Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection   **Undergraduate Scholarship**

5-11-2013

Feel it, Don't Fake it: Deep Acting and Perceptions of Feedback Utility

Eileen Toomey
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugtheses

Part of the Cognition and Perception Commons

BUTLER UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

Honors Thesis Certification

Please type all information in this section:

Applicant ___Eileen Toomey___
(Name as it is to appear on diploma)

Thesis title ___Feel it, Don't Fake it Deep Acting and Perceptions of Feedback Utility___

Intended date of commencement ___May 11, 2013___

Read, approved, and signed by:

Thesis adviser(s) ___Alison QuRalley___ ___3/20/13___
Date

Reader(s) ___R Brian Rush___ ___4/25/13___
giesler
Date

___ ___
Date

Certified by ___Judith Hearper Morrel___ ___9-16-13___
Director, Honors Program Date

For Honors Program use:

Level of Honors conferred: University ___Summa Cum Laude___

Departmental ___Psychology with High Honors___
___University Honors Program___

Feel it, Don't Fake it: Deep Acting and Perceptions of Feedback Utility

A Thesis

Presented to the Department of Psychology

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Of

Butler University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for Graduation Honors

Eileen Toomey

April 12, 2013

Table of Contents

Feel it, Don't Fake it: Deep Acting and Perceptions of Feedback Utility

When it comes to portraying emotions, is it better to fake emotions that one does not have, or is it better to try to genuinely feel them? One of the more heavily studied topics is the concept of emotional labor and its effect on employees in organizational settings. Emotional labor is defined as the display of expected emotions by service agents during service encounters. It is performed through surface acting (i.e., putting on a performance of "service with a smile" emotions without trying to feel those emotions) and deep acting (i.e., the expression of genuine emotion) (Ashford & Humphrey, 1993). Our study aims to add to the body of literature on emotional labor by exploring student perceptions of the different strategies of emotional labor in a professor.

Emotional Labor: An Overview

The concept of emotional labor originated out of the seminal work of Arlie Russell Hochschild. Flying home on an international airline, Hochschild noticed disgruntled flight attendants being reprimanded for their lack of friendly emotional displays. She realized that these airlines had begun to sell and advertise the nurturing, friendly atmosphere, and the flight attendants were being required to labor in order provide that warmth to each of the customers on board their plane. In her 1983 work entitled *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feelings*, Hochschild defines emotional labor as "the silent work of evoking and suppressing feelings…when you do emotional labor to express the company's disposition toward the public, and to make a profit for the company, you put your feelings to work" (39, Hochschild, 1983). This new definition of labor in the job context moves outside of the confines of physical work. It is the work one does in order to portray the emotional tone and culture stipulated by the organization in order to increase organizational success.

Engaging in emotional labor can be as exhausting as physical labor and in some cases more detrimental to an employee's wellbeing. However, engaging in emotional labor is not wholly toxic. Hochschild identifies two types of emotional labor to keep up organizational appearances: surface acting and deep acting. Surface acting relates to idea of putting on of an outward appearance (Hochschild, 1983). It involves suppressing true emotions and displaying emotions that are not truly felt. Surface acting is also related to the idea of putting on an act or a show in order to be consistent with organizational values. On the other hand, deep acting involves actually evoking the feelings needed in order to seem to feel the right feeling for the job (Hochschild, 1983). It is the genuine feeling of organizational values—taking on those values put forth by the company and expressing the emotions related to them. Both types of emotional labor require the need to regulate emotions—transform, suppress or control thoughts and feelings—and as a result, both types can be costly in terms of psychological effort especially in the context of emotionally demanding jobs (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2012). Such emotionally demanding jobs include flight attendants, nurses, and teachers. Due to its implications for the psychological well-being of employees, emotional labor research has largely focused on its effects on the employee condition.

Emotional Labor and the Employee Condition

Understanding how individuals engage in emotional labor and are affected by emotional labor can provide organizations with powerful tools to help improve their employees' wellbeing, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Levels of emotional labor are affected by the amount of job control. Higher job demands and lower job control are association with higher levels of emotional labor (Pugliesi, 1999). In

addition, emotional labor can increase perceptions of job stress, increase overall psychological distress, and decrease employee job satisfaction (Pugliesi, 1999).

The act of suppressing true emotion and displaying emotions not truly felt can be emotionally exhausting and can have a number of other adverse impacts on employee well-being. Emotional exhaustion was found to be more likely to be experienced when employees engaged frequently in surface acting, not deep acting (Grandey, 2003). It seems that the benefits of engaging in deep acting reduced emotional dissonance (i.e., the discomfort experienced when displaying an emotionally that is not genuinely felt) and increased positive reactions from customers, which may have restored an employee's emotional resources in a way that surface acting cannot. Not only is the act of displaying emotions that are not truly felt related to emotional exhaustion, but it is also linked to higher rates of employee turnover (Goodwin et al., 2011). In many situations, employees have to hold back and refrain from expressing negative emotions related to the job. As such, this high level of effort in suppressing negative emotions is related to high levels of emotional exhaustion (Sebastijanovic, 2011). As one might feel exhausted after a day of physical labor, emotion works in the same manner. Employees engaging in a large amount of work in order to suppress and regulate their emotions eventually become emotionally fatigued.

