

# The Development of the Teacher Emotional Labor Scale (TELS): Validity and Reliability

*Cem Şafak ÇUKUR\**

## **Abstract**

The current study had two main purposes. The first was to develop and validate an instrument to measure emotional labor among teachers (Teacher Emotional Labor Scale, TELS) with an emphasis on the emotion regulation strategies during critical work events. The second was to investigate whether emotional deviance could be considered as one of the emotional labor strategies. The developed 20-item self-report scale's validity and reliability was tested within high school teachers. The sample for this study consisted of 190 high school teachers working at various public schools in Muğla, Turkey (88 females and 102 males). The teachers were employed on a full-time basis and held no administrative position. The average work experience was 17.14 years (SD = 8.80). Confirmatory factor analysis results supported the four dimensional structure of emotional labor separating surface acting, deep acting, automatic emotion regulation, and emotional deviance in the current teacher sample. Results also provided initial evidence for the construct validity, criterion validity and internal consistency of the subscales (ranged from .70 to .81) of TELS.

## **Key Words**

Emotional Labor, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Automatic Emotion Regulation, Emotional Deviance, Education.

*\*Correspondence:* Cem Şafak Çukur, Associate Professor, Muğla University, Faculty of Art and Letters, Psychology Department, Kötekli-Muğla / Turkey.  
E-mail: cemsafak@yahoo.com

Research from different theoretical and methodological perspectives has begun to investigate the important role of emotions in the workplace. One of the topics that emotion studies at work especially give attention is emotional labor. As sometimes called “emotional management” or “emotion work”; emotional labor has been conceptualized as multidimensional constructs reflecting various processes, such as emotional display rules (feelings rules), felt and expressed emotions at work (emotional dissonance), internal process and emotion regulation. The concept was first defined thoroughly by Hochschild (1983). She defines emotional labor as the regulation of employee’s emotions to comply with occupational or organizational norms (emotional display rules). As she puts it “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display...” (p. 7). Since Hochschild’s (1983) early conceptualization, several emotional labor studies have examined the nature, dimensions, antecedents, and outcomes of emotional labor (for reviews, Ashforth, & Humphrey, 1995; Brief, & Weiss, 2002; Çukur, & Şahin, 2007; Morris, & Feldman, 1996; Zapf, 2002).

Early emotional labor studies have provided a rich and descriptive data on different aspects of emotional labor processes within various jobs and occupations through case studies and qualitative methods (Hastings, 2004; Hochschild, 1983; Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998; Nias, 1996; Rafaeli, & Sutton, 1991; Van Manen, & Kunda, 1989). Although these studies have played an important role in the theoretical development of emotional labor concepts and strategies, researchers have called for more systematic and quantitative methods to measure emotional labor, determine emotional labor dimensions, and examine the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor (Adelman, 1995; Ashforth, & Humphrey, 1995; Morris, & Feldman, 1996; Wharton, 1993). In this context, there have been several attempts to develop quantitative measures of emotional labor that have focused on different dimensions or strategies of emotional labor (Brotheridge, & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge, & Lee, 2003; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Glomb, & Tews, 2004; Kruml, & Geddes, 2000; Morris, & Feldman, 1996). This study is part of these efforts.

The main purpose of this study is to develop and validate an instrument to measure emotional labor. Unlike many of the previous emotional labor scales, the scale is solely designed to assess emotional labor among teachers (Teacher Emotional Labor Scale, TELS). TELS

was developed to measure emotional labor that teachers perform for their students, coworkers, and supervisors. Several case and qualitative studies have demonstrated that emotional labor is an important part of teaching and is related to teacher's professional and personal outcomes (e.g., burnout, commitment, identity, etc.) (Brennan, 2006; Hargreaves, 1998; Hartley, 2004; Isenbarger, & Zembylas, 2006; Nias, 1996; Zembylas, 2004). As Winograd (2003) points out; teaching requires different kinds of emotional rules, including showing passion for the job, avoiding both negative and positive "extreme emotions", and approaching situations, students, and their own mistakes calmly. However, emotional aspects of teaching or emotional labor that teachers perform have not received much attention (Bellas, 1999; Sumsion, 2000; Troman, 2000; Zembylas, 2003).

