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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study will examine how stress occurs within organizations and its relationship with organizational-level variables by adapting an individual-level psychological survey of burnout to a coding instrument that may be used to code burnout within workplace ethnographies. Additionally, I extend one of the primary organizational antecedents of burnout, interpersonal interaction, to uncover the relationship between the two. I will examine interpersonal interaction in terms of aspects of emotional labor. My measures of burnout and emotional labor will be added to an existing ethnographic dataset.

In this chapter, I will review the sociological literature on stress and burnout. The study of stress within sociology has a long history and is a large and varied field. The stress model has been debated and changed, posing important theoretical and methodological issues for sociologists. Stress at work has been studied as a specific stressor due to its serious consequences for both individuals and organizations. Further, it has introduced new measures and models of the stress process – namely the model of the process of burnout.
I will first outline the issues surrounding the study of stress generally within sociology. This will include a review of both antecedents of workplace stress and measurement issues involved in the study of stress, including the definition of stress as a dependent variable and the effects of social support as mediators and/or moderators of workplace stress. I will then identify the issues specific to the study of job stress. Next, I will discuss the dependent variable I use to measure the effects of job stressors, burnout, and will examine how this concept has been theorized as both a dependent variable in the work stress process and a unique process unto itself. In Chapter Three, I will describe my specific conceptualization of burnout as a construct that I am able to add to an existing database of quantitative codings of workplace ethnographies.

**STRESS**

In 1989, Pearlin summarized the most important issues in studying stress sociologically. Although this work was created nearly twenty years ago and was critiquing the previous thirty years of research, his insights have withstood the test of time. He identifies the problems that sociology has strived to remedy and those which sociology is still confronting. One major part of Pearlin’s argument about how stress should best be studied sociologically is his emphasis on understanding the structural nature of the stress process. He argues that the structural location of people affects the stress process because it affects the stressors they will be exposed to, the coping resources they have, and the stress outcomes they will experience. Differences in stress based on general social stratification as well as the roles that people fulfill within social
institutions and the relationships that accompany these roles, such as within the family or the workplace are evident.

By looking at stress structurally, sociologists truly examine the “socially patterned distribution” (243) of stressors, mediators, and outcomes (Pearlin 1989). Aneshensel (1992) later terms this large category of stressors “systemic stressors”. Practically, this entails not dismissing background information data as unimportant within a model. This has implications in both stress theory and in the treatment of data within statistical analyses of stress: demographic descriptions should not be used merely as controls within stress research; rather, they should be considered as themselves important in understanding the stress process. Current research has underscored this importance. For example, Turner and Avison (2003) find that racial differences in stress experiences are underestimated when a comprehensive and socially located view of stress is not used. To truly understand lifecourse differences, the complexities of people’s real lives and the stressors within those lives must be considered in terms of multiple stressors, the social roots of those stressors, and how stressors are perceived and managed.

Although Pearlin’s critique of the sociological study of stress aptly identifies issues that are still at the forefront of the field, sociologists later began to question his strong emphasis on different levels of exposure to stress stemming from different social locations. Instead, some research proposes that differential vulnerability is a better explanation of the group differences that are found in stress outcomes. The earliest proponents of the vulnerability hypothesis argue that different social groups may be more vulnerable to the negative effects of stressors (Thoits 1995). Kessler et al.’s (1995) work is perhaps the earliest popular application of the vulnerability hypothesis. They find that
stress within one’s social network is more upsetting for women than for men. Researchers later argue that different groups are simply more vulnerable to different stressors rather than one group being particularly vulnerable to all stressors (Thoits 1995). In the mid 1990’s, researchers began to weigh exposure and vulnerability in explaining group differences related to stress. For example, Turner, Wheaton and Lloyd (1995) carefully examine the importance of both aspects and determine the vulnerability argument to be somewhat overstated and the possibility of confounding the two due to difficulties in measuring exposure. Many researchers now look at both as explaining stress related group differences in physical and mental health outcomes.

STRESSORS

The traditional model of stress includes the various types of stressors to which people are exposed, mediators which affect the role of these stressors, and stress outcomes which are the various outcomes that may be affected by stressors (Thoits 1995). There are two main groups of stressors within sociological research: life events and chronic strain. The ways that these stressors have been conceptualized has changed dramatically over time. Early research saw life events as stressful because they indicated a change, and early theory viewed all change as negative and/or stressful. Pearlin (1989) argues that this is problematic because change is not inherently stressful or negative. The view of change in terms of life events shifted to identify that 1) life events can be more or less harmful depending on whether or not they are wanted, expected, or seen as normal and 2) many life events do not happen in a vacuum. Rather, many life events are part of
an ongoing process or are connected to an underlying problem. Further, a person’s structural location can also affect which life events they experience and under which circumstances they experience them (Lantz et al. 2005).