In a study that examined the effect of emotional labor on a variety of job roles, surface acting is positively related to depersonalization. So, when the employees fake their emotional expressions, they distance themselves more from customers (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002). Additionally, deep acting contributed to larger sense of personal efficacy, the sense that one can capably complete one's work well, while surface acting

resulted in a diminished sense of personal accomplishment (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002). This suggests that surface acting can lead to a number of adverse effects on employee well being whereas deep acting does not produce the same negative effects.

Emotional Labor and the World of Academia

Research in the field of emotional labor originated from Hochschild's (1983) seminal work on employees in "service with a smile" organizations (e.g., flight attendants) and has since then expanded to other professional contexts. Recent research has revealed that service oriented employees did not report higher levels of emotional exhaustion than employees in other occupations. Additionally, researchers have focused on the effects of emotional labor on professors. Based on the nature of the role, emotional labor is a fundamental aspect of the teaching role that has potentially negative consequences for well-being (Hargreaves, 2000). Professors constantly interacting with students and other faculty members engage in emotional labor in order to be congruent with the emotional displays of the university. In fact, professors labor less to display authoritative emotions than friendly emotions when dealing with disruptive students (Spencer, Smock & Fox, 2008). Thus, emotional labor is an integral concept in understanding the factors that make academic organization more successful. Similar to applied roles, professors who express genuine emotions at work tend to experience less emotional exhaustion, more job satisfaction, and more affective commitment to the institution (Mahoney et al., 2011). Specifically, genuine positive and negative expressions were related to both positive (job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and negative (emotional exhaustion) work outcomes. A recent study on teachers from the United Kingdom reported that emotional labor has several adverse

impacts on teacher job attitudes. Teachers who reported more emotional labor, (e.g., the amount of emotional dissonance between what emotions the teachers displayed and what was truly felt) were more emotionally exhausted, more dissatisfied with their job, and were more likely to depersonalize their students (Kinman et al., 2013). However, social support within the organization acted as a buffer against the negative impact of emotional labor on teacher well-being.

Individual differences shed some interesting insight into the study of emotional labor in an academic setting. Women are more engaged with students at a personal level and may require a higher degree of emotional labor (Bellas, 1999). Teaching and service require higher amounts of emotional labor, and these occupations are more aligned with characteristics and behaviors normally seen as feminine (Bellas, 1999). The role of tenure in academic settings also plays an important role as tenured faculty professors tend to labor less than untenured professors (Spencer, Smock, & Fox, 2008). As professors must engage in emotional labor throughout the critical tasks of their profession, it is necessary to examine how this emotional labor affects their employment experience and well-being. Recently, there has been a call in the field to focus on the student's view of emotional labor as it might add insight into the nature of emotional labor in academic settings (Mahoney et al., 2011).

Perceptions of Emotional Labor

Perceptions of emotional labor can greatly affect the interactions between employee and customer as well as the interactions between teacher and student. Administrative assistants who engage deep acting have a positive influence on observed interactions with the customer (Grandey, 2003). Additionally, employees perceived as

engaging in surface acting were rated as more likely to break character when interacting with a customer (Grandey, 2003). Perceptions of emotional labor reach outside of service interactions to academia, as well. Students are constantly interacting with professors in class and in private sessions in which their performance on different academic tasks is evaluated. The way in which professors emotionally labor can greatly affect the student experience.

Recently, Tunguz and Canevale (2011) conducted an experimental study in which students gave job interviews and process accountability and outcome accountability's effect on emotional labor were measured. Process accountability refers to the extent to which participants are appraised for the method by which they make decisions, whereas outcome accountability refers to the extent to which participants are accountable for the result of their decision-making (Tunguz & Carnevale, 2011). In their study, Tunguz and Carnevale found that process accountability increases emotional labor displays in participants and encourages successful interactions. This was the first study of its kind that examined student emotional labor displays and opened the door for further exploration of emotion labor in academia.

In addition, perceptions of emotional displays in performance appraisal settings have been a focus of research in recent years. The way in which one delivers negative and positive feedback matters to the recipient. In their study focusing on affective displays and message congruency, Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) had participants watch feedback videos that were either positive or negative in regards to the message. Additionally, the actors in the videos were to engage in either positive or negative emotional displays resulting into two congruent videos in which the emotional displays

matched the content of the message (e.g., positive emotional display while relaying positive feedback), and two incongruent videos (e.g., positive emotional display while relaying negative feedback). Positive and message-aligned leader emotional displays were perceived as more positive to students and more congruent with students' definition of a strong leader (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). Additionally, congruency between a leader's verbal message and expression of emotion determined the quality of the member's perception of the leader-student relationship (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). This evidence reinforces the importance of evaluating students' perceptions of professor emotional displays in order to further improve professor-student interactions.

In the context of performance appraisal, evaluators are expected to abide by certain emotional display rules. These emotional display rules can be seen as affective guidelines for acting and showing emotions in the context or giving feedback. In order to engage in such emotions appropriately, evaluators engage in emotional labor. In organizational settings, how evaluators engage in these emotions can greatly affect the reception of the feedback (Ritchie & O'Malley, 2009). Additionally, subordinate perceptions of managerial emotional laboring in performance appraisal settings could have implications for future performance, organizational commitment, perceived fairness, and influence subordinate display rules (Ritchie & O'Malley, 2009). Further research needs to be done in order to see how emotional labor displays affect the recipient's perceptions of the feedback.