Emotional labor studies can be categorized into two main categories: job-focused approaches or employee-focused approaches (Brotheridge, & Grandey, 2002). The first approach mainly gives priority to job characteristics that are related to emotional labor (the display rules, frequency of customer interaction, variety, duration and intensity of emotions required during job related interaction). The second approach emphasizes emotional regulation process and internal state when employees perform emotional labor. The latter approach emphasizes how emotion is managed (effort and control) (Kruml, & Geddes, 2000). Similarly, emotional labor conceptualizations or emotional labor measures have emphasized different aspects of emotional processes. In this context, Glomb and Tews (2004) distinguished three main perspectives: behavioral expression, emotional dissonance and internal process.

In early empirical studies, deep and surface acting have appeared as two main emotional labor strategies. When employee's feelings do not fit the situation (display rules); they can stimulate emotions that are not actually felt or change the outward expression emotion that are felt (surface acting). They can also change their inner feelings ("work up") to bring the required emotions through their past experience or training (deep acting). The surface acting strategies could be consider as the reflection culturally learned display rules as put by Ekman and Friesen (1971) into the workplace. Both strategies reflect, but different kinds and degrees, emotive dissonance, a gap between felt and expressed emotion (Brotheridge, & Lee, 2003; Hochschild, 1983; Kruml, & Geddes, 2000). Recent researchers have also recognized genuine acting (auto-

matic emotion regulation) where felt emotions are conquest with displays rules as an important dimension of emotional labor (Ashforth, & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff et al., 2005). On the other hand, none of the previous empirical research has investigated emotional deviance as one of the emotional labor strategies or dimensions.

Some have argued that emotional deviance where felt and expressed emotions are not conquest with required display rules of organization is important part of emotional experiences in work and should be considered as part of emotional labor (Mann, 1999; Rafaeli, & Worline, 2001; Zapf, 2002). As Rafaeli and Sutton (1987, p. 33) state; “emotional deviance is the opposite of emotional dissonance because the organization member expresses inner feelings and disregards feelings rules. Again, however, the internalization of feeling rules may influence the effects of incongruence between felt and expressed emotions.” Therefore, the second purpose of this study was to investigate whether emotional deviance could be considered as one of the emotional labor strategies. Considering emotional deviance in emotional labor concept and measures reflect recent theoretical developments in emotional labor studies where emotional labor has been considered as a multidimensional construct that reflects divergent consequences for different types of emotional labor (customer vs. coworkers) in different work settings (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006; Fiebig, & Kramer, 1998; Steinberg, & Figart, 1999; Tschan, Rochat, & Zapf, 2005; Weiss, & Cropanzola, 1996; Wharton, 1999).

### **The Development and Validation of the Teacher Emotional Labor Scale (TELS)**

Employee-focused and internal process (emotion regulation) approaches were followed to develop the TELS. Based on previous emotional labor conceptualizations (e.g., Fiebig, & Kramer; 1998; Hoscschild, 1983; Rosenberg, 1998; Zapf, 2002) and theoretical background (e.g., Basch, & Fisher, 2000; Çukur, 2007; Fineman, 1993; Grandey, 2003; Gross, 1999; Kruml, & Geddes, 2000; Rafaeli, & Sutton, 1991), the development of the TELS was based on four dimensions of emotional labor to capture the emotional regulation process of performing emotional labor: surface acting, deep acting, automatic emotion regulation (naturally felt emotions), and emotional deviance. The methodological approach

