2013), for example, reflected on the cost of 'deep acting' and 'surface acting' on women and men in the workplace, finding that women engaged in surface acting were particularly negatively affected in terms of job satisfaction and stress.

It is not surprising that emotional labor takes its toll, given its performative dimensions. Unsurprisingly much of the literature on emotional labor is steeped in the language of the stage, and borrows concepts from services literature to conceptualize its requirements. Thus, the literature is replete with phrases such as 'surface acting',

'deep acting', 'feeling rules', 'display rules' and 'affective displays', as well as words such as 'actors' and 'personas' (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Goffman, 1959; Hochschild, 1979, 1983). This emphasis, however, ~~may~~ might suggest that emotional labor is always a form of acting to win over an audience, whereas emotional labor ~~may~~ could also be genuine in some instances and thus not require acting. In fact, a service agent ~~may~~ might be expressing an authentic self in the service encounter and indeed this constitutes a third kind of emotional labor, which is a genuine expression of expected emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Medler-Liraz and Seger-Guttman (2015) also allude to this third kind of emotional labor, which is for employees to show some degree of authenticity in terms of their service work, thus putting considerable pressure on emotional labor agents to be convincing and believable. They ~~may~~ might even assume protypical characteristics that go along with the role, until their 'acting' becomes part of their authentic self-expression. That in fact is the ideal, if a recent article on the value of mindfulness in emotional labor is anything to go by. Wang, Berthon, Pitt and McCarthy (2016) write about the value of service workers *truly* empathizing with customers, thus intensifying the self-less caring skills required in this work or, as the authors put it, mindfulness enables employees "to put themselves into people's shoes and feel their feelings" (p. 658). This echoes England and Farkas' (1986) study that extolled service workers to feel what customers felt as if they were their own feelings. If we extend the acting analogy, presumably this deep empathy would be akin to the method acting school, which we all appreciate is much more effective and impressive than simply observing an actor seemingly repeating lines from a ~~learnt~~ learned script.

There has been a significant body of work that has explored feminine and female capital in the field of paid caring work, which is one of the primary domains of emotional labor. Notable among them is Skeggs' (1997) study, which considers the intersections between class and gender in relation to women's caring work, and the emotional investment of mothers in their children rather than themselves, highlighting differences between the middle-class women in the study, focused on their children's educational capital, and the working-class women she interviewed, who prioritized their children's emotional well-being, concluding that women's gender capital operates within limits. In her study of women in various roles and at various levels in nursing and social work, Huppatz (2009) found that women were unlikely to attain a

higher managerial position in these professions. She makes the distinction between female (embodied) capital and feminine capital, suggesting how both are forms of capital that women may "wield in innovative ways" (Huppatz, 2009, p. 60). However, in her study she also observes that the "naturalization" of feminine capital in relation to caring work, based on the assumption that such skills and capabilities are not seen as acquired skills but as "an innate female capacity", leads to such skills being undervalued and underpaid (Huppatz, 2009, p. 55).

Huppatz (2009) draws on Bourdieu's (2001, p. 93) argument that women's symbolic capital is less culturally valued than men's: women are "separated from men by a negative symbolic co-efficient" and "a diminution of symbolic capital entailed by being a woman". Bourdieu also observes that women typically find work in "quasi-extensions of the domestic space" (p. 94), which is a concept that has much salience in this chapter. Reay (2004, p. 71), in her study on women's involvement in their children's education, suggests that Bourdieu's work does not specifically consider emotional capital, however, which is "a specifically gendered capital" that is "all about investments in others rather than the self".

Ashforth and Humphreys (1993) suggest that we need to see emotional labor in a wider, macro context that moves beyond organizational and occupational norms to consider the societal imperatives behind it, so what is the wider significance of the rise of emotional labor? Eva Illouz (1997) notes that it is laden with gender distinctions. She writes that "the communicative ethos" of managing is now aligned with "traditional female selfhood" (p. 43), and indeed the loss of self in the service of others; a feeling economy that masks "social domination" (p. 45). In her later work, *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism* (2007), she discusses how capitalism has created an emotional culture in the workplace "in which the public and private are now deeply and inextricably intertwined" (p. 3). She goes on to observe that the distinction between men and women is based on and reproduces itself through emotional cultures that comprise fixed emotional divisions, and that these underlying assumptions have found their way into the workplace and indeed have taken center stage. This is an appropriation of traditional feminine qualities to create a new, better, more communicative management style with overtly masculine traits, whereby emotions are "more closely harnessed to instrumental actions" (p. 23).