As mentioned previously, labor has evolved from its focus on service oriented roles to academia, so we aim to add to this pool of research looking into the students' perceptions of emotional labor. More specifically, we look to explore the differences in

student perceptions of deep and surface acting when receiving negative feedback from a professor and how this affects students' reactions to the feedback. As such, we hypothesized that participants who received negative feedback from a professor engaging in deep acting would report higher motivation to use the feedback, perceive the feedback to be more fair and useful, and have increased memory of the feedback.

Method

Participants

Participants were undergraduate students from Butler University ($N= 67$). Nearly 13% of the participants were male, and 87.3% were female. The majority of participants (87.3%) identified themselves as Caucasian, whereas 12.8% of participants identified themselves as a minority. Participants were recruited through the use of Sona System's online sign up website. Participants were compensated for their participation by receiving extra credit for a psychology course of their choice or a Starbucks gift card for the amount of five dollars.

Procedure

Upon beginning the study, participants received a brief description about the procedure and signed informed consent forms attesting to their agreement in participating in the study. Students were then seated at a computer. The study first included a cover story explaining the University's interest in using a virtual feedback system in which professors will offer performance feedback via video instead of in person. This interest in a virtual feedback system purportedly decreased student discomfort in discussing their performance in the classroom.

Following the completion of a demographic survey, students completed an assessment center task in which they were asked to assess personnel in an organization and to rate the personnel from most expendable to least expendable. Participants were lead to believe that the computer would score their performance, and the feedback video they see would include comments typical for participants in the score range. Participants were told that there are four possible videos that could be viewed and were used in a previous study. However, in reality, all participants received the same negative feedback video regardless of their performance. Participants were randomly assigned to either the surface acting or deep acting conditions. The professor engaged in either surface acting (i.e., acting out or displaying the emotions associated with giving negative feedback without attempting to feel them) or deep acting (i.e., genuinely feeling and displaying the emotions related with giving negative feedback) while delivering the negative feedback message. In order to effectively portray the emotional labor strategies, the actor was trained in the emotional strategies behind engaging in deep acting, and surface acting (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2006). Participants then completed a series of questionnaires examining their reactions to the negative feedback. Participants were then debriefed on the feedback deception and purpose of the study.

Measures

Ekman Pictures of Facial Affect. Participants' abilities to recognize emotional displays were measured using Ekman's Pictures of Facial affect stimulus set (1976). The stimulus set contains six photos depicting a person expressing a different emotion such as depression or happiness. The exact photos can be seen in Appendix C.

Emotional Labor. In order to effectively measure students' perceptions of professor emotional labor displays, the Emotional Labor Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003) with additions from the 1998 version of the Emotional Labor Scale was employed, α= .81. This scale is comprised of 16 Likert type questions each measuring a form of emotional labor. The scale includes the item, "Pretend to have emotions that they didn't really feel?", rated from 1= "Rarely" to 5 = "Always". The scale measures levels of deep acting, surface acting, emotional labor variety, and frequency of use.

Perceived Fairness of Outcome Feedback. The measure of perceived fairness of feedback employed in this study was the 4-item measure adapted from Keeping, Makiney, Levy, Moon, & Gillette (1999) scored on 7-point scales ranging from 1= "strongly disagree" and 7= "strongly agree", α= .69. The scale includes the item, "I agree with the way my performance was rated."

Perceived Utility of Process Feedback. The measure of perceived utility employed in this study was the 4-item measure adapted Greller (1978), α= .79. This scale includes the item, " The feedback helped me learn how I can the task better," scored on 4-point scales ranging from 1= "I do not feel this way at all, not at all" and 4= "I feel exactly this way, completely".

Outcome Feedback Accuracy. The measure of feedback accuracy used was the 7-item questionnaire developed by Stone, Gueutal, & McIntosh (1984), α= .69. This measure is scored on a 7-point scale ranging from 1= "strongly disagree" and 7= "strongly agree". There are two items that are reverse scored in order to control for carry-over and practice effects (e.g., "I do not feel the feedback reflected my actual performance").

Motivation to Use Feedback. In order to effectively measure students' motivation to use the feedback they received in the video, the Motivation to Use Feedback (Dorfman, Stephan, & Loveland, 1986), α= .86. This scale is comprised of two Likert type questions adapted to fit an academic setting and includes the item, "I am willing to change my academic behaviors on the feedback I received", rated from 1= "strongly disagree" to 7= "strongly agree".

Emotional Reactions to Feedback In order to effectively measure students' reactions to the feedback they received in the video, the Emotional Reactions to Feedback (Thayer, 1989), α= .82. This scale is comprised of 10 Likert type questions and includes items like, "depressed" rated from 1= "definitely feel" to 4= "definitely do not feel".

Demands for Emotional Labor. An adaptation of Schaubroeck and Jones' (2000) demands for expression of positive efference and suppression of negative efference scales was used to assess students' expectations of professors' positive and negative emotional expressions. Both scales consist of 4 items totaling in 8 items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1= "strongly agree" and 5= "strongly disagree". The items were adapted to reflect the academic environment (e.g., "To be effective in the feedback session, professors must try to act excited, enthusiastic, proud, or determined."). The positive efference scale reports a reliability coefficient of α= .73, and the negative efference scale reports a reliability coefficient of α= .86.

