



www.ijpes.com



Investigation of Emotional Labor in Teaching

Esra TÖRE¹

¹Faculty of Education, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey  0000-0001-9133-6578

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 01.12.2020

Received in revised form
16.04.2021

Accepted 03.06.2021

Available online

25.07.2021

Article Type: Research
Article

ABSTRACT

Teaching, as a profession, involves high levels of emotional labor. This aspect of teaching makes it distinct from other lines of work. It is an emotion-based profession, and good practice of teaching is full of positive emotions. This positivity is a must in the teacher's relationship with his/her students to ensure a healthy classroom atmosphere. The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' emotional labor behaviors based on various variables. This study was designed as a descriptive survey model, conducted on 556 teachers working in 21 different schools in İstanbul. With a stratified sampling method, the study data were collected through a measuring tool consisting of 'Personal Information Form' and 'Emotional Labor Scale'. Percentage (%), frequency (f), standard deviation (s), mean score (\bar{x}) values were calculated, and One-Way ANOVA tests and T-test were performed. As a result of the research, it was found that teachers' overall emotional labor behavior level was medium. The highest average score, which was collected under the factor of "genuine emotions," is "high"; the lowest average score, which was collected under the "surface acting" factor, is "low", and teachers' deep acting level was "medium." Teachers' emotional labor levels vary based on gender, profession, and school type. On the other hand, teachers' emotional labor levels do not vary according to their age, tenure, and education level. The findings were discussed, and recommendations were made to the practitioners and researchers.

© 2021 IJPES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Emotional labor, surface acting, deep acting, genuine emotions, teacher

1. Introduction

The most significant characteristics that distinguish humans from other organisms are their mental abilities and feelings. Emotions have a significant effect in determining people's attitudes and behaviours (Hochschild, 1983). Especially in recent years, "Emotional Labor" draws attention as an indispensable and expected service sector component. Teachers are at the forefront of the service sector; they are always face-to-face with the students, administrators, and parents and are expected to meet and communicate with them. Emotional labor is also considered an essential component of the education sector (Hochschild, 1983, Wharton, 1999; Sutton and Wheatley, 2003). Because of this, evaluation of the emotional and cognitive responses of children in different age groups to continuous education and training is crucial for, for teachers, whose job is to guide the students (Beğenirbaş & Yalçın, 2012).

Studies show that the profession of teaching is requires the highest level of emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983). According to Goodwin, Groth, and Frenkel (2011), teaching is a profession that requires displaying a cheerful and lively disposition or being neutral when needed. Emotional labor research provides teachers with awareness on this issue and aims to improve the strategies for using emotional labor (Ertürk, Kara & Güneş, 2016). In this context, this study aims to examine the emotional labor behaviors of teachers based on various variables. The study contributes to the field with a high number of participants from different professions and school types.

¹ Corresponding author's address: İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey
e-mail: esra.tore@izu.edu.tr

Citation: Töre, E. (2021). Investigation of emotional labor in teaching. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 8(3), 51-62.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2021.8.3.225>

1.1. Emotional Labor

Emotional labor can be defined as expressing the emotions desired by organizations (Morris and Feldman, 1997). It includes evaluating when to express feelings and when not to, assessing inappropriate expressions of emotion, and managing and regulating such expressions. Grandey (2000) defines it both as feelings and expressions of emotions for organizational purposes. In the organizational context, emotional labor involves employees displaying the expected feelings during service encounters (Akin et al., 2014). There are three criteria suggested by Hochschild (1983) for teaching to meet as a profession that involves emotional labor: (1) Values such as cultural expectations of professional standards which are imposed on teachers as external control on their emotional labor; (2) Direct interaction of teachers with their colleagues, students and their parents; (3) producing specific frames of mind (such as excitement, concern, the happiness of fear) (e.g., excitement or anxiety, joy or fear) in their students or other people around them (Winograd, 2003).

Three strategies of performing emotional labor are surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotions. Hochschild (1983) defines surface acting as employees expressing the behavior's expected by their organization, whether their inner feelings are the same as their behavior's or not. On the other hand, deep acting aims to change the inner feelings to match the demonstrated behaviour (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). In other words, in surface acting, the person plays a superficial role to mask his/her true feelings, expressing different emotions on the outside (Grandey, 2003); while in deep acting, the person strives to focus on the inner emotions in order to feel the desired role, just like an actor or an actress (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002). In a sense, deep acting employees put themselves in customers' shoes and empathize (Rupp et al., 2008). The third dimension of emotional labor consists of genuine emotions or naturally felt emotions. Diefendorff et al. (2005) specified that feeling sad about a customer's problem exemplifies genuine emotion. They empirically studied genuine emotions to show the differentiation between surface and deep acting.

The research showed that deep acting had a positive relationship with organizational attachment and customer satisfaction. People who engaged in deep acting were also more likely to feel a sense of personal accomplishment (Hülshager & Schewe, 2011). Wang et al. (2011) had similar results in their research.

