Emotional Labour and Self-Determination Theory: A Continuum of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Causes of Emotional Expression and Control

RICHARD SISLEY[*] AND ROY SMOLLAN[**]

Abstract

What drives employees to engage in each of the three forms of emotional labour: surface acting, deep acting and genuine expression? The motivational bases of these behaviours have seldom been examined. We therefore explore them through the continuum of controlled to autonomous drivers of behaviour which are central to Self-Determination Theory. The concepts of extrinsic motivation (external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and integrated regulation) and intrinsic motivation are integrated with forms of emotional labour to explain how and why employees regulate their emotional expression.

Introduction

Emotional labour (EL) is performed when employees express what the organisation would consider as 'appropriate' emotions and suppress the display of 'inappropriate' emotions (Brotheridge and Lee, 2002). As a general rule, employees are expected to be polite, warm and friendly to internal and external stakeholders while expressions of anger and frustration are strongly discouraged (Smollan, 2006). If these responses are not genuine employees may feel the need to work at making them genuine or fake them (Hochschild, 1983). They tend to do what the organisation requires of them because of the explicit or implicit relationships between EL and reward or punishment (Sutton and Rafaeli, 1988). Achieving success in meeting any type of job demand should result in praise, good performance appraisals, job advancement and greater remuneration, and these benefits could be expected to translate into greater job satisfaction. Conversely, employees who are judged as weak in meeting certain job demands may suffer criticism and slow, if any, career progress. Applying this logic to EL, however, fails to explain why particular types of emotional regulation are selected by individual employees in a given situation. Indeed, despite the surge of scholarly interest in emotions at work, and EL in particular (Ashkanasy and Daus, 2013), little attention has been paid to what motivates employees to regulate their emotions. This is even more surprising given that the consequences for employee health and wellbeing of performing EL are often negative (Prati, Perrewé, Liu and Ferris; 2009; Pugh, Groth and Hennig-Thurau, 2011).

[*] Richard Sisley, PhD is a Senior Lecturer at AUT, Auckland, New Zealand, richard.sisley@aut.ac.nz

[**] Roy Smollan, PhD is a Senior Lecturer at AUT, Auckland, New Zealand, roy.smollan@aut.ac.nz

The study of EL is a multi-disciplinary endeavour, with Grandey, Diefendorff and Rupp (2013) suggesting that EL can be viewed through three primary lenses: sociology (as an occupational requirement), organisational behaviour (as emotional displays) and psychology (as an intrapsychic process). While all three lenses should be used to provide a holistic picture, our emphasis in this article is on the intrapsychic process, specifically on the role of motivation in embracing or resisting EL-related job demands. However, we draw on the other two perspectives to provide the context for motivation to perform EL. We also locate our study in the context of employment relations (which has seldom been explicitly done for EL) because EL goes to the heart of many work role requirements and creates many tensions. (Diefendorff, Richard and Croyle, 2006; Hochschild, 1983). Lamm and Rasmussen (2008: 110) maintain that employment relations is "an area where there are continuous power struggles and conflict over how we work, what our rights and obligations are and what constitutes acceptable conditions of work."

The emotional component of work roles has grown as the number of jobs in the service sector increases and as some of the 'soft skills' (Nickson, Warhurst, Commander, Hurrell and Cullen, 2012) of internal and external work relationships have become more important. Prior research into EL has focused on its nature, the various forms or strategies employees use and the consequences for organisational performance and individual wellbeing. However, it has seldom addressed what motivates employees to express and control emotions beyond the reward/punishment consequences.

The key research question we seek to answer is: In what ways are forms of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation related to different EL strategies? We therefore draw on concepts from Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci and Ryan, 2002) which has been used extensively in organisational and social psychology (see Gagné and Deci, 2005; Hagger and Chatzisarantis, 2009; Stone, Deci and Ryan, 2009). We begin by reviewing the research into EL, position EL in the field of employment relations and provide an overview of SDT. We then integrate EL and SDT by developing a table of possible employee responses and an accompanying set of propositions that can be empirically tested.

The Nature of EL

Previous research into EL has defined it in many different ways (Glomb and Tews, 2004; Hsieh, Yang and Fu, 2011). The originator of the term, Hochschild (1983: 7), explained EL as the "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display." Brotheridge and Lee (2003: 365) regard it as the effort made by employees to "regulate their emotional display in an attempt to meet organisationally-based expectations specific to their roles." According to Morris and Feldman (1996: 997) it is "the effort, planning and control needed to express organizationally-desired emotion during interpersonal transactions." Therefore one key point of difference in definitions of EL is whether it is primarily the management of emotion or the management of one's communication of the emotion through voice, facial expression and other forms of body language. Of prime concern to the organisation is that the outward display of emotion is appropriate and consequently the deleterious effects, such employee burnout and lack of authenticity (Grandey, 2003; Pugh et al., 2011), have often gone unnoticed. Authors have also suggested that the concept of EL needs to be seen together with aesthetic labour, the effort to 'look good' (Nickson et al., 2009) as part of what Sheane (2011) terms presentational labour.

EL in the Context of Employment Relations

Rasmussen (2009) notes that employment relations is a multi-disciplinary field, with its roots in economics, sociology, psychology, politics, history and law. He identifies four key elements of the field: the power and interests of employer and employee, the strategies they use to enhance their interests, the use of formal and informal rules and processes, and the contexts in which employment relationships operate.