of the Emotional Work Events Theory (Weiss, & Cropanzola, 1996) which gives priority to the interaction between work-related emotion events and employee reactions to them was followed to generate the TELS items. At the first steps, the critical events that reflect teachers' interactions with students, coworkers and supervisors were drawn from the previous qualitative studies (Çukur, 2007; Uysal, 2007). These critical events include variety of situations that teachers come across more frequently (blame for low grades, discrimination, a bad or good news about students, etc.), and require a variety of emotional responses (anger, joy, disappointment, surprise, irritation, etc.). Then, a total of 5 items that reflect each of the four emotional labor strategies (a total of 20 items) was followed the related critical events ("One of your students find your mistake during lecture and share it with other students. Even though it is not expected from me as a teacher, I exactly reflect to students how I feel." - one of the emotional deviance item of the TELS). Participants rated each of the 20-items of the self-report scale using a 5-point Likert scale. The scale reflects the extent to which it was true behavior (1 = "Not at all true"; 5 = "Very true"). The final wording of items was done with focus groups of 15 teacher college graduate students.

To investigate discriminant and convergent validity of the TELS, correlations between the subscales of the TELS and the existing scale of emotional labor were examined. For this purpose, the emotional labor scale (Diefendorff et al., 2005) that has three subscales (surface acting, deep acting, and expression of naturally felt emotions) reflecting different emotional labor strategies was used. It is expected that deep, surface, and automatic emotion regulation scales will be correlated with the related dimensions of emotional labor from the alternative scales of Diefendorff et al. (Hypothesis 1). On the other hand, emotional deviance subscale of the TELS will be uncorrelated with the three subscales of emotional labor from the alternative measure (Hypothesis 2).

To establish the criterion-related validity of the TELS, the relationships between the subscales of the TELS and emotional exhaustion and job autonomy were investigated. Based on previous research findings (Brotheridge, & Lee, 2003; Güleriyüz, & Aydın, 2006; Rafaeli, & Worline, 2001; Thoits, 1990; Zapf, 2002), it is proposed that the TELS surface acting and emotional deviance will positively relate to emotional exhaustion. On the other hand, automatic emotion regulation of the TELS will not relate to emotional exhaustion (Hypothesis 3 and 4).

Similarly, it is proposed that employees who have high job autonomy perception will less likely to follow the required emotion rules (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005), thus perform less surface and deep acting. On the other hand, they are more likely to express naturally display automatic emotion regulation and not follow the required emotion displays rules leading to emotional deviance (Hypothesis 5).

## Method

### Participants

The sample for the study consisted of 190 high school teachers working at public schools of Mugla (88 females and 102 males). The mean age of participants was 42.26 years (ranging from 25 to 57). The average work experience was 17.14 years ( $SD = 8.80$ ). The teachers were employed on a full-time basis and held no administrative position.

### Materials and Procedure

Along with the Teacher Emotional Labor Scale (TELS) developed in this study, the following measures were given to participants in research packet to establish construct and criterion-related validity of the TELS. The measures that were originally written in English were adopted for this study through back-translation method (Brislin, 1986). The internal reliability for each of the subscales, and their respective means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.

*The Emotional Labor Scale.* Emotional labor was assessed with Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand (2005) 14- items measures. The measure assesses emotional labor strategies in three subscales: deep acting (5 items, "I put on a show or performance when interacting with customers"), surface acting (4 items, "I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to customer", and the expression of naturally felt emotions (3 items, "The emotions I express to customers are genuine"). The scales anchor ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree and higher numbers indicates increasing use of related emotional labor strategies. The measure was especially chosen to as the existing emotional labor scale to establish construct validity of the TELS because it includes items from other emotional labor measures (for example, Brotheridge, & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003; Kruml, & Geddes, 2000). To adapt the scale items to the teacher sample, the wording of "customers"

in the original scale items was modified as “at my job.”

*The Emotional Exhaustion.* The Turkish version (Ergin, 1993) of emotional exhaustion subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, & Jackson, 1981) was used to measure emotional exhaustion. The subscales include nine-items (“I feel emotionally drained from my work”) and each item could range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The higher numbers indicate increasing intensity of emotional exhaustion. Previous research has shown the reliability and validity of this inventory to measure emotional exhaustion within various jobs and occupations. (Lee and Ashforth, 1996).