Regarding individual well-being, they found that deep acting was statistically unrelated to depersonalization and emotional exhaustion. In addition, deep acting was negatively related to a reduced sense of personal accomplishment and had a small but significant negative relationship with psychosomatic complaints. Deep acting was positively related to both non-self-reported task performance, self-reported task performance, and job satisfaction. In addition to Kammeyer-Mueller et al. (2013) used a meta-analytic structural model to test the effects of deep acting on job performance and stress. They found that deep acting was positively related to job performance and satisfaction and unrelated to stress/emotional exhaustion.

There are two studies on the commonness of deep acting, surface acting, and genuine emotions among employees. Dahling and Perez (2010) researched how emotional labor strategies are affected depending on personal characteristics. The result was that natural feelings and genuine emotional labor were more common among senior employees. Since senior employees presumably have more professional experience and have undergone more emotional labor, the study also points out that employees with greater skill levels are more prone to have genuine feelings about their job. Kiffin-Petersen et al. (2008) found that genuine emotions and deep acting were the most efficient emotional labor forms. Twenty-eight per cent of employees in their study were found to be skilled at performing both. A mere 4 per cent have used all three types of emotional labor, implying that surface acting is rarely used alongside genuine emotions and deep acting.

1.2. Emotional Labor in Teaching

Teaching, as a profession, involves high levels of emotional labor. This aspect of teaching makes it distinct from other lines of work. It is an emotion-based profession, and good practice of teaching is full of positive emotions. This positivity is a must in the teacher's relationship with his/her students to ensure a healthy classroom atmosphere (Akin et al., 2014). In that respect of teaching, emotional labor is primarily perceived as a process during which teachers try to manage, generate, and inhibit their feelings and expressions of emotion according to expectations and the normative beliefs held about the teaching profession. For effective emotional labor, some specific strategies are required for teachers to regulate their feelings and emotions when working (Yin et al., 2013).

Given that learning, providing guidance, and teaching are not the only processes that deal with emotions, they are always emotional by nature (Hargreaves, 2001). For example, a teacher expressing anger in class is considered an unhealthy example (Liljestrom, Roulston, & deMarrais, 2007), and these emotions should be controlled to avoid such occurrences (Noor and Zainuddin, 2011).

Winograd's (2003) self-study reveals five emotional rules for teachers: (1) to love their work; (2) to avoid the display of extreme emotions like anger, joy, and sadness; (4) to love and to show enthusiasm for students; (3) to be enthusiastic and passionate about the subject matter; (5) to have a sense of humour and laugh at their own mistakes and the peccadilloes of students. The researchers agree that teaching involves emotional labor. If teachers cannot manage their emotions appropriately according to the rules, they will be treated as unprofessional. As a result, teachers need to perform emotional labor (Tsang, 2011; Zembylas, 2002, 2005).

Akın and his colleagues (2014) found that senior teachers have higher levels of emotional labor. Their results highlight considering ways to enhance emotion regulation skills for inexperienced and recently qualified staff and the need for teacher-training programs to raise awareness of the emotional demands of teaching.

Şat and his colleagues (2015) found significant differences in sub-dimensions of emotional labor in terms of marital status, gender, educational background, types of institution, and teachers' seniority. Also, Ertürk et al. (2010) found that male teachers' emotional labor behaviour levels are higher than female colleagues. Similarly, primary school teachers had higher levels than high school teachers. Teachers aged 41 and over had higher levels than teachers aged 40 and under 40. Teachers with 16 years and more seniority had higher levels than seniority between 1-5 years. Bıyık and Aydoğan (2014) found that the emotional labor levels of male teachers are higher than female teachers; teachers with higher seniority tend to spend more emotional labor than those with less seniority. In addition, Polatkan (2016) found that male teachers' deep acting levels were statistically higher than female teachers. The genuine acting levels of teachers who love their jobs were meaningfully higher than those who do not. The level of deep acting of teachers who were over 46 is meaningfully higher.

Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found that teachers' emotional labor level shows differences in gender, working period in the same school, and seniority. It has been determined that in the following examples, the former ones respectively have higher levels of emotional labor than the latter ones: teachers who have been working for longer compared to those who have been working shorter in the same school; male teachers compared to female teachers, and senior teachers compared to junior teachers. Contrary to this, Özgün (2015) and Ceylan (2017) found that teachers' emotional labor level does not differ in seniority.

Researchers found that male teachers' deep acting, and surface acting levels were meaningfully higher than female teachers (Ceylan, 2017; Kadan & Aral, 2018, Yakar, 2015). Baş (2012) found that the emotional labor levels of female employees were higher than their male counterparts. On the other hand, Kaya (2009) found that teachers' emotional labor behaviours do not vary according to institution roles, experience in the institution, or gender. Köksel (2009) found that emotional labor levels do not vary according to gender.