Emotional labor is clearly laced with ideological assumptions around women and 'feminine' traits attributed to them, and is not a gender-neutral phenomenon (e.g. Taylor & Tyler, 2000; Pilcher, 2007; Wolkowitz, 2006), as it is primarily undertaken by women, who are perceived to be better at performing it. Women engaged in emotional, service work are also doing gender, in the sense that they are enacting gendered roles based on stereotypical beliefs in women's social capital and interpersonal skills as women (Kerfoot & Korczynski, 2005). Such labor conflates their domestic and public roles and, needless to say, is often supervised and controlled by male "emotional managers" (James 1998). Their work is thus entangled with assumptions about feeling (female) bodies and rational (male) minds; what it means to be a woman, and what it means to be a man; in other words, an illustration of the binary system that continues to control us all.

Hochschild's (2012) recent work on the outsourced self discusses the marketization of the personal realm so that everything that had previously been part of the private and personal, such as love and child-rearing, is now available as packaged expertise. The market reaches "into the heart of our emotional lives", she argues, a realm previously shielded from market imperatives, and we are urged to see ourselves in market terms. Her earlier book, *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feelings* (1983), documented the marketization of emotions, and the gender issues embedded in it, noting that "[a]As traditionally more accomplished managers of feelings in private life, women more than men have put emotional labor on the market, and they know more about its personal costs." (p. 11). Indeed, women's traditional skills at emotion management are "more often used by women as one of the offerings they trade for economic support" (p. 20). Thus, the private, emotion management realm traditionally inhabited by women has been replicated in the public sphere in emotional labor roles that mirror those they are expected to excel at on the home front.

Given that this volume of critical work on marketing is primarily addressing the marketing academic community, it seems appropriate to now turn to one of the domains in which emotional labor is proliferating, namely that of higher education. How has the marketization of education impacted on gender roles within academe, and what can it reveal about the ideological forces at work around us?

Emotional labor in higher education

There has been a proliferation of studies in the educational field in recent years that have explored the emotional labor of teachers and lecturers in education. The significance of emotional labor in the context of higher education is obvious. Teachers and lecturers are now service providers, seeking to satisfy the demands of their customers (students), with student satisfaction the Holy Grail that must be sought (Ogbonna & Harris, 2004).

Kinman, Wray and Strange (2011) point to the clear parallels between teaching and services work in general, arguing that emotional labor within teaching has become increasingly intensive, and that this has had a detrimental effect on teachers' well-being. There have been a number of key studies on emotional labor in higher education (e.g. Berry & Cassidy, 2013; Constanti & Gibbs, 2004; Davies, 2003; Deem, 1998, 2003; Deem & Brehoney, 2005; Ogbonna & Harris, 2004; Zhang & Zhu, 2008). This body of work is typically framed within the impact of new managerialism in higher education.

New managerialism "asserts the rights of managers to manage and the importance of management_…_challenging professional autonomy and discretion" (Deem, 2003, p. 242), and manifests itself as a focus on cost centers, outsourcing, performance scrutiny, surveillance, auditing, performance indicators, and league tables (Deem, 2003). Constanti and Gibbs (2004) have explored the impact of academic institutions as service providers, whereby customer/student satisfaction and profit for management has have led to the exploitation of academics to satisfy both of these imperatives. The authors note that emotional labor is more "susceptible to both emotional and financial exploitation than other forms of labor" (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004, p. 246). Furthermore, they argue that the managerialist expectations of academic staff has have led to "voluntary exploitation" (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004, p. 248). Berry and Cassidy (2013) also express concern at the intensification of emotional labor in higher education. Findings from their study showed that lecturers performed high levels of emotional labor compared to other professions that were more often associated with it, such as nursing, and they highlighted the fact that high levels of emotional labor were linked to dysfunctional factors such as problems in relation to well-being, job satisfaction and job performance. Ogbonna and Harris

(2004) have also studied the effect of the marketization of higher education and the toll it has taken on academic staff in relation to the emotional labor expected of them. Their study identified significant gender differences, with female lecturers feeling particularly vulnerable to the managerial control exerted on them in relation to their emotional labor performance.