These four elements can also be used to analyse the construct of EL. Firstly, the requirement to hide or show emotions at work can put employer and employee into adversarial positions where power relationships are uneven. Secondly, employers may adopt strategies that promote the use of EL to achieve organisational ends, like customer satisfaction, and employees may resort to faking the appropriate emotions as a way of meeting job expectations but still suffer the consequences. As Hochschild (2013, p. xiii) comments 30 years after the publication of her seminal book:

> Tellingly, in the United States the idea of emotional labor has been embraced by business advice gurus as an undiscovered resource and means of competitive advantage, and by labor unions as a cause of burnout deserving of financial compensation.

Thirdly, as Pugh, Diefendorff and Moran (2013) point out, by factoring in emotional display and suppression into the human resource management processes of job analysis, job descriptions, selection, training and performance management, organisations create implicit or explicit feeling or display rules (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Hochschild, 1983). Fourthly, EL is influenced by social, professional and organisational forces (Bolton, 2005; Smollan, 2006), which influence an organisation's culture and determine tasks requirements in various jobs. While EL has been described as a process whereby feelings are commercialised for profit (van Maanen and Kunda, 1989), studies have also revealed the need to perform EL in the public sector (e.g. Guy, Newman and Mastracci, 2008; Hsieh et al., 2011), particularly in healthcare (e.g. Mann, 2005) and in non-profit organisations (e.g. Callahan, 2000; Eschenfelder, 2009).

Targets of EL

Early research into EL focused on service encounters in which staff needed to show positive emotions and curtail negative emotions to customers and clients to enhance their satisfaction. Hochschild's (1983) study of airline attendants was followed by studies of staff in other service industries, such as convenience stores (Sutton and Rafaeli, 1998), call centres (Song and Liu, 2010), fast-food outlets (Tan, Foo, Chong and Ng, 2003), financial services (Bagozzi, Verbeke and Gavino, 2003) and adventure tourism (Sharpe, 2005). Research has also been conducted in professional areas where practitioners meet clients, for example, in healthcare (Mann, 2005), law (Harris, 2002; Lively, 2002) and academia (Mahoney, Buboltz, Buckner and Doverspike, 2011). Given that leaders need to generate commitment and enthusiasm in followers, EL researchers have turned their attention to the emotional content of their roles (Humphrey, Pollak and Hawver, 2008; Lewis, 2000). Humphrey et al. (2008) have separated the roles of those significantly engaged in EL as those in customer service, the caring professions, social control (e.g. police and bill collectors) and leadership. Yet every organisational role to some degree requires staff to regulate their emotions to maintain productive relationships with respect to different 'audiences' (Harris, 2002), including internal stakeholders, such as colleagues and subordinates, and representatives of external agencies, such as clients, suppliers, government, media and investors.

Types of EL

Hochschild (1983) identified two processes that employees use to be able to display or suppress emotions. Surface acting requires the management of emotional expression so that the other party gets the impression that appropriate feelings are shown. This does not require the person to feel the emotion, merely to simulate it. Deep acting, however, involves considerably more effort as the employee aims to experience the emotion so that in due course it is revealed as authentic expression. In their analysis of the cultural practices at Disneyland, van Maanen and Kunda (1989) reveal the painstaking attempts by the organisation to convince staff that they *should* feel the right emotions. Sharpe (2005) reports that her respondents, outdoor guides, had been persuaded to believe that being genuine in emotional expression was morally correct and that faking emotion was insufficient. One guide observed of an encounter with a difficult tourist: "It was tough trying to be genuine and sincere and encouraging. But it was important and it was a good lesson for me" (p. 44).

Blau, Fertig, Tatum, Connaughton, Park and Marshall (2010) argue that the labels of surface acting and deep acting are too limiting and therefore need to be broadened. They contend that difficult clients present much greater challenges to the employee. They argue that surface acting should therefore be separated into basic surface acting, which is the effort to regulate one's emotional expression in the normal course of events, and challenged surface acting, which is considerably more difficult, and occurs when the other, usually a client, acts in a demanding, even hostile, way. For example, referring to EL in the non-profit sector Eschenfelder (2009: 175) suggests that:

> …workers often deal with people who are sick, abusive or abused, down on their luck, without homes, or dealing with life histories beyond most people's imagination. Because of difficult situations being faced by these clients, they can be unpleasant to work with, overly demanding, dishonest, manipulative, and disobedient.

Blau et al. (2010) distinguish between three forms of deep acting. Basic deep acting is defined as, "changing one's display and also the felt emotion" (p. 193), perspective taking occurs when one is trying to see an issue from the other's point of view, and positive refocus involves looking beyond the negative elements of an encounter to find something positive.

Researchers have also argued that the display of positive emotion is often quite genuine and needs no acting (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Glomb and Tews, 2004; Mahoney et al., 2011). Some scholars contend that this is not EL because the actor does not have to work at producing the 'appropriate' emotion (Blau et al., 2011). However, other researchers (e.g. Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Dieffendorff, Croyle and Gosserand, 2006; Glomb and Tews, 2004) do consider the expression of naturally felt emotions to be EL because energy still has to be expended and controlled for it to be effective. Glomb and Tews (2004) found in their empirical study of a number of occupational groups that genuine expression can also be emotionally exhausting. Diefendorff et al. (2006) demonstrated empirically that genuine expression produced a distinctly different form of emotional strategy from that associated with deep acting and surface acting. The natural expression of negative emotion is seldom investigated by scholars (Mahoney et al., 2011), presumably because it is usually frowned on, except within prescribed limits in context-specific circumstances, such as debt-collecting (Sutton, 1991), police work (Glomb and Tews, 2004), the disciplining of students (Mahoney

et al., 2011) and supervisor-subordinate relationships (Lewis, 2000). Mann (2005) also advises that natural expression in caring professions such as nursing may not always be effective as the practitioners may become too embroiled in the emotions of the patients.