Some researchers found that emotional labor behaviors' of teachers were at a moderate level (Akbaş & Bozkurt Bostancı, 2019; Beğenirbaş & Meydan, 2012; Ertürk et al., 2010; Savaş, 2012); and other researchers found that emotional labor behaviours of teachers were at a high level (Akın et al., 2014, Aytekin Uysal, 2007; Brown et al., 2014; Ceylan, 2017, Yılmaz et al., 2015). Polatkan (2016) found that secondary school teachers' emotional labor level was highest on surface acting, followed by genuine and deep acting. Akın et al. (2014) found that the emotional labor levels of teachers were 4.53 for genuine emotions, 4.47 for deep acting, and 3.99 for surface acting on a five-point Likert scale. The female teachers used surface acting and deep acting behaviours significantly more often than the male teachers do.

This study aims to examine teachers' emotional labor behaviours based on various variables. With this purpose, the study has sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of teachers' emotional labor?
 - 1a. What is the level of teachers' surface acting?
 - 1b. What is the level of teachers' deep acting?
 - 1c. What is the level of teachers' genuine emotions?

2. Do primary teachers' emotional labor levels (surface acting, deep acting, genuine emotions) significantly vary according to various variables?

2a. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to gender?

2b. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to age?

2c. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to tenure?

2d. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to education level?

2e. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to the profession?

2f. Do teachers' emotional labor levels significantly vary according to school type?

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

This study aims to examine teachers' emotional labor behaviors based on various variables. For research purposes, this study was designed as a descriptive survey model, which seeks to determine the presence and degree of a change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2013).

2.2. Population and Sample

The universe of the research study consists of 9.597 public school teachers in Küçükçekmece and Bağcılar districts, within the borders of İstanbul province. The sample group of the research includes 556 teachers who work in 21 different regions of İstanbul in the schools of the Ministry of National Education. The sample group was determined by stratified sampling. Subgroups in the universe are identified and represented in the sample by their current proportions in the universe. The number of samples selected from each layer relies on the number of units of that layer (Karasar, 2013). A stratified sampling universe has homogeneous layers. Sample from layers have been selected, and the selections were combined. In stratified sampling, boundaries are used in the presence of substrates or subunit groups in a specified universe (Kılıç, 2013). In this research, stratified sampling was used, considering that the responses from different geographical regions may vary. Teachers' personal variables within the scope of the research are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Teachers' Personal Variables

| Variable | Variable Value | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Gender | Female | 65,5 |
| | Male | 34,5 |
| Age | 25 and under | 5,3 |
| | 25-34 years old | 44,8 |
| | 35-44 years old | 35,5 |
| | 45-54 years old | 11,3 |
| | 55 and above | 3,1 |
| Tenure | 1-5 years | 24,7 |
| | 6-10 years | 31,0 |
| | 11-15 years | 16,3 |
| | 16-20 years | 16,1 |
| | 20-25 years | 6,6 |
| | 26 years and above | 5,1 |
| Education Level | Graduate | 87,5 |
| | Master and doctorate | 12,5 |
| Profession | Pre-school teacher | 11,4 |
| | Primary school teacher | 24,7 |
| | Branch teacher | 57,9 |
| | School manager | 6,1 |
| School type | Kindergarten | 9,8 |
| | Primary school | 29,1 |
| | Secondary school | 27,3 |
| | Anatolian high school | 18,0 |
| | Vocational high school | 15,8 |

As shown in Table 1, 65,5% of the participants were female; the majority were between 25-34 years old (44.8%); 57.9% were branch teachers; 87.5% have graduate degrees, 29,1% of them work in primary schools.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The study data were collected with a measuring tool, which consists of 'Personal Information Form' and 'Emotional Labor Scale.' The description of the measurement tool has been given below.

Personal Information Form: The questionnaire prepared by the researcher was used to determine some of the characteristics of the participants (gender, age, tenure, education level, profession, school type).

Emotional Labor Scale: The Scale was created by Diefendorff et al. (2005) and was adapted to Turkish in the teacher sample by Basım and Beğenirbaş (2012). The scale has three dimensions, surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotions. The participants were evaluated with the help of the five-point Likert Scale (1 = Never, 5 = Each Time). Surface acting was measured in scale by six items, deep acting by four items, and genuine emotions by three items. The internal consistency of the scale has been calculated as .80 (Basım & Beğenirbaş, 2012). In this study, Cronbach's alpha = .85 for the surface acting sub-dimension, Cronbach's alpha = .87 for the deep acting sub-dimension, and Cronbach's alpha = .83 for the genuine emotions sub-dimension. The Cronbach's alpha value for the overall scale is .77.

Based on the assumption that the scale was equally spaced, the score range coefficient for the arithmetic means was 0.80. Score Range = (Highest Value-Lowest Value) / 5 = 4/5 = 0.80. Accordingly, the evaluation range of arithmetic means is "very low" between 1.00-1.80, "low" between 1.81-2.60, "medium" between 2.61-3.40, "high" between 3.41-4.20, "very high" between 4.21-5.00 (Gömleksiz & Bulut, 2006; Tanuğur et al., 2013.)