Turning to gender issues within emotional labor in higher education, there is a growing body of literature that explores its gendered implications. The 'feminisation' feminization' across many disciplines was marked by a growing interest in the social and relational aspects of such public service work. Ahmed's study of 'Affective affective Economics' economics' (2004) and Leathwood and Hey's (2009) article discuss how emotions work in certain ways to do certain things. Both studies unpick the gendered assumptions within higher education, showing how such emotional skills are coded as feminine (see also Leathwood & Read, 2009).

In addition, the 'new managerialism' in higher education has been the subject of a significant body of feminist critique (e.g. Davies, 2003; Deem, 2003;, Leathwood, 2005; Morley, 2005). In her 2005 study, Leathwood writes that despite the circulation of optimistic discourses about the long-awaited revalidation of the 'feminine' in management, this has not materialized due to the powerful force of the "masculinist new managerialism" sweeping through further and higher education. Private sector management practices, she argues, now apply, whereby middle management positions are feminized as the (female) neo-liberal subject of "emotionality, caring and introspection" (Walkerdine, 2003, p. 242). Drawing on Nancy Chodorow's (1978) work, Leathwood (2005) notes that idealized feminized identities, such as caring and nurturing, are constructed in relation to others, whereas their masculine counterparts are constituted as "standing alone, independent and autonomous" (p. 401).

Chowdhry's (2014) study showed that female lecturers were strongly identified with nurturing requirements in regards to students, including "spoon-feeding", which was also demonstrated in Larson's (2008) study of the "caring performance" of women lecturers in higher education (their "pink-collar duties", as she describes it), with both studies suggesting that much of this work was invisible and unrecognized. Leathwood and Read's (20082009) study also focused on the particular pressures faced by women lecturers in relation to the emotional labor expected of them. Finally,

Morley (2005) offers a particularly scathing insight into "hegemonic masculinities and gendered power relations" within the new managerialist paradigm in higher education, with its emphasis on competition, auditing, performance, control and measurement. She focuses in particular on the teaching quality movement, demonstrating how "women's socialized patterns of caring" are appropriated by it, thus creating a "psychic economy", such as quality assessment exercises in teaching and learning, which is in fact "a gendered care chain" (Morley, 2005, p. 413). Women typically find themselves inextricably immersed and enmeshed in such work, ~~whilst~~ while their male colleagues often manage to evade them in order to pursue research productivity and competitive individualism!

Koster (2011) offers a more personal account of emotional labor in higher education, discussing her own "extraordinary emotional labor" in her role as a lecturer on gender in a higher education institution. She emphasizes that this was indeed a gender issue, as she sought to create boundaries and impose limitations on the exhausting and boundary-less expectations placed on her by her students. Koster (2011) concurs with other studies, previously mentioned, that women not only provide more emotional labor than men in higher education, but are also subject to societal expectations that they will do so. This emotional "housework" or "pink-collar" work is both stressful and time consuming. It blurs the boundaries between the public and private sphere, offers no professional or monetary remuneration, and, above all, is taken for granted. Deem's (2003) study has also shown that gendered expectations and constraints are as firmly in place as ever, with what she terms a "macho-masculinity" deeply embedded in management, which is based on tacit understandings that disadvantage women.

To return to Leathwood's (2005) study, she observes that women are in fact often hybrids between academic autonomy and traditional femininity, struggling to manage these dual expectations, a double-edged sword one might say. At the time of writing this chapter, there is little to suggest that the tide is likely to turn away from the gender-typing and sex-typing in higher education that seems to have gathered fresh momentum in recent years. In fact, the macho-managerialist grip on education is likely to tighten as, post-Brexit, we brace ourselves for the storms to come in terms of

falling student numbers, greater competition, reduced budgets, less research-funding, and even greater accountability for our students' and managers' satisfaction.