*The Job Autonomy.* 3 items of the job autonomy subscale of the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman, & Oldham, 1975) were used to measure participants’ perception of job autonomy. The scale indicates the degree to which employees have freedom, independence, and discretion in performing their tasks (Hackman, & Oldham, 1975). Participants respond on a 5-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) and the higher numbers indicates the greater job autonomy perception.

## Results

### Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the TELS Items

Confirmatory factor analyses in LISREL 8.7 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2005) were conducted to investigate the factor structure and item performance of the offered 4 factor model of the TELS that separated emotional deviance, automatic emotion regulation, deep acting, and surface acting into different subscales along with alternative 3, 2, and 1 factor models. For each model, individual items were loaded on only one related factor and factors (latent variables) were allowed to correlate freely. Most frequently used indicators of fit were applied, including (a) the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit ( $\chi^2$ ), (b)  $\Delta\chi^2/\Delta df$  tests, (c) the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), (d) the Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (AGFI), (e) the Root Mean Square Residuals (RMSR), (f) the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), (g) the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and (h) the Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI) (Loehlin, 1998; Sümer, 2000; Toit, & Toit, 2001).

**Table 1.***Summary of CFA Fit Indices for Offered 4-Factor and Alternative Models*

		$\chi^2$	Sd	$\chi^2$ /Sd	GFI	AGFI	CFI	NNFI	RMSR	RMSEA
<b>A.</b>	<b>4- Faktör</b>	<b>302.93*</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>.89</b>	<b>.85</b>	<b>.93</b>	<b>.92</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>.06</b>
B.	3- Factor	367.37*	167	2.20	.84	.80	.91	.89	.09	.08
C.	3-Factor	689.88*	167	4.13	.73	.66	.81	.79	.15	.13
D.	3- Factor	381.22*	167	2.28	.83	.79	.90	.89	.09	.08
E.	3- Factor	675.40*	167	4.04	.74	.67	.83	.80	.15	.13
F.	2-Factor	420.09*	169	2.49	.82	.77	.89	.87	.09	.10
G.	2-Factor	743.73*	169	4.40	.72	.65	.80	.77	.16	.13
H.	2- Factor	1322.21*	169	7.82	.59	.49	.71	.68	.17	.19
I.	1-Factor	1391.84*	170	8.19	.58	.48	.69	.66	.17	.20

**A** = ED / AER / DA / SA (the offered model 4 Factor)

**B** = ED / AER / DA + SA (3 Factor)      **C** = ED / SA / DA + AER (3 Factor)

**D** = DA / SA / ED + AER (3 Factor)      **E** = AER / DA / ED + SA (3 Factor)

**F** = ED + AER / DA + SA (2 Factor)      **G** = ED / AER + DA + SA (2 Factor)

**H** = ED + SA / AER + DA (2 Factor)      **I** = ED + AER + DA + SA. (1 Factor)

ED =Emotional Deviance; AER = Automatic Emotion Regulation;

DA= Deep Acting; SA= Surface Acting

\*  $p < 0.05$

The fit indices of confirmatory factor analyses are presented in Table 1. Overall fit statistics and the  $\Delta\chi^2/\Delta df$  tests supported the 4-factor solution (Model A) as a significantly better fit than other alternative solutions. However, GFI and AGFI scores for the 4 factor solution a little bit lower than desired (.90) though better than the scores in alternatives models. The 3 factor models of B (combining deep acting and surface acting into one factor while keeping emotional deviance and automatic emotion regulation separate) and D (combining emotional deviance and automatic emotion regulation while keeping deep and surface acting separate) overall fit indices were also within the range of generally acceptable levels. However, based on  $\chi^2$  differences tests; Model A versus Model B ( $\Delta\chi^2(3) = 64.44, p < 0.01$ ), and Model A versus Model D ( $\Delta\chi^2(3) = 78.29, p < 0.01$ ); the Model A fit significantly better than model B and D.