2.4. Data Analysis

The data collected for the research study were analyzed by using SPSS 23 program. The normality of the data was examined with the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test, and it was determined that the data have a normal distribution ($p > .05$; $p = .300$). In this case, One Way ANOVA, Independent Samples T-test was employed to analyse the data among parametric tests.

The levels of teachers' emotional labor were calculated by using arithmetic means and standard deviation. For determining whether teachers' emotional labor differs according to the variables of gender and education level, Independent Samples T-test was conducted. One Way ANOVA was used to determine whether teachers' emotional labor differs according to the age, tenure, profession, and school type variables.

3. Findings

1. The first sub-question of the study is 'What is the level of teachers' emotional labor?' The values of the mean score (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (S) of this sub-problem are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Findings

| <i>Surface Acting (F1)</i> | <i>x</i> | <i>S</i> |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| I playact to properly deal with students. | 2.16 | 1.13 |
| I wear a mask to show the emotions required by my profession. | 1.93 | 1.05 |
| I act as if I feel the emotions that I do not feel while doing my profession. | 1.87 | 1.05 |
| I act as if I feel good when dealing with my students. | 2.00 | 1.04 |
| I show my students different emotions than I really feel. | 1.86 | 0.97 |
| When I take care of the students, I perform extra performance as if I were doing a show. | 2.43 | 1.23 |
| <i>Overall score of surface acting</i> | <i>2.04</i> | <i>4.90</i> |
| <i>Deep Acting (F2)</i> | <i>x</i> | <i>S</i> |
| I do my best to feel the emotions I have to show the students. | 3.34 | 1.34 |
| I make an intense effort to make the students feel the emotions that I have to show. | 2.97 | 1.38 |
| I really try to experience the emotions I have to show students. | 2.21 | 1.32 |
| I make an effort to feel the emotions I have to show in reality. | 2.63 | 1.34 |
| <i>Overall score of deep acting</i> | <i>3.05</i> | <i>4.60</i> |
| <i>Genuine Emotions (F3)</i> | <i>x</i> | <i>S</i> |
| The feelings I show students are sincere. | 4.37 | .79 |
| The feelings I show students are the same as what I felt at that moment. | 4.12 | .92 |

| | | |
|---|------|------|
| The emotions I show to the students emerge spontaneously. | 4.00 | .95 |
| Overall score of genuine emotions | 4.16 | 2.32 |
| Overall score of emotional labor | 2.83 | 7.56 |

The average scores given by the teachers to the emotional labor scale are given in Table 2. As can be seen in Table 2, the highest average scores were collected under the factor of "genuine emotions" ("high" between 3.41-4.20); the lowest mean scores were collected in the "surface acting" factor ("low" between 1.81-2.60), and teachers' deep acting level were "medium" between 2.61-3.40.

The items with the highest average score on the scale are the following: "The feelings I show students are sincere." (x= 4.37), "The feelings I show students are the same as what I felt at that moment." (x= 4.12), "The emotions I show to the students emerge spontaneously." (x= 4.00). The items with the lowest score are the following: "I show my students' different emotions than I really feel." (x= 1.86), "I act as if I feel the emotions that I do not feel while doing my profession." (x= 1.87), "I wear a mask to show the emotions required by my profession." (x= 1.93). When the scale was evaluated as a whole, it was found that teachers' emotional labor levels were "medium" between 2.61-3.40.

The second sub-problem of the study is 'Do teachers' emotional labor level (surface acting, deep acting, genuine emotions) vary according to various variables?' The results show that teachers' emotional labor levels vary according to gender, profession, and school type. On the other hand, teachers' emotional labor levels do not vary according to their age, tenure, and education level. The relationships between various variables and teachers' emotional labor levels are shown in the tables below.

The results of the t-test conducted to measure the effect of gender on the emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Level of Teachers' Deep Acting (T-Test) According to Gender

| | Gender | n | X | S | df | t | p | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|----|
| Deep Acting | Female | 362 | 11.98 | 4.77 | 554 | -1.46 | .000 | ** |
| | Male | 194 | 12.59 | 4.24 | | | | |

** p<0.01

According to the study's findings, male teachers show deeper acting behaviours (t = -1.46, p <0.01) than female teachers. On the other hand, teachers' surface acting and genuine emotions do not vary according to gender.

The ANOVA results conducted to measure the effect of the age on emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 4.

Table 4. The Level of Teachers' Emotional Labor (ANOVA) According to the Age

| | Age | N | \bar{X} | Sd | df | F | p | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------|------|----|------|------|------|
| Emotional Labor Total | 25 and under | 29 | 35.92 | 7.03 | 4 | 0.37 | .829 | * |
| | 25-34 years old | 249 | 37.17 | 7.64 | | | | |
| | 35-44 years old | 198 | 36.97 | 7.38 | | | | |
| | 45-54 years old | 63 | 36.80 | 7.64 | | | | |
| | 55 and above | 17 | 35.0 | 9.50 | | | | |

*p>0.05

According to the study's findings, emotional labor levels are not age-dependent (F=0.37, p>0.05).