Conclusion

This chapter has taken us on a journey that began with the gender dichotomy in marketing, a discussion of the much anticipated 'feminisation' feminization' of disciplines and, specifically, how this has impacted (or not) in marketing in the academy and in the workplace. This led into a review of services marketing and the gender issues therein, showing that women are positioned as the 'feeling bodies' of much marketing work, reinforcing gender-typing and sex-typing in the workplace. The emotional labor literature tells a similar story, and is equally revealing in terms of the gendered issues within it. Finally, I focused on emotional labor within the higher education sector, particularly the growing body of feminist work in this fertile field, which has critiqued emotional labor and its implications for women. A review of this literature shows how the current masculinist new managerialism has impacted on all of us, but particularly on female academics, who are expected to be adept at managing the 'caring' demands of this newly marketized domain. Once again, ideologies around women's 'nature' and their cultural conditioning to nurture others (Chodorow 1978) conspire to reinforce gender stereotypes.

One of the key objectives of this chapter has been to draw together two domains: services marketing and emotional labor, and show their underlying ideologies from a gendered perspective. It is apparent that when underlying ideological biases are not sufficiently challenged at their foundations they can be reinvigorated by market forces, as has clearly been the case with the stalled 'feminisation' feminization' of disciplines and workplaces. One might equally argue that a re-appropriation (and exploitation) of the 'feminine' for organizations' own ends is more accurate. A greater awareness of that which is considered the norm, and a more critical approach generally, can enable us to challenge what is expected from us, and the gendered assumptions upon which these expectations are based. Continuing to cast a critical eye on that which is normalized, whilst while potentially dangerous in terms of our professional careers, and to find outlets for our work that challenge the dominant paradigm, is important, as it is only by unpicking the underlying ideologies that shape

our experiences that we can begin to discuss them, problematize them and ultimately change them.

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economics. *Social Text*, *22*(2), 117–139.

Anaza, N.A., Nowlin, E.L., & Wu, G.J. (2016). Staying engaged on the job: The role of emotional labor, job resources, and customer orientation. *European Journal of Marketing*, *50*(7/8), 1470–1492.

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

Baxter, M. (1990). *Women in ~~Advertising~~advertising*. London, Institute of Practitioners in Advertising.

Berry, K., & Cassidy, S. (2013). Emotional labour in university lecturers: Considerations for higher education institutions. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *2*(2), 22–36.

Berry, L.-L. (1981). The employee as customer. *Journal of Retail Banking*, 3(March), 33–40.

Berry, L.L., Zeithaml, V.A., & Parasuraman, A. (1985). Quality counts in services too. *Business Horizons*, *28*(3), 44–52.

Bettany, S., Dobscha, S., O'Malley, L., & Prothero, A. (2010). Moving beyond binary oppositions: Exploring the tapestry of gender in consumer research and marketing. *Marketing Theory*, *10*(1), 3–28.

Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, western culture, and the body*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine ~~Domination~~domination*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bradley, H. (1999). *Gender and power in the workplace: Analysing the impact of economic change*. Basingstoke, Macmillan Press.

Bristor, J., & Fischer, E. (1991). Feminist thought: Implications for consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *19*(4), 518–536.

Butler, J.P. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London, Routledge.

Cameron, J., & Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2003). Feminising the economy: Metaphors, strategies, politics. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *10*(2), 145–157.

Catterall, M., Maclaran, P., & Stevens, L. (Eds.) (2000). *Marketing and feminism: Current issues and research*. London, Routledge.

Chodorow, N.J. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Chowdhry, S. (2014). The caring performance and the 'blooming student': Exploring the emotional labour of further education lecturers in Scotland. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, *66*(4), 554–571.

Claes, M.-T. (1999). What is equality and how do we get there? *International Labour Review*, *138*(4), 431–446.

Claes, M.-T. (2001). Women, men and management styles (pp. 385–404). In M. Loutfi (Ed.), *Women, gender & work* (pp. 385–404). Washington, International Labour Office.