Causes of EL

The most common reason offered for appropriate expression and suppression of emotion is that it is considered to be in the interests of the organisation. In the early focus on service providers, researchers took the position that when staff display friendliness and warmth to customers or clients the latter respond with purchases and repeat custom as demonstrations of their satisfaction. Thus what have been termed 'feeling rules' (Hochschild, 1979), or more accurately 'display rules' (Ekman, 1973), have been explicitly and implicitly created to signal to staff how important it is to express and control emotions appropriately (Diefendorff et al., 2006). Researchers have also shown that different industries have different EL expectations (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993) and that professions develop formal codes of conduct and informal expectations of appropriate emotional management (e.g. Harris, 2000; Mann, 2005).

Yet, as Smollan (2006) points out, there are many other drivers of EL, such as norms from the wider social environment, which are influenced by national and ethnic factors, by group expectations and socially-constructed gender and power roles, and by a range of factors within the individual, such as emotional intelligence, personality and self-identity. Emotional regulation (Gross, 1998) is influenced by a variety of social contexts, such as family, school, sport, religion and community life. The processes by which we regulate our emotions at work may not necessarily be very different from these other contexts, although the specific drivers may be somewhat different.

Bolton (2005) identifies four motives for EL: pecuniary (it is required for a paid job role), prescriptive (based on company values or derived from codes of conduct for professionals), philanthropic (offered as an 'extra' without being required) and presentational (influenced by wider social norms). It is quite possible that employees are motivated at different times by all of these forces in carrying out their jobs but, with the exception of the philanthropic, all seem to have an extrinsic focus. While Bolton's framework provides a useful basis for examining employee motives, it does not adequately explain when a person uses surface acting or deep acting or is expressing a genuine emotion.

Emotional intelligence is the ability to understand and manage one's own emotions and understand and appropriately respond to the emotions of others (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). In service encounters, for example, this provides sales people with the skills to understand the frustration or anger of customers, helps them to control their own negative emotions, such as irritation or anxiety, and allows for a productive resolution of difficult issues. As Prati et al. (2009) demonstrated, it also enables the sales staff to reduce the strain associated with surface acting. Austin, Dore and O'Donovan (2008) report that emotional intelligence (measured using a scale that mixes ability with personality) was negatively associated with surface acting and unrelated to deep acting. High emotional intelligence in leaders also encourages followers to share their feelings with them more readily, as Smollan and Parry (2011) report in a qualitative study on organisational change.

Research has also revealed how the related constructs of personality, self-concept and self-identity influence the degree to which individuals feel comfortable in performing EL, whether it is surface acting, deep acting or natural expression. For example, Diefendorff et al. (2006) found surface acting was positively predicted by neuroticism and self-monitoring, and negatively by extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness; deep acting was positively predicted by agreeableness alone; and expression of naturally felt emotions was positively predicted by extraversion and agreeableness. Similarly, Austin et al. (2008) found in surveying students who had worked with people that surface acting was positively correlated with neuroticism and negatively correlated with extraversion and conscientiousness, while deep acting was positively correlated with agreeableness and extraversion. Kiffin-Petersen, Jordan and Soutar (2010) report on a study of a wide range of occupations in which respondents high in agreeableness and extraversion tended to engage in deep acting while emotional instability predicted surface acting. In two studies of service personnel, Chi, Grandey, Diamond and Kimmel (2011) found that where extraverts did use surface acting they performed better than introverts.

In interpreting social identity theory, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993: 98) suggest that when an employee's sense of identification with the organisation or role is strong, "that is, individuals who regard their roles as central, salient and valued components of who they are – are apt to feel most authentic when they are conforming to role expectations, including display rules." They note that while this does not determine the nature of EL it influences the degree of job satisfaction and stress the employee experiences as a result of the EL. Pugh et al. (2011) found that when employees feel low self-efficacy in situations which require them to hide or fake emotions they experience considerable job dissatisfaction and emotional exhaustion. Thus, while dispositional variables do not necessarily dictate what form of EL the employees use, they do influence their levels of wellbeing.

While a great deal of EL research has examined what it is, what causes it and what the outcomes are for the organisation and the employee, it has paid insufficient attention to the motivation of the employee to perform various forms of EL. The antecedents of EL have too often been simply pigeon-holed as reward and punishment or broadened on occasion, to include individual differences, such as emotional intelligence or personality. Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003), in their control theory interpretation of EL, used the Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964) constructs of valence and expectancy, and Hsieh et al. (2011) demonstrated a negative association between the public service motivation construct and surface acting and a positive association between public service motivation and deep acting. With these exceptions the patterns of motivation underlying EL appear not to have been explored in any published literature. An unpublished Masters thesis by Saluan (2009) did posit a relationship between the types of motivation described in Self-Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000, 2002) and the categories of EL, in the context of developing a measure of an expanded version of Bolton's (2005) model of motives for EL, described above. Intrinsic motivation was found to have a strong positive relationship with deep acting and genuine emotional expression and a negative relationship with surface acting.