Manipulation Check. An adaptation of Paswan, Pelton, & True (2005)'s Perceived Supervisor Sincerity scale was used to check the strength of the effectiveness of the different emotional displays (i.e., deep vs. surface acting) used by the professor. The scale consists of 6-items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=

"strongly agree" and 5= "strongly disagree". The items were adapted to reflect the academic environment (e.g., "The professor was genuinely interested in my welfare during the feedback session"). The reliability coefficient of the sincerity scale is α= .79.

Results

Throughout data collection, experimenters were trained to identify participants that seemed to have guessed the hypothesis or feel that the feedback was false. Experimenters were told to make note of each case. The five participants that were identified to have guessed the deception were then excluded from our analyses (resulting $N = 63$).

Additionally, we conducted analyses on each of the measures controlling for the participants' gender and the participants' scores on the Ekman Pictures of Facial Affect stimulus set. There was no significant effect of emotional labor displays on any of the measures when controlling for either the Ekman measure or gender.

Contrary to our hypothesis, there was no significant effect of emotional labor display strategy on participant emotional reactions to negative feedback, $F(1, 61)= .706$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However, the means on the scale were trending in the direction that supports the hypothesis, such that participants in the deep acting reported less negatively valenced reactions to the negative feedback. There was no main effect of emotional labor strategy on the participants' overall perceptions of emotional labor $F(1, 61)= .1.43$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Within the adapted emotional labor scale, we were able to parse out the items relating the participant perceptions of deep acting and surface acting. There was no significant effect of emotional labor display on participant perceptions of deep acting, $F(1, 61)= .1.43$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Additionally, there was no support for our hypothesis surrounding participant perceptions of surface acting, $F(1, 61)= .024$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

There was no significant effect on perceived supervisor sincerity, $F(1, 61)= 3.80, p > .05$,

$\eta^2=.04$. It is necessary to note that the means for perceived sincerity also trended in the

predicted direction such that those in the surface acting condition perceived the

supervisor as less sincere although no significant effect was found. There was no

significant effect found for neither demands of positive efference, $F(1, 61)= .03, p > .05$,

nor for demands of negative efference, $F(1, 61)= .067, p > .05$.

In terms of the feedback measures, a MANOVA was conducted, and there was no

significant effect of emotional labor display type on the majority of the feedback

measures. For perceived feedback fairness, $F(1, 61)= ..80, p > .05, \eta^2=.01$, we found little

support for our hypothesis. For perceived feedback accuracy, $F(1, 61)= .16, p > .05$,

$\eta^2=.00$, there was also no significant effect. Lastly, there was no significant effect on

participants' motivation to use the feedback, $F(1, 61)= .97 p > .05, \eta^2=.02$. However, as

predicted, there was a significant effect of emotional labor display on perceived feedback

utility, $F(1, 61)= 9.65, p < .05, \eta^2=.14$, such that participants in the deep acting condition,

on average reported the feedback as more useful than those in the surface acting

condition. A complete table of all correlations for all of measures can be found in

Appendix A1. Tables containing the means and F-values of the measures can be found in

Appendix A2 and Appendix A3.

Discussion

Following the trajectory of emotional labor research, we sought to expand on the

research in academic contexts. The purpose of our study was to discover effects of

professor emotional displays on student perceptions and reactions to outcome feedback.

We sought to discover if faking or actually feeling the emotions related to negative

feedback had an effect on students' motivation to use the feedback, emotional reactions

to the negative feedback, and perceptions of supervisor sincerity, emotional labor, feedback fairness, utility, and accuracy.

Our results suggest that when giving negative feedback, it is desirable to genuinely feel the emotions related to the feedback. Faking it, or portraying emotions without truly feeling them, is not conducive to creating a positive feedback environment (Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004). Our significant findings surrounding feedback utility show that students found the feedback more useful when the professor engaged in deep acting and genuinely expressed emotions when appraising the student's performance. This provides further evidence for the finding that how a manager engages in emotional labor affects the way a subordinate receives the feedback (Ritchie & O'Malley, 2009). Additionally, the students perceived the professor as more sincere when he engaged in deep acting rather than surface acting, although the results were not significant. These findings could improve the interactions between teachers and students. Due to the frequency at which students complete exams, papers, and projects during their time in school, feedback interactions occur year round, making the need to understand perceptions of emotional labor that much more important.

Overall, the utility measure was the most sensitive in finding an effect of the emotional displays on the students' reactions to the feedback. Based on its composition, it could be that it most closely targets student's affective reactions to genuine displays of emotions. It is also most applicable in the setting of study. None of the items in the scale needed to be altered in order to reflect the impersonal and virtual environment of the feedback.

This raises an important point about the rest of the scales. Outside of the Utility measure, there was no significant effect of type of emotional strategy on any of the other measures. One reason behind these findings could be the modifications made to the scales. The Emotional Labor scale for example, was created with the intent that the scales are to be used on actors of emotional labor (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). It was not originally meant for the perceivers of emotional labor. In order to fit the academic and virtual context of the study, the wording of items on the scale was altered. Therefore, it may not be as sensitive to students' perception of emotional feedback. Due to the minimal amount of research on perceptions of emotional labor, there are no scales currently available that specifically target effects of emotional displays in this manner.