Unlike life events, which are viewed as somewhat singular, time-limited, although socially located events, chronic strain involves the ongoing, daily hassles that people face. Many times, chronic strain is related to the roles people play and those relationships tied to those roles because they are ongoing and significant (Pearlin 1989). Pearlin and Schooler’s (1978) conceptualization of five types of chronic strain redefined the field of stress research and how sociologists came to measure and understand the impact of chronic stressors. These types include role overload, interpersonal conflict, inter-role conflict, role captivity, and role restructuring. These conceptualizations all deal with conflict within a person’s primary relationships, although Pearlin is careful to note later that all types of chronic strain do not occur within these relationships.

One type of chronic strain not tied to a primary relationship that has received more recent attention is the “ambient stressor” (Pearlin et al. 2005) or the “daily hassle” (Thoits 1995) which is, again, tied back to social location. An ambient stressor is a daily stressor that is not specific to either role or activity. One main type related to social inequality is best described as geographical. For example, Downey and Van Willigan (2005) examine the effects of environmental stressors on people, specifically how living in an area with a lot of industrial activity acts as a stressor. Pearlin et al. (2005) note that ambient stressors may also be stressors that affect self-image. They characterize this type
of ambient stressor as those “failures and frustrations” (p. 208) that are rooted in social inequality, such as unrealized goals of success based in differences in opportunity (see also Wheaton 1993).

Finally, there are two types of chronic strain given particular weight in recent sociological work. These include economic strain and discriminatory experiences (Pearlin et al. 2005). As well as acting as a persistent chronic strain, economic strain affects many areas of life and may both create other stressors and affect one’s perception of other stressors. Another chronic strain of particular recent attention is discrimination. Negative treatment based on race, gender, or other ascribed social characteristics is a particularly devastating chronic strain for three reasons. They occur over the lifecourse, they occur across multiple social settings, and they may create a sense of stressful anticipation for the next occurrence (Pearlin et al. 1995).

In his early work, Pearlin (1989) rightly argues that it is important not to categorize stressors too simply - as either solely a life event or a chronic stressor. Instead, it is crucial to understand that stressors do not happen in a vacuum. In the real lives of people, it is not uncommon to see a life event lead to chronic strain or a chronic strain lead to a stressful life event. Further, he states that the presence of either a life event or a chronic strain impacts how a person views a subsequent life event or chronic strain. Aneshensel (1992) later argues against the categorization of stressors as events or chronic, stating that these divisions are arbitrary and contrived.

In the same vein, Pearlin identifies other ways in which stressors might affect people’s lives in ways that are very different from how researchers often simply conceptualize and measure stressors. There are two main issues at hand. First, stressors
multiply. That is, many people experience stressors that lead to other stressors and many stressors occur together. For example, losing a job may lead to chronic economic strain which may lead to marital problems and distress. Researchers have identified this issue and attempt to determine which stressors occur first and which are consequences of the first stressor. In addition, he mentions stress contagion. Family and work research within sociology has identified many facets of this. Stress in one area of a person’s life may, in effect, bleed into another area. Further, one person’s stress can affect other people, usually those people in the primary relationships within a person’s life.

Pearlin (1989) notes the importance of values in determining the effect of a stressor. In this case, again, he is arguing the importance of understanding the complex and interrelated nature of many facets of people’s lives. What he is introducing is that, similar to the importance of understanding a person’s social location, individual values must also be understood. The reason this is important is because a person’s values determine whether or not a stressor is threatening to them, whether a stressor is, in fact, defined as a stressor. Similarly, Aneshensel (1992) defines stressors as not inherently stressful but, rather, as stressful because they represent discrepancies from an individual’s values, wants or needs. This is an important theoretical concern that has not yet been comprehensively investigated.

MEDIATORS

The social stressors people face are, in great part, determined by that person’s social location. So too are the mediators that affect how a person deals with those
stressors. There are four main groups of mediators. As Pearlin (1989) notes, coping and social support have received the most sociological attention, but self image and other personality aspects are also important, though on a more individual basis. In addition, mediators may have both direct and indirect effects on stressors.

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) define coping as the ways in which people lessen the negative impact of stressors. This may include both actions and thoughts. Pearlin (1989) notes the importance in determining the various forms that coping may take and argues that sociologists must identify whether personality or situation specific characteristics determine coping strategies. Once again, he paints a picture of the stress process as complicated as the individual lives and circumstances in which stress occurs, but, at the same time, identifies how similar social locations may create similar “coping repertoires” (250). Coping strategies include avoiding stressors, preventing stressors from creating other stressors, and changing the meaning of events (Aneshensel 1992). Researchers have categorized coping generally into strategies that manage emotions or affect problems (Lazarus & Folkman 1984, Lattack 1986).