We believe that the fine-grained approach of Self-Determination Theory provides valuable insights into what facets of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation drive individuals to perform the different types of EL. We therefore first outline the nature of the theory then describe how it relates to the motivational basis of EL and its various forms.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

SDT was developed by Deci and Ryan (2000, 2002) from their earlier and less comprehensive Cognitive Evaluation Theory, from the mid-1980s onwards. It has proved popular in research studies in a variety of contexts and disciplines (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Fundamental to their model is the distinction between autonomous and controlled motivation, on the basis of which SDT classifies several types of external and internal motivation, and the relationships between them, in a manner that appears very well suited to further explication of EL. The self-determination continuum (Table 1) shows a range of possible types of motivation and, within them, sub-types of what are labeled regulatory styles. The model is well described elsewhere (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2002) but will be summarised here.

Table 1: The Self-Determination Continuum

Amotivation	Extrinsic motivation				Intrinsic motivation
	External regulation	Introjected regulation	Identified regulation	Integrated regulation	
Absence of intentional regulation	Contingencies of reward and punishment	Self-worth contingent on performance; ego-involvement	Importance of goals, values and regulations to the individual	Coherence of goals, values and regulations within the individual	Interest and enjoyment of the task
Lack of motivation	Controlled motivation	Moderately controlled motivation	Moderately autonomous motivation	Autonomous motivation	Inherently autonomous motivation

Source: Adapted from Gagné and Deci (2005: 26)

Extrinsic motivation, as classically defined, is the motivation to perform an action in order to attain a *separable outcome* (Ryan and Deci, 2002), either a desired consequence (typically a reward of some kind) or the avoidance of an undesired consequence, such as a punishment. This is contrasted with intrinsic motivation that arises from the person's interest in and enjoyment of the activity, so that the desired outcome is the activity itself and the feelings associated with engaging in it, and there is no separable outcome. An alternative definition, based on the concept of *locus of causality* (Heider, 1958), was used by deCharms (1968) to classify motivation as intrinsic when the origin of and control over a person's behavior are perceived to be from within themselves, and extrinsic when it is perceived to be external to themselves. However, SDT adheres to the separable outcome criterion to distinguish intrinsic from extrinsic motivation and uses the perceived locus of causality (PLOC) construct to separate sub-types of extrinsic motivation.

The contrast between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has been described many times and has informed much research (see Gagné and Deci, 2005). However, SDT goes further and explores the *internalisation* of extrinsic motivation, which can occur to varying degrees, with corresponding differences in the level of felt autonomy. Autonomy, in SDT, means "acting with a sense of volition and having the experience of choice" (Gagné and Deci, 2005: 333). External regulation refers to the classically recognised extrinsic motivation in response to demands and contingencies outside the person, to obtain rewards or avoid punishments, where the PLOC is entirely external. If the regulation is internalised relatively superficially

and the person does not identify with it, or accept it as their own, if "it is within the person but is not considered part of the integrated self" (Ryan and Deci, 2002: 17), autonomy remains low, PLOC is again external, and the regulation is almost as controlling as in external regulation. This is known as *introjected regulation*. This kind of regulation can include ego concerns and contingent self-esteem, where a person behaves in a given way in order to feel that he/she is a 'good' person.

If, however, individuals are able to identify with the value underlying the regulation and can see it as in some sense 'their own', thus shifting to an internal PLOC, autonomy substantially increases and the motivation is labeled *identified regulation*. "People feel greater freedom and volition because the behavior is more congruent with their personal goals and identities" (Gagné and Deci, 2005: 334). When this congruence or identification is fully integrated with other components of the individuals' self, to the extent that the behaviour expresses fundamental aspects of their personhood, their motivation is said to be *integrated regulation*, and is as autonomous as intrinsic motivation, while remaining distinguished from it by the separable outcome criterion. Each of these motivational states can be of relatively short duration, or can become individually preferred patterns or tendencies across a range of situations in the longer term, and hence can then be regarded as autonomous or controlled motivation traits (Sheldon, Ryan and Reis, 1996; Sisley, 2010).

SDT differs from most other theories of work motivation in that it is less concerned with the 'amount' or strength of motivation and more focused on distinguishing the relative proportion of autonomy versus control in the different types of motivational regulation (Gagné and Deci, 2005). It is an important contributor to motivation theory, as evidenced by a wealth of research studies, both theoretical and applied. (For a review see Stone et al., 2009). In addition, the SDT home site (www.selfdeterminationtheory.org) lists more than 50 academic papers under the heading of Organizations and Work alone, more than 160 under Education, and no less than 235 under Sport, Exercise and Physical Education, and these lists are far from exhaustive. A few examples listed are the application of SDT in the work and organisational areas of creativity, self-esteem, job performance, employee commitment and well-being, knowledge-sharing, burnout, engagement, turnover and compensation.

EL and SDT

Applying the categories of the SDT continuum to the three forms of EL – surface acting, deep acting and genuine expression/naturally felt emotions (Diefendorff et al., 2005), some correspondences become apparent. These proposed relationships are displayed in Table 2 below and include hypothetical examples of how an employee might explain his or her reasoning for acts of expressing the 'right' emotion or suppressing the 'wrong' emotion. Accompanying the table is a set of propositions on the EL/SDT relationships.