The ANOVA results conducted to measure the effect of the tenure on emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 5.

Table 5. The Level of Teachers' Emotional Labor (ANOVA) According to the Tenure

| | Age | N | \bar{X} | Sd | df | F | p | Sig. |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------|------|----|------|------|------|
| Emotional Labor Total | 1-5 years | 138 | 37.60 | 7.24 | 5 | 1.43 | .209 | * |
| | 6-10 years | 173 | 36.69 | 7.41 | | | | |
| | 11-15 years | 91 | 36.15 | 7.39 | | | | |
| | 16-20 years | 90 | 38.31 | 8.13 | | | | |
| | 20-25 years | 36 | 37.19 | 6.84 | | | | |
| | 26 years and above | 28 | 34.27 | 8.90 | | | | |

*p>0.05

According to the study's findings, emotional labor levels do not depend on tenure ($F=1.43$, $p>0.05$). The results of the t-test conducted to measure the effect of education level on the emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 6.

Table 6. *The Level of Teachers' Emotional Labor (T-Test) According to Education Level*

| | Education Level | n | X | S | df | t | p | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----|-------|------|-----|--------|------|------|
| Emotional Labor Total | Graduate | 486 | 36.75 | 7.64 | 554 | -1.313 | .969 | * |
| | Master and | 70 | 38.22 | 7.71 | | | | |
| | Doctorate | | | | | | | |

* $p>0.05$

According to the study's findings, emotional labor levels do not depend on education level ($t=-1.313$, $p>0.05$).

The ANOVA results to measure the impact of the profession on the emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 7.

Table 7. *The Level of Teachers' Genuine Emotions (ANOVA) According to the Profession*

| | Profession | N | \bar{X} | Sd | df | F | p | Sig. |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----------|------|----|------|------|------|
| Genuine Emotions | 1-Pre-school teacher | 65 | 12.66 | 2.20 | 3 | 3.12 | .02* | 2-3 |
| | 2-Primary school teacher | 134 | 12.94 | 2.04 | | | | |
| | 3-Branch teacher | 323 | 12.24 | 2.43 | | | | |
| | 4-School manager | 34 | 12.72 | 2.40 | | | | |

According to the findings of the study, primary school teachers' genuine emotions levels are higher than branch teachers' ($F=3.12$, $p < 0.05$). On the other hand, teachers' surface acting and deep acting levels do not vary according to the profession.

The ANOVA results to measure the effect of school type on the emotional labor behaviour of teachers are given in Table 8.

Table 8. *The Level of Teachers' Emotional Labor (ANOVA) According to the School Type of Teachers*

| | School type | N | \bar{X} | Sd | df | F | p | Sig. |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----------|------|----|-------|--------|------|
| Emotional Labor Total | 1-Kindergarden | 55 | 36.36 | 6.62 | 4 | 3.684 | .000** | 3-5 |
| | 2-Primary School | 158 | 36.51 | 7.68 | | | | |
| | 3-Secondary school | 154 | 38.58 | 7.75 | | | | |
| | 4-Anatolian High School | 100 | 36.39 | 7.19 | | | | |
| | 5-Vocational High school | 89 | 34.75 | 7.45 | | | | |
| Deep Acting | 1-Kindergarden | 55 | 12.36 | 4.71 | 4 | 3.651 | .000** | 3-5 |
| | 2-Primary School | 158 | 12.05 | 4.52 | | | | |
| | 3-Secondary school | 154 | 13.13 | 4.71 | | | | |
| | 4-Anatolian High School | 100 | 11.80 | 4.41 | | | | |
| | 5-Vocational Hig school | 89 | 10.79 | 4.41 | | | | |
| Genuine Emotions | 1-Kindergarden | 55 | 12.88 | 2.08 | 4 | 4.732 | .000** | 1-5 |
| | 2-Primary School | 158 | 12.74 | 2.32 | | | | |
| | 3-Secondary school | 154 | 12.75 | 1.91 | | | | |
| | 4-Anatolian High School | 100 | 12.35 | 2.46 | | | | |
| | 5-Vocational Hig school | 89 | 11.59 | 2.75 | | | | |

According to the study's findings, teachers' deep acting, genuine emotions, and total emotional labor levels differ according to the profession. Secondary school teachers' deep acting ($F=3.65$, $p < 0.01$), genuine emotions ($F=4.73$, $p < 0.01$) and total emotional labor ($F=3.68$, $p < 0.01$) levels are higher than vocational high school teachers. Similarly, kindergarden and primary school teachers' deep acting ($F=3.65$, $p < 0.01$) and genuine emotions ($F=4.73$, $p < 0.01$) levels are higher than vocational high school teachers.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