This study sought to expand on the emotional labor research by viewing emotional labor as a two-way process. Instead of only considering the effects of emotional labor on the actor, we propose that there is more to the story and recipients of emotional labor are equally affected by the interaction. Our study expands upon the research of Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) in which perceptions of affective display strategies in leaders were examined. When affective displays were congruent with the content of the message given, the quality of the leader-student relationship improved and increased students' perceptions of the quality of the leader. Similar to our study, this research looks at emotional labor perceptions in a virtual setting and academic context.

Also, looking at emotional labor through the lens of academia, Tunguz and Carnevale (2011) examined process and outcome accountability and their effect on students' use of emotional labor. They explored the emotional labor outside of organizational contexts and sought to discover the mechanisms behind emotional labor in

students. Similarly, our study expands on this literature by looking the processes behind the interaction between a professor and student. Thus, our study generalizes reasonably well to an academic context. It utilizes student participants and simulates a realistic feedback content in which their work is evaluated by a professor.

Another factor that is important to note is the gender of the professor. In an academic setting, interacting with students and giving feedback is seen as more feminine (Bellas, 1993). So, it could be that using a male professor is not as strong of a manipulation due to the perception that giving feedback is a more feminine behavior. Thus, using a female professor could make the manipulation stronger overall. Additionally, utilizing a female professor in the study would introduce another independent variable, enabling us to better understand how gender and emotional labor work to affect feedback recipients.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

Although the results of the present study provide additional insight into emotional labor in the context of academia, it is not without its limitations. One limitation to the study is the virtual component to negative feedback. In order to ensure that students all received the same negative feedback experience controlling for extraneous variables, the professor's feedback needed to be recorded and shown through a video. This virtual component to the study could have affected the way in which participants perceived the feedback and emotional displays employed by the professor. It might have been more difficult to perceive the professor's emotions than it would in person. Additionally, the screen size in which the video was shown is much smaller than real life, face-to-face encounters.

Due to need to use video feedback, the content of the feedback was not specific to each participant's work. So, it was necessary to deceive the participants into believing that the comments made in the video are typical for someone who received their score. While experimenters were trained to vet out participants that may have guessed that the feedback received was bogus, some participants may have guessed the hypothesis or manipulation without expressing it to the experimenter. Due to the impersonal manner in which the feedback was given, it was difficult to convince participants that the feedback they received corresponded to the work they did on the task. This then would affect the way in which they perceive the feedback, thus affecting how they would respond to the measures employed later in the study. However, due to technology's ever growing presence in organizations, it is becoming increasingly more important to understand these effects in a virtual environment. Organizations are beginning to rely on employees in virtual roles and virtual tools such as video conferencing. In order to improve and better understand these interactions, it is necessary to study employee's reactions to emotional displays in these virtual settings.

Thirdly, due to the virtual setup of the experiment, the study experienced some technical difficulties in its implementation. There were several participants that had to view the feedback video two times before the program moved on to the reaction measures. This additional viewing could have affected the way in which the participants responded to the measures. The video would play in the corner of the screen rather than the middle. Additionally, other technical difficulties forced us to use just one set of feedback videos. Therefore, we were only able to utilize a male actor in the feedback videos and were unable to explore gender's effect on emotional labor perceptions.

Future research could explore subordinate perceptions of managerial emotional labor displays in an organizational setting. Performance appraisal occurs frequently in organizations and carries weight in determining personnel decisions, pay increases, and the effectiveness of training programs. Due to the outcomes of performance management sessions, these interactions can be difficult for both parties involved. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to explore emotional labor in this context in order to better inform and train managers on the strategies that can help make these interactions more worthwhile to subordinates.

Lastly, if trained properly to keep the feedback message and feedback environment consistent in each trial, future research should consider delivering the feedback face-to-face. It may be easier for participants to perceive and react more strongly to the emotional display strategies used by the professor if the interactions were made in person. This would also reflect a real world performance management scenario better than using a video to relay feedback.

Conclusion

Our study expands the traditional view of emotional labor's effect on the actor and places the focus on the perceiver of emotional labor in the context of performance appraisal. These performance appraisal sessions can be emotionally trying on recipients and evaluators. Based on our results, it is necessary for managers and professors to engage in deep acting in order to make the feedback message more useful to the recipient. With this knowledge, evaluators in academic or organizational settings can be better prepared to make the performance management process more motivating to learners.

References

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

Bellas, M L. (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *561*(1), 96-100.

Biron, M., & van Veldhoven, M. (2012). Emotional labour in service work: Psychological flexibility and emotion regulation. *Human Relations*, *65*(10), 1259-1282.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *60*(1), 17-39.

Diefendorff, J M. "Antecedents and consequences of emotional display rule perceptions." *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88.2 (2003), 284.

Diefendorff, J M. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*(8), 945.

Goodwin. (2011). Relationships between emotional labor, job performance, and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 538-548.

Grandey A (2005). Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 96*, 38-55.

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

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mixed emotions: Teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(8), 811-826.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Groth, M., Paul, M., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). Are all smiles created equal? How emotional contagion and emotional labor affect service relationships. *Journal of Marketing,* 58-73.

Hochschild, A. R. (2003). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Univ of California Press.