Table 2: Proposed Relationships between the SDT Continuum and Types of EL

	External regulation	Introjected regulation	Identified regulation	Integrated regulation	Intrinsic regulation
	Contingencies of reward and punishment	Self-worth contingent on performance; ego-involvement	Importance of goals, values and regulations	Coherence of goals, values and regulations	Interest and enjoyment of the task

Surface acting	*I pretend to care because of rewards or punishment.*	*I try to act as if I care because I will feel good if I act professionally.*			
Deep acting			*I try hard to care because I believe it is important to care about clients in this situation and to treat them well.*	*I try hard to care because I deeply believe in the value of caring for others. It is important that the clients feel they have been treated appropriately.*	
Genuine emotional expression				*I show positive emotions when looking after clients because I genuinely care about them (even when the actual tasks are uninteresting or unpleasant).*	*I enjoy looking after clients and I am happy to show it.*
	Controlled motivation	Moderately controlled motivation	Moderately autonomous motivation	Autonomous motivation	Inherently autonomous motivation

Surface Acting and SDT

Surface acting is performed in order to please someone else, usually the person's manager or the customer or colleague with whom the employee is interacting. In other words, the employee is seeking to obtain rewards (e.g. praise) or avoid punishments (e.g. their manager's displeasure or anger) (Sutton and Rafaeli, 1988). As such, the motivation is for an outcome separable from the interaction itself, and hence is a form of extrinsic regulation. By definition, the emotion shown is simulated rather than genuine and is engaged in order to create a favourable reception (Hochschild, 1983), constituting a type of impression management (Gardner and Matinko, 1988). Thus, it fits well with the low autonomy forms of extrinsic regulation, namely external and introjected (Gagné and Deci, 2005). If the behaviour is performed in the presence of the manager, or is closely supervised in some other way, the motivation is external regulation. If it persists when the person is not observed or closely supervised, we can assume that the person has internalised the external regulation to some extent, without identifying with it or necessarily endorsing it, and the behaviour is driven by introjected regulation (Gagné and Deci, 2005). In either case there is an external PLOC – one is acting this way because someone else requires or expects it.

> *Proposition 1a: When employees express or suppress emotions appropriately because of an expected reward or punishment they are motivated by external regulation.*

> *Proposition 1b: When employees express or suppress emotions appropriately because someone else expects it and/or they feel their self-worth is contingent on doing so, they are motivated by introjected regulation.*

Deep Acting and SDT

Deep acting on the other hand involves making a deliberate effort to actually feel the required emotion that in due course will lead to a spontaneous display of it (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff and Gosserand, 2003; Hochschild, 1983). The purpose of this is again to achieve a separable outcome, in that the purposeful effort made to experience and express the emotion is separate from actually doing so, but the distinction is more subtle. Thus the motivation is extrinsic, but to the extent that the individuals wish to make this effort and express this emotion because they think it important to do so in terms of their own values, the PLOC is internal. This may be out of loyalty to the organisation, a demonstration of good faith (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Johnson and Spector, 2007), because the staff members endorse the display rules, or believe that it is important to act towards others in an appropriate way. However, in all such cases they identify with the values underlying the behaviour. Hence the motivation is high-autonomy extrinsic regulation, either identified or integrated, depending on the depth and extent of the identification (Gagné and Deci, 2005).

> *Proposition 2a: When employees consciously attempt to feel and express emotions appropriately because doing so is consistent with their values in this particular context, they are motivated by identified regulation.*

> *Proposition 2b: When employees consciously attempt to feel and express emotions appropriately because doing so is consistent with their fundamental values, behaviour and sense of identity in this and other contexts, they are motivated by integrated regulation.*

Genuine Emotional Expression and SDT

Turning to the display of genuinely felt emotions, if the employee finds this behaviour enjoyable, positively challenging, or interesting, and hence rewarding in its own right without reference to external contingencies, clearly the motivation is intrinsic. Examples might be the 'natural' salesperson who simply enjoys the actual process of making a sale, and the nurse who experiences satisfaction when a kind word to a patient is seen to be comforting. Mahoney et al. (2011: 419) concluded after their study of university academics that "Professors may think positive genuine expression is the simplest path to receive intrinsic rewards (e.g., higher quality relationships with students) or extrinsic rewards (e.g. high teacher ratings)."

When such a spontaneous display of appropriate emotions does not have these qualities of enjoyment but is nonetheless genuine, the underlying motivation is better classed as integrated regulation, the most internalised and identified-with variety of extrinsic motivation (Gagné and Deci, 2005). For example, an employee might feel real empathy for dissatisfied customers, and sincerely wishes to improve the outcome for them, but does not enjoy the customers' angry displays.

> *Proposition 3a: When employees express naturally-felt emotions not for enjoyment, but because doing so is consistent with their fundamental values, behaviour*

and sense of identity in this and other contexts, they are motivated by integrated regulation.

Proposition 3b: When employees express naturally-felt emotions because they enjoy doing so, they are intrinsically motivated.

Implications for Theory and Practice

As noted above, personality traits such as extraversion and agreeableness have been shown to be differentially associated with the three types of EL (Diefendorff et al., 2005). People with enduring preferences for either autonomous or controlled motivation can be said to have corresponding motivational traits (Sheldon et al., 1996, Sisley, 2010), and it may be that these also influence which type of EL is employed in a given situation, as per the relationships in Table 2. Thus, those with a controlled motivational preference, operating under external or introjected regulation, would be more likely to select surface acting, whereas those with a trait of preferring autonomous motivation, driven by identified, integrated or intrinsic regulation, would more often opt for deep acting or expression of genuinely felt emotions. This would be consistent with Johnson and Spector's (2007) finding that employees with high levels of autonomy usually adopt deep acting rather than surface acting in EL situations.