**Table 2.**

*Factor Loadings from Four Factor Solutions According CFA of TELS*

<b>Automatic Emotion Regulation</b> ("I genuinely express how I feel") when	<b>Standard Loading*</b>	<b>Error Variance</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>
1. Getting blame from your supervisor about the way of you deal with students...	.57	.68	.42
5. Getting complies from your students about your teaching style...	.64	.59	.43
9. Hearing a very good news about students at board meeting ...	.62	.61	.52
13. One of your students asking rude questions constantly...	.48	.77	.50
17. Explaining very low grade of one of your favorite students ...	.68	.54	.36
<b>Surface Acting</b> ("I try to control my feelings to have emotions I need to display form my job") When			
2. Sharing sad news with students...	.59	.65	.35
6. Your students unexpectedly get very high grades...	.54	.71	.29
10. One of your coworkers making rude jokes about you...	.46	.79	.21
14. Your supervisor share a news that make most of your coworker happy, but you don't ...	.70	.50	.50
18. Figuring out your students did not their homework that you think very Important at class ...	.50	.75	.25
<b>Emotional Deviance</b> ("Even though it is not expected from me as a teacher, I exactly reflect to how I feel") when			
3. One of your students find your mistake during lecture and share it with other students ...	.70	.51	.49
7. Your supervisor did not except change planes in your program. .	.75	.44	.56

<b>11.</b> Unexpectedly, your supervisor apprises you in front of your coworkers...	.67	.55	.45
<b>15.</b> One of your students makes a big mistakes and the rest of students start laughing...	.71	.49	.51
<b>19.</b> One of your students asks to change his/her grades claiming its is your mistakes for the low grade...	.70	.50	.50
<b>Deep Acting</b> (I try to put an effort to actually feel the emotion I need to display) When			
<b>4.</b> Getting a very bad news from your family before the class. . .	.65	.58	.42
<b>8.</b> You did not find very funny most of jokes that your coworkers do...	.66	.57	.43
<b>12.</b> You need to teach a class that you don't like very much about not very interesting subject. . .	.72	.48	.52
<b>16.</b> Your supervisor generally makes negative and hurting comments. . .	.71	.50	.50
<b>20.</b> Discussing frequently with students about grades. . .	.60	.64	.36

\* All t values significant at  $p < 0.05$

Based on Model A, all items had factor loadings that were statistically significant (t values) and loadings ranged between .46 and .71. The primary factor loadings, error variance and of each items from the four factor solutions (Model A) are presented in Table 2. For all items, the item-total correlation were .20 or greater (Kline, 1986).

The internal consistency reliabilities for all the TELS ( $\alpha=79$ ) and subscales were in acceptable, ranging from .70 to .81 (Table 3).

#### Relationships between the TELS and Other Related Measures

The internal reliability for each of the scales and their respective means and standard deviations along with correlations among the TELS subscales and other measures to investigate validity are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.**  
*Descriptive Statistics,  $\alpha$  Coefficients (on the Diagonal), and Correlations of Variables*

	Ort	SS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>1.</b> Auto Em. Regulation	3.01	.86	(.74)								
<b>2.</b> Surface Acting	3.09	.78	.01	(.70)							
<b>3.</b> Deep Acting	3.36	.84	-.01	.49**	(.80)						
<b>4.</b> Emotional Deviance	2.27	.88	.55**	-.13	-.05	(.81)					
<b>5.</b> Natural Emo.(DCG*)	1.57	.72	.30**	-.03	-.11	.20**	(.72)				
<b>6.</b> Surface Acting(DCG)	3.29	.80	-.13	.16*	.09	-.17*	-.14*	(.65)			
<b>7.</b> Deep Acting(DCG)	3.50	.61	.03	.08	.07	-.12	-.09	.28**	(.57)		
<b>8.</b> Emotional Exhaustion	3.90	.64	-.14*	.15*	.06	.35**	-.30**	.19**	.05	(.71)	
<b>9.</b> Job Autonomy	3.55	1.09	.05	-.16*	-.01	.14*	.15*	-.13	-.09	-.24**	(.73)

\*DCG denotes Diefendorff, Croyle and Grosserand's (2005) Emotional Labor Measures.

\* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.001.

The correlations between the TELS subscales and the alternative scale partly supported the hypotheses (Hypothesis 1 and 2). As expected, the surface and automatic emotional regulation subscales of the TELS were positively correlated with the related subscales of the alternative measure (Diefendorff et al., 2005). However, the positive correlation of deep acting with alternative subscale was not statistically significant. Contrary to the prediction, emotional deviance significantly related to

the expression of naturally felt emotions ( $r = .20, p < 0.001$ ) and surface acting ( $r = -.17, p < 0.05$ ). There was no significant correlation between emotional deviance and deep acting. As predicted, only surface acting ( $r = .15, p < 0.05$ ) and emotional deviance ( $r = .35, p < 0.001$ ) were related to emotional exhaustion (Hypothesis 3 and 4). Similarly, while high job autonomy perception were positively related to emotional deviance ( $r = .14, p < 0.05$ ), the relationship was negative with surface acting ( $r = -.16, p < 0.05$ ) (Hypothesis 5).

### Discussion

Confirmatory factor analysis results supported four dimensional structures of emotional labor separating surface acting, deep acting, automatic emotion regulation, and emotional deviance in current teacher sample. Results also provided initial evidence for the construct validity, internal consistency, and criterion-related validity of the TELS. However, considering that the offered correlations for construct and criterion-related validity did not support fully, it is essential further replication in different context to ensure consistency. Overall, research findings support that emotional labor should be considered as multidimensional construct. Especially, a major reason for the confusion or contradictory conclusion about emotional labor's consequences (e.g., burnout, emotional exhaustion, and satisfaction) could be result of studies have not considered the role of emotional deviance. Including emotional deviance as part of emotional labor measures could increase the predictive validity of emotional labor measures. The availability of this instrument can also stimulate much needed systematic emotional labor research for teaching. However, the current study only focused on high school teacher with relatively small number of participants.

## References/Kaynakça

- Adelmann, P. (1995). Emotional labor as a potential source of job stress. In S. L. Sauter & L. Murphy (Ed.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress* (p. 371-381). Easton, MD: Easton Publishing.
- Ashforth, B., & Humphrey, R. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 88-115.
- Ashforth, B., & Humphrey, R. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, *48*, 97-125.
- Basch, J., & Fisher, C. D. (2000). Affective events-emotions matrix: A classification of work events and associated emotions. In N. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel, & W. Zerbe (Ed.), *Emotions in workplace: Research, theory, and practice* (p. 36-48). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Bellas, M. L. (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *The Annals of the American Academy*, *561*, 96-110.
- Brennan, K. (2006). The managed teacher: Emotional labour, education, and technology. *Educational Insights*, *10*, 55-65.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 279-307.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (Vol. 8, p. 137-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Brotheridge, C., & Grandey, A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *60*, 17-39.
- Brotheridge, C., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labor Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 365-379.
- Çukur, C. Ş. (2007). İş yerinde duygular, duygusal düzenleme ve duygusal işçilik. T. Solmuş (Ed.), *Endüstriyel klinik psikoloji ve insan kaynakları yönetimi* içinde (s. 71-113). İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Çukur, C. Ş. & Şahin, Z. (2007). Duygusal işçilik bağlamında duygu ve kültür ilişkisi. R. Erdem ve C. Ş. Çukur (Ed.), *Kültürel bağlamda yönetsel ve örgütsel davranış* içinde (s. 461-516) Ankara: TPD Yayınları.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 339-357.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Richard, E. M., & Croyle, M. H. (2006). Are emotional display rules formal job requirements? Examination of employee and supervisor perceptions. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *79*, 273-298.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *17*, 124-129.
- Ergin, C. (1993). Doktor ve hemşirelerde tükenmişlik ve Maslach Tükenmişlik Ölçeğinin uygulanması. R. Bayraktar ve İ. Dağ (Ed.), *VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi bilimsel çalışmaları* içinde (s. 143-54). Ankara: TPD Yayını.
- Fiebig, G. V., & Kramer, M. V. (1998). A Framework for the study of emotions in organizational contexts. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *11*, 536-572.