Kinman, G., Wray, S., & Strange, C., (2011): Emotional labour, burnout and job satisfaction in UK teachers: the role of workplace social support, *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 31*(7), 843-856

Mahoney, K. T., Buboltz Jr, W. C., Buckner V, J. E., & Doverspike, D. (2011). Emotional labor in American professors. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 16*(4), 406-423.

Näring, G., Vlerick, P., & Van de Ven, B. (2012). Emotion work and emotional exhaustion in teachers: the job and individual perspective. *Educational Studies, 38*(1), 63-72.

Newcombe, M J. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *The leadership quarterly, 13*(5), 601-614.

Pugliesi, K. The consequences of emotional labor: Effects on work stress, job satisfaction, and well-being. *Motivation and emotion* 23.2 (1999), 125-154.

Ritchie, S. A., & O'Malley, A. L. (2009). The role of emotional labor in performance appraisal: Are supervisors getting into the act? *Academy of Management Proceedings.*

Sebastijanovic, M. (2011). Antecedents and outcomes of emotional labor. Dissertation abstracts international, *71*(10-A)

Spencer, S & Smock, B.R., (2008, April). *Service with Authority: Antecedents of Emotional Labor in Academia.* Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, Inc., San Francisco, CA

Steelman, L.A., Levy, P.A., & Snell, A.F. (2004). The feedback environment scale (FES): Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64(1),* 165-184.

Trougakos, J P. (2008). Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. Academy of Management journal, *51*(1), 131-146.

Tunguz, S. (2011). Social context effects in the display of emotion: Accountability in a simulated organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(6), 1371-1398.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Key Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Emotion Labor Perceptions	2.74	.53	(.83)										
2. Emotional Reactions	2.21	.51	.16	(.82)									
3. Perceived Fairness	3.43	1.10	.09	.05	(.69)								
4. Perceived Accuracy	2.72	1.02	.13	.14	.70**	(.69)							
5. Motivation to use Feedback	4.84	1.35	.46**	.22	.52**	.46**	(.86)						
6. Perceived Sincerity	3.74	.70	.08	-.17	.20	.11	.25*	(.79)					
7. Perceived Utility	2.19	.61	.32*	.14	.25*	.14	.49**	.49**	(.79)				
8. Positive Efference	3.89	.74	.20	.06	-.183	.09	.04	.11	.26*	(.73)			
9. Negative Efference	3.10	.95	.09	.19	.20	.16	.37**	.22	.34*	.32*	(.86)		
10. Surface Acting Perceptions	2.48	.75	.56**	.01	.04	-.00	.14	-.16	-.01	-.11	.00	(.70)	
11. Deep Acting Perceptions	3.18	.81	.65**	-.05	.16	.07	.37**	.25	.25*	.12	.09	.16	(.71)

Note. N=63. Numbers in parentheses are Cronbach's alphas. *p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 2

Effects of Emotional Labor on Key Variables

DV	Condition	*M*	*F*	η^2
Emotional Labor Perceptions	Deep Acting	2.83	.143	.04
	Surface Acting	2.65		
Emotional Reactions	Deep Acting	2.26	.706	.01
	Surface Acting	2.16		
Perceived Sincerity	Deep Acting	3.92	3.80	.04
	Surface Acting	3.58		
Positive Efference	Deep Acting	3.92	.03	.00
	Surface Acting	3.90		
Negative Efference	Deep Acting	3.13	.067	.00
	Surface Acting	3.07		
Surface Acting Perceptions	Deep Acting	2.49	.024	.00
	Surface Acting	2.46		
Deep Acting Perceptions	Deep Acting	3.01	.143	.04
	Surface Acting	3.31		

Note. *N*=63 where Deep acting (*n*= 30) and Surface Acting (*n*= 33). *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$.

Table 3

MANOVA: The Effects of Emotional Labor on Feedback Variables

DV	Condition	*M*	*F*	η^2
Perceived Fairness	Deep Acting	3.57	.80	.01
	Surface Acting	3.31		
Perceived Accuracy	Deep Acting	2.78	.16	.00
	Surface Acting	2.67		
Motivation to use Feedback	Deep Acting	5.02	.97	.02
	Surface Acting	4.68		
Perceived Utility	Deep Acting	2.43	9.65**	.14
	Surface Acting	1.98		

Note. $N=63$, where Deep acting (*n*= 30) and Surface Acting (*n*= 33). *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$.

Appendix A: Demographic Measure

Please indicate your status on each of the following questions:

Age: _____

Gender: Male   Female

Race: Caucasian

African American

Asian

Hispanic

Middle Eastern

Pacific Islander

Other: _____

Year in School:

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Other:_____

Appendix B: Ekman's Pictures of Facial Affect

Anger

Fear

Disgust

Surprise

Happiness

Sadness

Appendix C: Emotional Labor Scale
On an average during the feedback, how frequently did the professor:

_____1. Display specific emotions required by their job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____2. Adopt certain emtions as part of their job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____3. Express intense emotions.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____4.Express particular emotions needed for their job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____5. Use a wide variety of emotions when giving feedback.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____6. Resist expressing their true feelings.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____7. Pretend to have emotions that they didn't really feel.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____8. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that were needed during feedback.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____9. Show some strong emotions.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____10. Express many different emotions when giving feedback

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____11. Hide their true feelings about the feedback.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____12. Try to actually feel the emotions they have to show as part of giving feedback.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____13. Display many different kinds of emotions.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____14. Try to be a good actor/actress

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

_____15. Feel like they needed to put on a "show" or "performance".

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D: Percevied Fairness of Outcome Feedback

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

1. The feedback was fair.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

2. I agree with my feedback.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

3. I agree with the way my performance was rated.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral

5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

    4. The performance feedback fairly represented my performance.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Appendix E: Perceived Feedback Utility

    1. The feedback helped me learn how I can the task better.
1 = I do not feel this way at all, not at all.
2 = I feel somewhat like this, a little.
3 = I feel generally like this, pretty much.
4 = I feel exactly this way, completely.