Research into the negative effects of EL can be enhanced by exploring the relationships between different forms of extrinsic motivation to perform EL and employee stress and burnout. For example, a number of studies have shown that greater autonomy is correlated with less stress, better health and better physical and mental well-being (see Sisley, 2010). If, as suggested above, deep acting is motivated by the more autonomous forms of extrinsic motivational regulation (identified and integrated) compared to surface acting (external and introjected), we have a possible explanation for the common finding that deep acting leads to less stress and burnout than does surface acting (e.g. Kiffin-Petersen et al., 2011; Naring, Briët and Brouwers, 2006). Since the more identified and integrated forms of motivational regulation posited to underlie deep acting are based on the personal values of the individual, and hence by definition are more authentic than the less autonomous motivation underlying surface acting, they also provide a mechanism for the effects of the perceived inauthenticity of 'faking it' by surface acting (Brotheridge and Lee, 2002).

From an organisational perspective, over time repeated use of the more stress-inducing surface acting strategy through much of the workday can be expected to have similar effects to other long-term stressors and to produce a chronically stressed or overaroused state, with the well-documented adverse effects on the health and well-being of employees and the likelihood of eventual burnout (Prati et al., 2009; Sisley, Henning, Hawken and Moir, 2010). It would therefore clearly pay employers to encourage staff to engage in deep acting (Grandey, 2003; Kiffin-Petersen et al., 2011; Song and Liu, 2010), and expression of naturally felt positive emotions in preference to surface acting, in accord with general stress prevention policies. However, given that deep acting initially requires more effort, and many employees are unable or unwilling to do it, allowing employees more autonomy in how to respond to other people's behaviour may be the key to lower levels of stress. The use of job autonomy to reduce job stress is a successful strategy documented by a range of researchers in stress management (e.g. Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Kalleberg, Nesheim and Olsen, 2009; Karasek, 1998) and EL (e.g. Johnson and Spector, 2007; Kiffin-Petersen et al., 2011). Understanding the nature of internalisation, as described in SDT, may help form successful

strategies for doing this. For example, the recruitment and selection process should pay special attention to employees' values and the degree of congruence of these with those underlying the work activity, to improve the chances of the employees being motivated by identified and integrated regulation and hence choosing to make use of deep rather than surface acting. Such practices would, incidentally, fit well within the overall facilitation of employee autonomy as an approach to organisation-wide stress management as advocated by Sisley (2010), but in any case clearly have value in their own right. Nevertheless, forms of surface acting are inevitable at times in many areas of organisational life, especially in service roles, so organisations also need to train employees in how to deal with the negative effects of EL (Prati et al., 2009).

However, van Maanen and Kunda (1989) warn that the more explicitly management requires employees to regulate their emotions they less effective this approach is likely to be. These extrinsic forms of motivation are likely to inhibit or even undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner and Ryan, 1999), at the cost of the individual's job satisfaction and psychological wellbeing, and probable adverse affects on both the employee's and the organisation's performance goals. Nevertheless, managers who have emotional intelligence and integrity will be aware of the emotional demands certain tasks have on employees (Smollan and Parry, 2011), and will provide them with training (Grandey, 2003) that helps to mitigate the demands, and support their staff when the going gets tough.

Finally, a relatively unexplored area of research is the extent to which different forms of motivation to perform EL are influenced by the nature of the work relationships. How relevant are issues of self-employment versus working for others (considering that Hochschild's (1983) definition was that EL was performed for a wage), or working for the profit-making sector compared to government and non-government sectors? Cohen (2011) showed that self-employed hairdressers resorted more frequently to deep acting while those working for others tended to engage in surface acting. However, there appear to be few studies that examine self-employment, particularly in the relationship between different forms of motivation and different forms of EL. In addition, studies of EL and public service motivation (Hsieh et al. 2011) and the non-profit sector (Eschenfelder, 2012) also indicate that the sector of employment does not substantially alter the requirement or the motivation to perform EL, nor does it have very different consequences than for those employed in commercial organisations. However, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation have not been sufficiently explored in studies of EL across different sectors and forms of work and SDT theory provides a useful lens through which to view these types of issues. We believe we have contributed to the literature on EL theory by infusing it with insights from SDT that analyse in more depth the motivational bases of emotional expression and control.

Conclusions

We have noted the lack of motivational analyses within the broad literature on EL and suggested that SDT provides a potentially useful framework for such an analysis. We believe that surface acting exhibits an external PLOC and is motivated by less autonomous, more controlled forms of extrinsic regulation (external and introjected regulation). In contrast, deep acting is characterised by an internal PLOC and driven by the more autonomous identified and integrated forms of motivational regulation, with the expression of naturally felt emotions being either intrinsically motivated or subject to integrated regulation, depending on whether the experience is enjoyable for the individual. The propositions we have presented

allow for empirical quantitative investigation. The integration of SDT and EL also provides a solid basis for a qualitative investigation which is suited to teasing out the complexities of emotional expression and regulation and their motivational antecedents.