Constanti, P., & Gibbs, P. (2004). Higher education teachers and emotional labour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *18*(4), 243–249.

Costa, J.A. (1991). *Proceedings of 1st conference on gender and consumer behavior.* June, Salt Lake City, UT. University of Utah.

Dasu, S., & Chase, R.B. (2010). Designing the soft side of customer service. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *52*(1), 33–39.

Davies, B. (2003). Death to critique and dissent: The policies and practices of new managerialism and of 'evidence-based practice'. *Gender & Education*, *1*(10), 91–103.

Deem, R. (1998). New managerialism and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the UK. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *8*(1), 47–70.

Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organizational cultures and the practices of manager-academics in UK universities. *Gender, Work & Organizations*, *10*(2), 239–259.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K.J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *31*(2), 217–235.

Desmond, J. (1997). Marketing and the war machine. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, *15*(7), 338–351.

England, P., & Farkas, G. (1986). *Households, employment and gender: A social, economic, and demographic view*. Hawthorne, NY, Aldine Publishing Co.

Ezzy, D. (2001). A simulacrum of workplace community: Individualism and engineered culture that service work and management encourage. *Sociology, 35*(3), 631–650.

Firat, A.F., & Venkatesh, A. (1995). Liberatory postmodernism and the reenchantment of consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research, 22*(3), 239–267.

Fischer, E., & Bristor, J. (1994). A feminist poststructuralist analysis of the rhetoric of marketing relationships. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 11*(4), 317–331.

Fisher, G. (2007). 'You need tits to get on round here': Gender and sexuality in the entrepreneurial university of the 21st century. *Ethnography, 8*(4), 503–517.

Gabbott, M., & Hogg, G.C. (1997). *Contemporary services marketing management: A reader*. London, The Dryden Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, Anchor Books.

Grandey, A.A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 95–110.

Grandey, A.A. (2015). Smiling for a wage: What emotional labor teaches us about emotion regulation. *Psychological Inquiry, 26*(1), 54–60.

Grönroos, C. (1985). Internal marketing— Theory and practice. *American Marketing Association's Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 41–47). Chicago, IL, American Marketing Association.

Grove, S.J., Fisk, R.P., & Bitner, M.J. (1992). The service experience as theater. Retrieved from www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/7341/volumes/v19/NA-19

Grow, J., & Broyles, S.J. (2011). Unspoken rules of the creative game: Insights to shape the next generation from top advertising creative women. *Advertising & Society Review, 12*(1). Available online.

Hirschman, E.C. (1991). A feminist critique of marketing theory: Toward agentic-communal balance. Retrieved from http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/gender/v01/SD%20Gender%20Conference%202%20-%20A%20Feminist%20Critique%20of%20Marketing%20Theory.pdf

Hirschman, E.C. (1993). Ideology in consumer research, 1980 and 1990: A Marxist and feminist critique. *Journal of Consumer Research, 19*(4), 537–555.

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

Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feelings*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Hochschild, A.R. (2012). *The outsourced self: Intimate life in market times*. New York, Metropolitan Books.

Hollows, J. (2000). *Feminism, femininity & popular culture.* Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Huppatz, K. (2016). Reworking Bourdieu's capital: Feminine and female capitals in the field of paid caring work. *Sociology*, *43*(1), 45–66.

Illouz, E. (1997). Who cares for the caretaker's daughter? Towards a sociology of happiness in the era of reflexive modernity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *14*(4), 31–66.

Illouz, E. (2007). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

James, N. (1998). Emotional labour: Skill & work in the social regulation of feelings. In L. Mackay, K. Soothill & K. Melia (Eds.), *Classic texts in health care* (pp. 219–225). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Joy, A., & Sherry, J.F. (2003). Speaking of art as embodied imagination: A multisensory approach to understanding aesthetic experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *30*(September), 259–282.

Joy, A., & Venkatesh, A. (1994). Postmodernism, feminism, and the body: The visible and the invisible in consumer research. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *11*(4), 333–357.