    2. I learned a lot from the feedback.
1 = I do not feel this way at all, not at all.
2 = I feel somewhat like this, a little.
3 = I feel generally like this, pretty much.
4 = I feel exactly this way, completely.

    3. The feedback helped me understand my mistakes.
1 = I do not feel this way at all, not at all.
2 = I feel somewhat like this, a little.
3 = I feel generally like this, pretty much.
4 = I feel exactly this way, completely.

    4. I have a clearer idea of what is expected from me because of the feedback.
1 = I do not feel this way at all, not at all.
2 = I feel somewhat like this, a little.
3 = I feel generally like this, pretty much.
4 = I feel exactly this way, completely.

Appendix F: Outcome Feedback Accuracy

1. The feedback was an accurate evaluation of my performance.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

2. I do <u>not</u> feel the feedback reflected my actual performance.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

3. I believe the feedback was correct.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

4. The feedback was consistent with how I felt I performed.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

5. The feedback was <u>not</u> a true assessment of my work.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Appendix G: Motivation to Use Feedback

1. I am willing to change my *work* behaviors based on the feedback I received.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

2. I want to improve my performance based on the feedback provided.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Appendix H: Emotional Reactions to Negative Feedback

1(*definitely feel*) to 4 (*definitely do not feel*), the extent to which adjectives (jittery, edgy, fearful, anxious, tense, bored, depressed, discouraged, gloomy, fatigued) describe your feeling "at this moment."

Appendix I: Demands for Expression of Positive Efference

1. To be effective in the feedback session, professors must try to act excited, enthusiastic, proud, or determined.
    1 = strongly disagree
    2 = somewhat disagree
    3 = neither agree nor disagree
    4 = somewhat agree
    5 = strongly agree
2. To be effective in the feedback session, professors must act cheerful and sociable.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

3. To be effective in the feedback session, professors must act interested or attentive to the student receiving the feedback.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

4. To be effective in the feedback session, professors must try to share in the enthusiasm or liveliness of the student receiving the feedback.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Appendix J: Demands for Suppression of Negative Efference

1. To be effective while giving feedback, professors must try to suppress how upset or distressed they may feel.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

2. To be effective while giving feedback, sprofessor must suppress any anger and contempt they may feel.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

3. To be effective while giving feedback, professors must try to pretend they are not upset or distressed.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

4. To be effective while feedback, professors must try to pretend they are not angry or feeling contempt.
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Appendix K: Perceived Supervisor Sincerity

1. The professor freely exchanged information and opinions about my performance during the feedback session.
    1 = strongly disagree
    2 = somewhat disagree
    3 = neither agree nor disagree
    4 = somewhat agree
    5 = strongly agree

2. The professor was sincere in dealings with me during the feedback session.
    1 = strongly disagree
    2 = somewhat disagree
    3 = neither agree nor disagree
    4 = somewhat agree
    5 = strongly agree

3. The professor was honest during the feedback session.
    1 = strongly disagree
    2 = somewhat disagree
    3 = neither agree nor disagree
    4 = somewhat agree
    5 = strongly agree

4. The professor was genuinely interested in my welfare during the feedback session.
    1 = strongly disagree
    2 = somewhat disagree
    3 = neither agree nor disagree
    4 = somewhat agree
    5 = strongly agree

5. The professor kept his/her word during the feedback session.
   1 = strongly disagree
   2 = somewhat disagree
   3 = neither agree nor disagree
   4 = somewhat agree
   5 = strongly agree
6. The professors told the truth during the feedback session.
   1 = strongly disagree
   2 = somewhat disagree
   3 = neither agree nor disagree
   4 = somewhat agree
   5 = strongly agree

Appendix L: Assessment Center Task

Step 1. You are one of the executives in charge of talent management in an organization forced to undergo downsizing. Your specific position is to act as Human Resource Manager with hiring and talent management authority for the departments within the organization. After reviewing some basic information about your organization, read the employee profiles that follow and rank-order the 10 employees from "1" for least expendable to "10" for most expendable.

Step 2. Make sure to look over the rankings you have selected to make sure the organization will still run effectively after your decision has been implemented. Make sure each of the different departments are fairly represented in your decision.
   Follow these instructions for reaching the best decision:
   1. Try to reach the best possible decision, while fairly representing each department
   2. Avoid changing your mind simply to please each department. The organization's best interests should be kept in mind.
   3. Make sure to consider your decision from every angle, as if you were working with other team members. View those possible differences of opinion as a help rather than a hindrance in decision making.