Employees may have many reasons, congruent and conflicting, for adopting one form of emotional labour strategy for a particular task or encounter. For example, it is plausible for an academic, as Mahoney et al. (2011) indicate, to engage in natural emotional expression for intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Even one who is intrinsically motivated by the challenge of teaching may on occasion find student behaviour to be taxing and requiring some form of surface acting to moderate an 'inappropriate' emotional response. Blau et al. (2010) and Song and Liu (2010) have shown that customer/client aggressiveness makes surface acting considerably more demanding. A variety of drivers may influence a suitable response in such situations. The employees may regulate their emotional expression because the organisation requires it, because it is consistent with their self-efficacy, values and sense of identity, and/or because they can see why the customer is being aggressive and not take it personally.

As noted earlier, EL also depends partly on individual differences, such as personality and emotional intelligence. A heightened sense of conscientiousness and agreeableness, together with insight into others' emotions, can influence an employee to observe organisationally-mandated display rules. These constructs therefore need to be factored into researching the nexus of EL and SDT.

EL seldom distinguishes between contrived emotional control and natural control. In writing on emotional regulation, Gross (1998: 275) prefers "to think of a continuum from conscious, effortful and controlled regulation to unconscious, effortless, and automatic regulation." In his definition of emotional regulation he includes processes by which individuals decide which emotions to experience, in addition to expressing and controlling them. This line of thinking relates to both the constructs that are the subjects of this paper. Firstly, the word labour in the EL construct indicates some form of effort. How conscious or 'effortful' the performance of EL is needs further investigation. With respect to the motivation to express or control emotion it could also be suggested that the more autonomous forms of motivation require less effort because they come more naturally and willingly. As Ryan and Deci (2006) point out, the relationships between conscious and unconscious forms of regulation and extrinsic forms of motivation have not been clearly established.

Finally, in this paper we have made little distinction between positive and negative emotions but need to do so to present a fuller picture. Most studies of EL focus on displaying positive emotion and curtailing negative emotion. If one has little intrinsic enjoyment of a task it may be difficult to perform either form of EL. For others it may be easier to display positive emotions but more difficult to handle the negative emotions, such as when staff need to deal with difficult situations (Blau et al., 2010; Song and Liu, 2010). The infusion of EL theory with insights from SDT theory signals a promising new approach to understanding and researching the processes of EL.

References

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

Ashkanasy, N. M. and Daus, C. (2013). Emotional labor across five levels of analysis: Past, present and future. In A. A. Grandey, J. M. Diefendorff and D. E. Rupp, *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work* (pp. 282-287.) New York: Routledge.

Austin, E. J., Dore, T. C. P. and O'Donovan, K. M. (2008). Associations of personality and emotional intelligence with display rule perceptions and emotional labour*. Personality and Individual Differences,* 44: 679–688.

Bagozzi, R. P., Verbeke, W. and Gavino, J. C. (2003). Culture moderates the self-regulation of shame and its effects on performance: The case of salespersons in the Netherlands and the Philippines', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2): 219-233.

Bakker, A. B. and Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3): 309-328.

Blau, G., Fertig, J., Tatum, D. S., Connaughton, S., Park*,* D. S. and Marshall, C. (2010). Further scale refinement for emotional labor: Exploring distinctions between types of surface versus deep acting using a difficult client referent. *Career Development International,* 15(2): 188-216.

Bolton, S. (2005). *Emotion management in the workplace.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brotheridge, C. M. and Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7: 57-67.

Brotheridge, C. M. and Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labor Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76: 365-379.

Callahan, J. L. (2000). Emotion management and organizational functions. A case study of patterns in a not-for-profit organization. *Human Resource Development Quarterly,* 11(3): 245-267.

Chi, N. W., Grandey, A. A., Diamond, J. A. and Kimmel, K. R. (2011). Want a tip? Service performance as a function of emotion regulation and extraversion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6): 1337-1346.

Cohen, R. L. (2011). When it pays to be friendly: Employment relationships and emotional labour in hairstyling. *The Sociological Review*, 58(2): 197-218.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., and Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125: 627-668.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human need and

the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry,* 11: 227-268.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (Eds.) (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research.* Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior.* New York: Academic Press.

Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H. and Gosserand, R. H. (2006). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66: 339-357.

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

Diefendorff, J. M, Richard, E. and Croyle, M. H. (2006). Are emotional display rules formal job requirements? Examination of employee and supervisor perceptions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79: 273-298.

Ekman, P. (1973). Cross-culture studies of facial expression. In P. Ekman (Ed.), *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review* (pp. 169-222). New York: Academic Press.

Eschenfelder, B. (2009). Exploring the nature of nonprofit work through emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(1): 173-178.

Gagné, M. and Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362.

Gardner, W. L. and Martinko, M. J. (1988). Impression management in organizations. *Journal of Managemen*t, 14(2): 321-338.

Glomb, T. M. and Tews, M. J., (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44: 679–688.

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., Diefendorff, J. M. and Rupp, D. E. (2103). Bringing emotional labor into focus: A review and integration of three research lenses. In A. A. Grandey, J. M. Diefendorff and D. E. Rupp, *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work* (pp. 3-27). New York: Routledge.

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotional regulation: An integrative view. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3): 271-299.

Guy, M. E., Newman, M. A. and Mastracci, S. H. (2008*). Emotional labor: Putting the service in public service.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Hagger, M. S. and Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2009). Integrating the theory of planned behaviour and self-determination theory in health behaviour: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology,* 14(2): 275-302.