In this section, the research findings are discussed, with previous research findings also taken into consideration. Teachers' overall emotional labor behaviour level was "medium." The highest average score, which was collected under the factor of "genuine emotions", is "high"; the lowest average score, which was

collected in the "surface acting" factor, is "low" and teachers' deep acting level was "medium". While some researchers (Akbaş & Bozkurt Bostancı, 2019; Beğenirbaş & Meydan, 2012; Ertürk et al., 2010; Sagas, 2012) found that emotional labor behaviours of teachers were at a medium level; other researchers (Akin et al., 2014, AYTEKIN UYSAL, 2007; Brown et al., 2014, Ceylan, 2017; Yılmaz et al., 2015) found that emotional labor behaviours of teachers were at a high level. Akin et al. (2014) found that the emotional labor levels of teachers were 4.53 for genuine emotions, 4.47 for deep acting, and 3.99 for surface acting on a five-point Likert scale. These research findings are consistent with the current findings. According to the research results, the surface acting had a negative effect, whereas deep acting and genuine emotions had a positive effect on positive organizational behaviour such as job performance (Kim et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Totterdell & Holman, 2003;) and job satisfaction (Bhave & Glomb, 2016; Chen et al., 2012, Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Cheung & Tang, 2009, Cheung & Tang, 2010; Cheung et al., 2011; Hur et al. 1, 2015; Park & Han, 2013). The findings suggest the desired result in which a high level of genuine emotions and low-level surface acting increase positive organizational behaviours such as job performance and job satisfaction. It is an indication that there is a need for studies to increase deep acting from medium level to high level.

It was found that teachers' deep acting levels vary according to gender. Male teachers show deeper acting behaviours than female teachers. Polatkan (2016) found that male teachers' deep acting levels were meaningfully higher than female teachers. Şat and his colleagues (2015) found significant differences in emotional labor subdimensions in terms of gender. Ertürk et al. (2010) found that male teachers' emotional labor behaviour levels higher male than their female counterparts. In addition, Bıyık and Aydoğan (2014) found that the emotional labor levels of male teachers are higher than female teachers. Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found that male teachers have higher emotional labor levels than female teachers. Researchers (Ceylan, 2017; Kadan & Aral, 2018; Yakar, 2015) found that male teachers' deep acting, and the surface acting level were meaningfully higher than female teachers. Baş (2012) found that the emotional labor levels of female employees are higher than their male colleagues. On the other hand, Kaya (2009) and Köksel (2009) found that teachers' emotional labor behaviours do not vary according to gender. In deep acting, the person strives to focus on the inner emotions to feel the desired role, just like an actor or an actress. The result can be explained. Gender roles: refers to the roles traditionally expected of men and women. While these roles expect men to behave more like they are, they expect women to feel and behave in accordance with social life (Vefikuluçay et. al, 2007).

Teachers' genuine emotions vary according to the profession. Primary school teachers' genuine emotions level is higher than branch teachers. This finding is explained by the fact that primary school teachers' study with younger students and for longer hours than branch teachers do. Therefore, they would need to perform more emotional labor behaviour than others do. Inconsistent with this research's results, Kaya (2009) found that teachers' emotional labor behaviours do not vary according to institution roles.

Teachers' deep acting, genuine emotions, and total emotional labor levels differ according to school type. Secondary school teachers' deep acting, genuine emotions, and total emotional labor levels are higher than vocational high school teachers. Similarly, kindergarten and primary school teachers' deep acting and genuine emotion levels are higher than vocational high school teachers' teachers do. It is thought that student's ages and needs can explain this situation. Ertürk et al. (2010) found that primary school teachers have higher levels of emotional labor behaviour compared to high school teachers. On the other hand, Kaya (2009) found teachers' emotional labor behaviours do not vary according to institution roles.

It was found that teachers' emotional labor levels do not vary according to age, tenure, and education level. Dahling and Perez (2010) found that senior employees express their naturally felt emotions, and they were more genuine in their emotions. Since senior employees presumably have more professional experience and have undergone more emotional labor, their study also points out that employees with greater skill levels are more prone to have genuine feelings about their jobs. Şat and his colleagues (2015) found significant differences in emotional labor subdimensions in terms of educational background and seniority of teachers. Akin and his colleagues (2014) found that more experienced teachers reported higher levels of emotional labor. Ertürk et al. (2010) found that teachers aged 41 and over have higher levels of emotional labor behaviour than teachers aged 40 and under, and teachers with seniority 16 years and more have higher levels than those who have seniority between 1-5 years. Bıyık and Aydoğan (2014) found that teachers with higher seniority tend to spend more emotional labor than those with less seniority. The level of deep acting of teachers who were over

46 is meaningfully higher. Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found that senior teachers have higher emotional labor levels than junior teachers. Contrary to this, Özgün (2015) and Ceylan (2017) found that teachers' emotional labor level does not differ in seniority. Kaya (2009) found that teachers' emotional labor behaviours do not vary according to experience in the institution.

5. Recommendations

In this section, recommendations based on the research findings are presented under two headings: practitioners and researchers.