COMPANY PROFILE

Delta, started in 1998, is a small, family-owned firm in the microcomputer business. The company grew rapidly because of its microcomputer boards, disk drives, optical disks, tape backup drives, and innovative approaches to solving computer hardware problems. Both managers and workers have put in long hours, often sacrificing their personal time to get the company off the ground.
   Unfortunately, a significant downturn in the economy has caused a reduction in sales, and it is increasingly apparent that some adjustments will have to be made if the company is to survive. Delta needs to be prepared for a ten percent reduction in work force.
   The president has asked you to examine the personal information of the 10 employees in the company who are most expendable. Your committee will have to make a series of

recommendations for a downsizing (layoff) of employees, all of whom are married, of the same age (28), and all with no previous experience before joining Delta. You are meeting to rank-order the employees from "1" for least likely to "10" for most likely to be laid off. There are at least 11 employees in each of the 5 departments. The employees other than those on the list you have been provided with have been with the company at least eight years, and it is not feasible to lay them off at this time.

Among the criteria you may want to consider in making your rankings are:

1. Education
2. Performance
3. Seniority
4. Technical ability
5. Attitude
6. Leadership
7. Effectiveness
8. Efficiency
9. Job function
10. Social ability

EMPLOYEE PROFILES

Finance

Gwen—seniority three and one-half years; four-year college education; has performed about average on annual appraisal (75 percent); average technical abilities and leadership potential; a steady, grinding worker; works long hours, has been working on employee benefit plan for two years; is a nonsmoker and nondrinker; has frequently complained about working with cigarette smokers.

Hal—seniority five and one-half years; four-year college education; has been rated average and above in annual appraisals (80 percent); high technical abilities; average leadership; always in on Saturday mornings; frequently works through lunch hour; has been working on committee to computerize payroll for past 18 months; is well liked and gets along with fellow workers; is a very neat and stylish dresser

Research and Development

Carole—Ph.D. in engineering; seniority two and one-half years; has been above-average research engineer in performance appraisal (90 percent); high technical and leadership abilities; works unusual hours (sometimes work late at night, then doesn't come in until noon the next day); developed patent on a new solid-state circuit device last year; seldom attends social events; is said to be friendly but often disagrees and conflicts with fellow workers

Dave—M.S. in engineering; seniority three and one-half years; has been average to above average on performance appraisals (75 percent); average technical abilities; average leadership; works steady 8AM to 5PM; is working on several R&D projects but none yet completed; always ready for a coffee break or joke-telling session; is well liked by coworkers; never complains about bad assignments

Marketing

Tony—M.B.A.; seniority two years; has been rated as performing better than 90 percent on performance appraisals; high technical abilities; above average leadership; works erratic hours (often comes into office at 9:30 and frequently plays golf on Wednesday afternoons); sold the highest number of product units in his product line; seldom socializes with fellow workers; often criticized because his desk is messy and disorganized, piled with correspondence and unanswered memos

Ken—Four-year college degree; seniority 18 months; has been rated an above-average to outstanding performer (80 percent); high technical abilities; average leadership; has been criticized for not making all of his sales calls, but has a good sales record; developed advertising campaign for a new product line; although a good bowler refuses to bowl on company team; has been rumored to drink quite heavily on occasion

Human Resource Management

Eduardo—Four-year college degree; seniority 18 months; has been rated above average as performer (80 percent); average technical abilities; high leadership; is frequently away from his desk and often misses meetings; has designed and implemented a new management development program; is well liked although frequently has differences of opinion with line managers; often takes long coffee breaks and lunch hours

Frank—Two-year college degree; seniority four years; has been rated average to above average as performer (70 percent); low technical abilities; above average leadership; works long hours; regularly attends all meetings; has been redesigning performance appraisal systems for past two years; is involved in many company activities; known as a friendly, easygoing man

Manufacturing

Irv—Four-year college degree; seniority 15 months; rated an outstanding performer (90 percent); high technical abilities; moderate leadership; has been criticized for not attending committee meetings; designed and implemented the computerized production control process; does not socialize with fellow employees; known as sloppy dresser (often wearing white or red socks with a suit, for instance)

Jackie—high school; seniority six years; rated an average performer (75 percent); average technical abilities; low leadership; always attends meetings; works steady 8AM to 5PM hours and Saturday mornings; has chaired committee to improve plant safety for past two years; participates in all social events; plays on company bowling and softball teams; known for a very neat, organized office

Appendix M: Actor Feedback Script

Hello, my name is Dr. Scarborough. I am an assistant professor of Organizational Behavior and Human Resources at IUPUI. I have reviewed your work on the Assessment Center Case Study. Unfortunately, your performance is uncommonly poor compared to the population that has completed this assignment. A team of Human Resource professionals and Organizational Behavior experts has developed an ideal standard by which to evaluate these employees. The sequence in which you recommend firing these employees only has 20% overlap with this ideal standard. In your assessment, you failed to utilize several important skills that would have enabled to come to a better conclusion regarding the organizational setup of Delta Company. By organizing the company in such a fashion, you have ensured its continued economic struggle. However, by improving on several strategies, I know that you will be able to better analyze the situation and make the better, educated decisions that I know you capable of. Make sure to pay special attention to the skills and accomplishments of the particular employee—as past performance is a strong indication of future performance. Additionally, it is important to have a strong mixture of subordinates and leaders in those that you keep. It is important to not pay too much attention to age and/or gender in your analysis. Even though your performance was poor, I am confident in your ability to improve in completing related assignments or making difficult decisions like this in the future.