Kerfoot, D., & Korczynski, M. (2005). Gender and service: New directions for the study of 'front-line' service work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *12*(5), 387–399.

Kinman, G., Wray, S., & Strange, C. (2011). Emotional ~~Labour~~labour, burnout and job satisfaction in UK teachers: The role of workplace social support. *Educational Psychology*, *31*(7), 843–856.

Klein, D. (2000). *Women in advertising, 10 years on: Findings and recommendations of a study commissioned by the Institute of Practitioners in Advertising*. London, IPA.

Knights, D., & Thanem, T. (2005). Embodying emotional labour. In D. Morgan, B. Brandth & E. Kvande (Eds.), *Gender bodies & work* (pp. 31–43). London, Ashgate Publishing.

Koster, S. (2011). The self-managed heart: Teaching gender and doing emotional labour in a higher education institution. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *19*(1), 61–77.

Kotler, P., & Singh, R. (1981). Marketing warfare in the 1980s. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, *3*(Winter), 30–41.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York, Basic.

Larson, H.A. (2008). Emotional labor: The pink collar duties of teaching, currents in teaching and learning. *Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1), 45–56.

Leathwood, C. (2005). Treat me as a human being – don't look at me as a woman: Femininities and professional identities in further education. *Gender & Education*, *17*(4), 387–409.

Leathwood, C., & Hey, V. (2009). Gender(ed) discourses and emotional sub-texts: Theorising emotion in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(4), 429–440.

Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2009). *Gender and the changing face of higher education: A feminised future?* London, SRHE & Open University Press.

Lovelock, C.H., Wirtz, J., & Chew, P.Y.P. (2009). *Essentials of services marketing*. Singapore, Pearson Education.

Macdonald, C.L., & Sirianni, C. (1996). *Working in the service society*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Maclaran, P., & Catterall, M. (2000). Bridging the knowledge divide: Issues on the feminisation of marketing practice. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *16*(6), 635–646.

Maclaran, P., Miller, C., Parsons, E., & Surman, E. (2009). Praxis or performance: Does critical marketing have a gender blind-spot? *Journal of Marketing Management*, *25*(7–8), 713–728.

Maclaran, P., Stevens, L., & Catterall, M. (1998). The 'glasshouse effect': Women in marketing management. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *15*(7), 309–317.

McDowell, L. (1997). *Capital culture: Gender at work in the city*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Medler-Liraz, H., & Seger-Guttman, T. (2015). The relationship between emotional labor strategies, service provider hostility, and service quality. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, *36*(3), 210–225.

Morley, L. (2005). Opportunity or exploitation? Women and quality assurance in higher education. *Gender & Education*, *17*(4), 411–429.

Nickson, D., & Korczynski, M. (2009). Editorial: Aesthetic labour, emotional labour and masculinity. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *16*(3), 291–299.

Normann, R. (1984). *Service management strategy and leadership in service businesses*. New York, Wiley.

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

Paglia, C. (1990). *Sexual personae: Art and decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. London, Penguin Books.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, *49*(4), 41–50.

Peñaloza, L. (1991). Boundary construction, feminism & consumer research. In J.A. Costa (Ed.), *Proceedings of 1st Conference on Gender and Consumer Behavior*. June, Salt Lake City, UT. University of Utah.

Peñaloza, L. (1994). Crossing boundaries/drawing lines: A look at the nature of gender boundaries and their impact on marketing research. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *11*(4), 359–379.

Peñaloza, L. (1999). Just doing it: A visual ethnographic study of spectacular consumption at Niketown. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, *2*(4), 337–400.

Pettinger, L. (2004). Brand culture and branded workers: Service work and aesthetic labor in fashion retail. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, *7*(2), 165–184.

Pettinger, L. (2005). Gendered work meets gendered goods: Selling and service in clothing retail. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *12*(5), 460–478.

Pettinger, L. (2008). Developing aesthetic labor: The importance of consumption. *International Journal of Work Organization & Emotion*, *2*(4), 327–343.

Phillips, B., Wee Tan, T.T., & Julian, C. (2006). The theoretical underpinnings of emotional dissonance: A framework and analysis of propositions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *20*(7), 471–478.