Recommendations for Practitioners

- Deep acting has a positive correlation with professional satisfaction and task performance, both self-reported and non-self-reported. Since teachers' deep acting level was found as "medium", it is recommended to conduct studies to raise the deep acting level higher.
- Male teachers have higher deep acting levels than female teachers do. Thus, it is recommended to conduct studies to raise the level of female teachers' deep acting behaviour.
- Kindergarten, primary, and secondary school teachers' deep acting and genuine emotions levels are higher than vocational high school teachers. It is recommended to conduct studies to raise vocational high school teachers' deep acting and genuine emotional behaviour levels.

Recommendations for Researchers

- This study was conducted in public schools. It is considered that it would be beneficial to conduct similar research in private schools as well.
- Primary school teachers' genuine emotions levels are higher than branch teachers. The finding will present a starting point for future qualitative studies. Researchers could explain the results with qualitative studies such as "focus group interview" and "observation".

6. References

- Akbaş, A., & Bostancı, A. B. (2016). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel politika algıları ile duygusal emek düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(3), 44-63.
- Akın, U., Aydın, İ., Erdoğan, Ç. & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2014). Emotional labor and burnout among Turkish primary school teachers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 41(2), 155-169.
- Aytekin Uysal, A. (2007). Öğretmenlerde gözlenen duygusal yaşantı örüntülerinin ve duygusal işçiliğin mesleki iş doyumunu ve tükenmişlik üzerine etkisi [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi.
- Basım, H. N., & Beğenirbaş, M. (2012). Çalışma yaşamında duygusal emek: bir ölçek uyarlama çalışması. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), 77-90.
- Baş, M. (2012). *Duygusal emek-müşteri memnuniyeti ilişkisi: engelli turizm pazarında bir araştırma* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi.
- Beğenirbaş, M. & Meydan, C. H. (2012). Duygusal emeğin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışıyla ilişkisi: öğretmenler üzerinde bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(3), 159-181.
- Beğenirbaş, M., & Yalçın, R. C. (2012). Öğretmenlerin kişilik özelliklerinin duygusal emek gösterimlerine etkileri. *Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1), 47-65.
- Bhave, D. P., & Glomb, T. M. (2016). The role of occupational emotional labor requirements on the surface acting-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Management*, 42(3), 722-741.
- Bıyık, Y. & Aydoğan, E. (2015). Duygusal emek ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisi: bir araştırma. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(3), 159- 180.

- Brotheridge, C. M., & 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., Grandey A. (2002) Emotional labor and burnout: comparing two perspectives of people work, *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 17-39.
- Brown, E. L., Horner, C. G., Kerr, M. M. & Scanlon, C. L. (2014). United States teachers' emotional labor and professional identities. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 11*(2), 205-225.
- Ceylan, A. K. (2017). Öğretmenlerin duygusal emeklerinin sosyo-demografik değişkenler yönünden özellikleri: batman ili araştırması. *Batman Üniversitesi Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi, 7*(2/1), 122-132.
- Cheung, F., & Tang, C. (2009). Quality of work life as a mediator between emotional labor and work family interference. *Journal of Business Psychology, 24*, 245–255.
- Cheung, F., & Tang, C. (2010). Effects of age, gender, and emotional labor strategies on job outcomes: moderated mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being, 2*, 323–339.
- Cheung, F., Tang, C. S. K., & Tang, S. (2011). Psychological capital as a moderator between emotional labor, burnout, and job satisfaction among schoolteachers in China. *International Journal of Stress Management, 18*(4), 348.
- Dahling, J. J., & Perez, L. A. (2010). Older worker, different actor? linking age and emotional labor strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 574–578
- Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 339–357.
- Ertürk, A., Kara, S. B. K., & Güneş, D. Z. (2016). Duygusal emek ve psikolojik iyi oluş: bir yordayıcı olarak yönetsel destek algısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(4).
- Gömlüksiz M. N & Bulut, İ (2006). Yeni fen ve teknoloji dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 16*(2), 173 - 192.
- Goodwin, R. E., Groth, M., & Frenkel, S. J. (2011). Relationships between emotional labor, job performance, and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 538-548.
- Grandey, A. (2003). When the show must go on: surface and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. Goodwin, R. E., Groth, M., & Frenkel, S. J. (2011). Relationships between emotional labor, job performance, and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 538-548. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 86–96.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: a new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5* (1), 95–110.
- Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers College Record, 3*, 1056–1080
- Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(6), 749-769.
- Hur, W. M., Han, S. J., Yoo, J. J., & Moon, T. W. (2015). The moderating role of perceived organizational support on the relationship between emotional labor and job-related outcomes. *Management Decision, 53* (3), 605-624.
- Hülshager, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: a meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*, 361–389.