Harris, L. C. (2002). The emotional labour of barristers: An exploration of emotional labour by status professionals. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(4): 553-584.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

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.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. R. (2013). Foreword. In A. A. Grandey, J. M. Diefendorff and D. E. Rupp,

Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work (pp. xiii-xv.) New York: Routledge.

Hsieh, C.-W., Yang, K. and Fu, K.-J. (2011). Motivational bases and emotional labor: Assessing the impact of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 72(2): 241-251.

Humphrey, R. H., Pollak, J. M. and Hawver, T. (2008). Leading with emotional labor. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 23(2): 151-168.

Johnson, H.-A. M. and Spector, P. E. (2007). Service with a smile: Do emotional intelligence, gender, and autonomy moderate the emotional labor process? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 12(4): 319-333.

Kalleberg, A. L., Nesheim, T., and Olsen, K. (2009). Is participation good or bad for workers? *Acta Sociologica*, 52(2): 99-116.

Karasek, R. A. (1998). Demand/Control model: A social, emotional and physiological approach to stress risk and active behavior development. In J. M. Stellman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Occupational Health and Safety* (pp. 34.06-34.14). ILO: Geneva.

Kiffin-Petersen, S. A., Jordan, C. L. and Soutar, G. N. (2010). The big five, emotional exhaustion and citizenship behaviors in service settings: The mediating role of emotional labor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50: 43-48.

Lamm, F. and Rasmussen, E. (2008). Employment relations. In K. Macky (Ed.), *Managing human resources in New Zealand* (pp. 108-143). North Ryde, NSW, Australia: McGraw-Hill.

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 21(2), 221-234.

Lively, K. J. (2002). Client contact and emotional labor: Upsetting the balance and evening the field. *Work and Occupations,* 29(2): 198-225.

Mann, S. (2005). A healthcare model of emotional labour: An evaluation of the literature and development of a model. *Journal of Health, Organization and Management*, 9(4/5): 304-317.

Mahoney, K. T., Buboltz, W. C., Buckner, J. E. and Doverspike, D. (2011). Emotional labor in American professors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(4): 406-423.

Mayer, J. D. and Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey and D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

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

Naring, G., Briët, M. and Bouwers, A. (2006). Beyond demand-control: Emotional labour and symptoms of burnout in teachers. *Work & Stress*, 20(4): 303-315.

Nickson, D., Warhurst, C., Commander, J., Hurrell, S.A. and Cullen, A.M. (2012). Soft skills and employability: Evidence from UK retail. *Economic and Industrial Democracy,* 33(1): 65-84.

Prati L. M, Liu Y., Perrewé, P. L. and Ferris, G. R. (2009). Emotional intelligence as moderator of the surface acting-strain relationship. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 15(4): 368-380.

Pugh, S. D., Diefendorff, J. M. and Moran, C. M. (2013). Emotional labor: Organization-level influences, strategies and outcomes. In A. A. Grandey, J. M. Diefendorff and D. E. Rupp, *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work* (pp. 199-221.) New York: Routledge.

Pugh, S. D. Groth, M. and Hennig-Thurau, T. (2011). Willing and able to fake emotions: a closer examination of the link between emotional dissonance and employee well-

being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2): 377-390.

Rasmussen, E. (2009). *Employment relations in New Zealand (2nd ed.).* Auckland: Pearson.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1): 68-78.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of Self-Determination Theory: An organismic and dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*. (pp. 3-33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester press.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will? *Journal of Personality*, 74(6): 1557-1585.

Saluan, C. M. (2009). Motives for managing emotions at work. Unpublished Master's thesis, Akron, OH: University of Akron.

Self-Determination Theory. www.selfdeterminationtheory.org. Accessed 18 November 2012.

Sharpe, E. K. 2005. "Going above and beyond": The EL of adventure guides. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 37(1): 29-50.

Sheane, S. D. (2011). Putting on a good face: An examination of the emotional and aesthetic roots of presentational labour. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 33(1): 145-158.

Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., and Reis, H. T. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22: 1270-1279.

Sisley, R. C. (2010). Autonomous motivation and well-being: An alternative approach to workplace stress management. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 35(2): 28-40.

Sisley, R. C., Henning, M. A., Hawken, S. J. and Moir, F. (2010). A conceptual model of workplace stress: The issue of accumulation and recovery and the health professional. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 35(2): 3-15.

Smollan, R. K. (2006). Running hot and cold: How acceptable is emotional expression at work? *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 1(3): 215-231.

Smollan, R. K. and Parry, K. W. (2011). Follower perceptions of the emotional intelligence of change leaders: A qualitative study. *Leadership*, 7(4): 435-462.

Song, G. and Liu, S. (2010). Customer-related social stressors and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of surface and deep acting. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(10): 1359-1366.

Stone, D. N., Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2009). Beyond talk: Creating autonomous motivation through Self-Determination Theory. *Journal of General Management,* 34(3): 75-91.

Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2): 245-268.

Sutton, R. I. and Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. *Academy of Management Journal,* 31(3,) 461-487.

Tan, H. T., Foo, M. D., Chong, C. L. and Ng, R. (2003). Situational and dispositional predictors of display of positive emotions', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 4(8): 961-978.

Van Maanen, J. and Kunda, G. (1989). "Real feelings": Emotional expression and organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 2: 43-103.