Pilcher, K. (2007). A gendered 'managed heart'? An exploration of the gendering of emotional labor, aesthetic labor, and body work in service sector employment. *Reinvention: A Journal of Undergraduate Research*. Retrieved from http://www.warwick.ac.uk/go/reinventionjournal/pastissues/launchissuewww.warwick.ac.uk/go/reinventionjournal/pastissues/launchissue

Reay, D. (2004). Gendering Bourdieu's concepts of capitals? Emotional capital, women and social class. *The Sociological Review*, *52*(2), 57–74.

Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, *68*(6), 119–125.

Rutherford, S. (2001). Any difference? An analysis of gender and divisional management styles in a large airline. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *8*(3), 326–345.

Scott, R., Cayla, J., & Cova, B. (2017). Selling pain to the saturated self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *44*(1), 22–43.

Sherry, J.F., Kozinets, R.V., Storm, D., Duhachek, A., Nuttavuthisit, K., & Deberry-Spence, B. (2001). Being in the zone: Staging retail theater at ESPN Zone Chicago. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *14*(1–2), 151–158.

Skeggs, B. (1997). *Formations of class and gender: Becoming respectable*. London, Sage.

Squires, J. (2002). *Gender in political theory*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Taylor, S., & Tyler, M. (2000). Emotional labour and sexual difference in the airline industry. *Work, Employment and Society*, *14*(1), 77–95.

Thompson, C.J., & Hirschman, E.C. (1998). An existential analysis of the embodied self in postmodern consumer culture. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, *2*(4), 401–447.

Toynbee, P. (2003). *Hard work: Life in low-pay Britain*. London, Bloomsbury.

Tynan, C. (1997). A review of the marriage analogy in relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *13*(7), 695–704.

Varca, P.E. (2009). Emotional empathy and front line employees: Does it make sense to care about the customer? *Journal of Services Marketing*, *23*(1), 51–56.

Von Wallpach, S., & Kreuzer, M. (2013). Multi-sensory sculpting (MSS): Eliciting embodied brand knowledge via multi-sensory metaphors. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(9), 1325–1331.

Walkerdine, V. (2003). Neoliberalism, working-class subjects and higher education. *Contemporary Social Science*, *6*(2) (June), 255–271.

Walsh, G., & Bartikowski, B. (2013). Employee emotional labor and quitting intentions: Moderating effects of gender and age. *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(8), 1213–1237.

Wang, E.J., Berthon, P., Pitt, L., & McCarthy, I.P. (2016). Service, emotional labor, and mindfulness. *Business Horizons*, *59*(6), 655–661.

Walsh, G., & Bartikowki, B. (2013). Employee emotional labor and quitting intentions: Moderating effects of gender and age. *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(8), 1213–1237.

Warhurst, C., Nickson, D.P., Witz, A. & Cullen, A.M. (2000). Aesthetic labour in interactive service work: Some case study evidence from the 'new' Glasgow. *Service Industries Journal*, *20*(3), 1–18.

Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D.P. (2007). Employee experience of aesthetic labor in retail and hospitality. *Work, Employment & Society*, *21*(1), 103–120.

Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D.P. (2009). 'Who's got the look?': Emotional, aesthetic and sexualized labour in interactive services. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *16*(3), 385–404.

Warhurst, C., Nickson, D.P., Witz, A., & Cullen, A.M. (2000). Aesthetic labour in interactive service work: Some case study evidence from the 'new' Glasgow. *Service Industries Journal*, *20*(3), 1–18.

Warhurst, C., Nickson, D., Witz, A., & Cullen, A.M. (2000). Aesthetic labour: An unforeseen future of work and employment. *Management Research News*, *23*(9–1), 154–155.

Witz, A., Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D. (2003). The labour of aesthetics and the aesthetics of organization. *Organization*, *10*(1), 33–54.

Wolkowitz, C. (2006). *Bodies at work*. London, Sage.

Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, *60*(April), 31–46.

Zhang, Q., & Zhu, W. (2008). Exploring emotion in teaching: Emotional labor, burnout, and satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Communication Education*, *57*(1), 105–122.