- Kadan, G., & Aral, N. (2018). Kaynaştırma uygulamasını yürüten öğretmenlerin duygusal emek ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Çocuk ve Gelişim Dergisi*, 1(1), 15-29.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Rubenstein, A. L., Long, D. M., Odio, M. A., Buckman, B. R., Zhang, Y., et al. (2013). A meta-analytic structural model of dispositional affectivity and emotional labor. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 47-90.
- Karasar, N. (2002). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayıncılık
- Kaya, E. (2009). *Özel okul öğretmenlerinin duygusal emek davranışını algılama biçimleri ile iş doyumları ve iş stresleri arasındaki ilişki* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Maltepe Üniversitesi.
- Kiffin-Petersen, S. A., Jordan, C. L., & Soutar, G. N. (2011). The big five, emotional exhaustion and citizenship behaviors in service settings: the mediating role of emotional labor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 43-48.
- Kılıç, S. (2013). Örneklemeye yöntemleri. *Journal of Mood Disorders*, 3(1), 44-6.
- Kim, H. J., Hur, W. M., Moon, T. W., & Jun, J. K. (2017). Is all support equal? The moderating effects of supervisor, coworker, and organizational support on the link between emotional labor and job performance. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 20(2), 124-136.
- Köksel, L. (2009). *İş yaşamında duygusal emek ve ampirik bir çalışma* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Celal Bayar Üniversitesi.
- Lee, C., An, M., & Noh, Y. (2015). The effects of emotional display rules on flight attendants' emotional labor strategy, job burnout and performance. *Service Business*, 9(3), 409-425.
- Liljestrom, A., Roulston, K. & deMarrais, K. (2007). 'There's no place for feeling like this in the workplace': women teachers' anger in school settings. In: P. Schutz & R. Pekrun, eds. *Emotion in Education*, 267-284. Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1997). Managing emotions in the workplace, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 9 (3), 257-274.
- Noor, N. M., & Zainuddin, M. (2011). Emotional labor and burnout among female teachers: work-family conflict as mediator. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 14(4), 283-293.
- Özgün, A. (2015). *Duygusal emek davranışının iş stresi üzerindeki etkisi* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
- Park, M. M., & Han, S. J. (2013). Relations of job satisfaction with emotional labor, job stress, and personal resources in home healthcare nurses. *Journal of Korean Academy of Community Health Nursing*, 24(1), 51-61.
- Polatkan, N. N. (2016). *Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin duygusal emek davranışları ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi.
- Rupp D.E., Mccance, A.S., Spencer, S., Sonntag K.; 2008; Customer (in) justice and emotional labor: the role of perspective taking, anger, and emotional regulation, *Journal of Management*, 34 (5), 903-924.
- Şat, A., Amil, O., & Özdevecioğlu, M. (2015). Duygusal zeka ve duygusal emek düzeylerinin bazı demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Özel okul öğretmenleri ile bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(39), 1-20.
- Savaş, A. C. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin duygusal zekâ ve duygusal emek yeterliklerinin öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu düzeylerine etkisi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (33), 139-148.
- Sutton, R.E., Wheatley, K. F., 2003; Teachers' emotions and teaching: a review of the literature and directions for future research, *Educational Psychology Review*, 15, 27-358.

- Tanuğur, B., Bekiroğlu, F., Gürel, C., & Süzük, E. (2013). Yeni ortaöğretim fizik programının günlük hayatla ilişkilendirilmesinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (4).
- Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion regulation in customer service roles: testing a model of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(1), 55.
- Tsang, K. K. (2011). Emotional labor of teaching. *Educational Research*, 2(8), 1312-1316.
- Vefikuluçay, A. G. D., Zeyneloğlu, A. G. S., Eroğlu, K., & Taşkin, L. (2007). Kafkas Üniversitesi son sınıf öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin bakış açıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2), 26-38.
- Wang, G., Seibert, S. E., & Boles, T. L. (2011). Synthesizing what we know and looking ahead: a meta-analytical review of 30 years of emotional labor research. *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, 7, 15-43.
- Wang, X., Wang, G., & Hou, W. C. (2016). Effects of emotional labor and adaptive selling behavior on job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 44(5), 801-814.
- Wharton, A.S. (1999) The psychological consequences of emotional labour, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561, 158-176.
- Winograd, K. (2003). The functions of teacher emotions: the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Teachers college record*, 105(9), 1641-1673.
- Yakar, S. (2015). *Turizm işletmelerinde duygusal emek ve tükenmişlik ilişkisi: otel işletmelerine yönelik bir araştırma* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Dokuz Eylül Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Yılmaz, K., Altınkurt, Y., Güner, M. & Şen, B. (2015). The relationship between teachers' emotional labor and burnout levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, (59), 75-90.
- Yin, H. B., Lee, J. C. K., & Zhang, Z. H. (2013). Exploring the relationship among teachers' emotional intelligence, emotional labor strategies and teaching satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35, 137-145.
- Zembylas M (2002). Structures of feeling in curriculum and teaching: theorizing the emotional rules. *Educational Theory*, 52(2), 187-208.
- Zembylas M (2005). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: a poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 935-948.