- Fineman, S. (1993). Organizations as emotional areas. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (s. 9-35). London: Sage Publications.
- Glomb, T. M., & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*, 1-23.
- Grandey, A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface and deep acting as predictors of emotional exhaustion and service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 86-96.
- Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G., & Steiner, D. D. (2005). Must 'service with a smile' be stressful? The moderating role of personal control for American and French employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *5*, 893-904.
- Gross, J. J. (1999). Emotion regulation: Past, present, future. *Cognition and Emotion*, *13*, 551-573.
- Gülyüz, E. & Aydın, O. (2006). İş kontrolü ve kontrol isteği ile tükenmişlik ve fiziksel sağlık arasındaki ilişkiler. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, *21*, 59-71.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*, 159-170.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional politics of teaching and teacher development with implication for educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *1*, 315-336.
- Hartley, D. (2004). Management, leadership and the emotional order of the school. *Journal of Education Policy*, *19*, 583-94.
- Hastings, W. (2004). Emotions and the practicum: The cooperating teachers' perspectives. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *10*, 135-148.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Isenbarger, L., & Zembylas, M. (2006). The emotional labor of caring in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 120-134.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (2005). *LISREL 8.7 for Windows*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International Inc.
- Kline, P. (1986). *A handbook of test construction: Introduction to psychometric design*. New York: Methaen.
- Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000). Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor: The hearth of Hochschild's work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *14*, 8-49.
- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 123-133.
- Loehlin, J. C. (1998). *Latent variable models: An introduction to factor, path, and structural analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Mann, S. (1999). Emotion at work: To what extent are we expressing, suppressing, or faking it? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*, 347-369.
- Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at the body shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 429-469.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *2*, 99-113.

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

Nias, J. (1996). Thinking about feeling: The emotions in teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, **26**, 293-306.

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

Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R. (1991). Emotional contrast strategies as means of social influence: Lessons from criminal interrogators and bill collectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, **34**, 749-775.

Rafaeli, A., & Worline, M. (2001). Individual emotion in work organizations. *Social Science Information*, **40**, 95-123.

Rosenberg, E. L. (1998). Levels of analysis and organizational affect. *Review of General Psychology*, **2**, 247-70.

Steinberg, R., & Figart, D. (1999). Emotional demands at work: A Job content analysis. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, **561**, 177-191.

Sumsion, J. (2000). Caring and empowerment: A teacher educator's reflection on ethical dilemma. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **5**, 167-179.

Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal eşitlik modelleri: Temel kavramlar ve örnek uygulamalar. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, **3**, 49-74.

Thoits, P. A. (1990). Emotional deviance: Research agendas. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (p. 180-203). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Toit, M., & Toit, S. H. C. (2001). *Interactive LISREL: User's guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International Inc.

Troman, G. (2000). Teacher stress in the low-trust society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **21**, 331-53.

Tschan, F., Rochat, S., & Zapf, D. (2005). It's not only clients: Studying emotion work with clients and coworkers with event-sampling approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **78**, 195-220.

Uysal, A. A. (2007). *Öğretmenlerde gözlenen duygusal yaşantı örüntülerinin ve duygusal işçiliğin iş doyumuna ve tükenmişlik üzerine etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Muğla Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Muğla.

Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). "Real feelings": Emotional expression and organizational culture. In L.

Cummings, L. & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (p. 43-103). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (p. 1-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, **20**, 205-232.

Wharton, A. S. (1999). The psychosocial consequences of emotional labor. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 561, 158-176.

Winograd, K. (2003). The functions of teacher emotions: The Good, the bad, and the ugly. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 1641-73.

Zapf, D. (2002) Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 237-268.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9, 213-238.

Zembylas, M. (2004). Emotion metaphors and emotional labor in science teaching. *Science Education*, 88, 301-324.