Social support is the most widely used mediator in sociological stress research. The biggest methodological issue in understanding social support has been distinguishing it from social networks. The key difference is that social support does not include all those people in an individual’s social network; rather, sources of social support refer to those people a person actually does call on during times of stress (Pearlin 1989). A further complication in this measurement issue is the notion of “perceived support”. Perceived support is that group of people an individual believes they have available to offer social support in times of stress. Some argue that it is this perception of social
support that is most important. Pearlin (1989) does not disagree with this assertion, but he cautions that sociology must not completely separate social support from the concept of social network because that limits the ways in which sociology can understand how social location and participation in social institutions can influence perceived social support as a coping resource. Sociologists frequently characterize social support as a resource that is both tied to the social roles that people play and ties people to social institutions and other social networks (Marcussen 2005). In this way, social support can be seen as being affected by and effecting socially located roles and relationships. Similar to categorizations of coping strategies, researchers have also categorized social support into two distinct types: emotional and instrumental (Fenlason & Beehr 1994).

Various aspects of self image also have been conceptualized as mediators. The most common is self-efficacy. Although Pearlin (1989) characterized sociological stress research at the time as minimizing the use of self image as a mediator because it is harder to relate to group differences via social location, more recent research has identified the relationship between social location and self image. In short, the various social roles and relationships one has, already stratified and varying by social group, are key in determining self image (Marcussen 2005). Thoits (1995) cautions researchers not to overlook the importance of “personal resources” such as self-esteem and feeling of control or mastery over one’s life in moderating the effects of stressors (p.60). Further, the effects of other types of coping resources such as social support on personal resources must be considered.
STRESS OUTCOMES/STRAINS

Strains are defined as “individual outcomes or results of stress” (Fenlason & Beehr 1994, p. 157). There are many different strains that sociologists may study, including physical and mental health, self perceptions, and role fulfillment. Pearlin (1989) cautions sociologists to again remember the complex role that stress plays in people’s lives and to not use singular stress outcomes. Instead, multiple outcomes should be included in sociological models of stress. Some researchers are looking at the positive effects of stress (Thoits 1995) and see stress reactions as normative in many cases (Lennon 1989). In some cases, a stressful event may act as a sort of catalyst for change in a person’s life. For example, a person may make positive life changes after a stressful life event occurs.

STRESS AND WORK

Not only is job stress a subset of the sociological study of stress, researchers are viewing job stress as unique and significant stressor that can both affect a person throughout their lifetime and illustrates the relationship between social location and individual experiences with stress. For example, Pearlin et al. (2005) mention an unpleasant or unstable job as stressors that may explain the health disparities seen when races or social classes are compared in terms of health outcomes over the lifecourse. Further, these stressors are unique because they are not stressors that can easily be overcome by individual effort as other health stressors may be. Fenwick and Tausig (1994) see job stress as unique
because it illustrates a link between society level economic changes and individual level experiences of stress. Wilson, Larson and Stone (1993) argue that job stress is significant because it not only affects work life but also greatly affects a person’s family relationship.

There are many aspects of the work life that may be viewed as stressors. One group of job stressors are defined as types of role stress – and relate back to Pearlin and Schooler’s (1978) categorizations of types of chronic strain. Role overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict are commonly noted in job stress studies. Role overload refers to feeling incapable of doing or having the time to complete work. In short, a person may feel that the demands of a situation are greater than their abilities. Early studies look at feelings of overload at work directly. For example, Kahn et al. (1964) developed a scale with items measuring feelings of overload at work. Xie and Johns (1995) examine the relationship between job scope, the activities required to perform a job, and stress. They find a curvilinear relationship between job scope and stress – meaning that jobs with very high or very low job scope are more likely to experience stress. Further, they find that one’s perception of how well their abilities match the demands of a job moderate the effects of job scope on stress. Role ambiguity is seen in the workplace as having unclear goals or requirements or competing relationships at work. Role conflict is defined as incompatibility within the expectations of a role (Singh, Goolsby & Rhoads 1994). For example, Parkington and Schneider (1979) examine specific types of role stress facing workers in service related industries. They argue that
these workers are more likely to experience role ambiguity and role conflict because they are often placed in situations in which the demands of bureaucracy or management and the demands of providing customer service compete.

Parasuraman and Alutto (1981) argue that there are many job stressors that are separate from role stress. They examine what they term “situational factors” (p.48) that relate to stressors such as complexity, routinization, and level of supervision. An additional stressor that is distinct from role stressors is job insecurity. Wilson, Larson, and Stone (1993) see job insecurity as a particular concern because it is common and leaves people in a state of immobility – they argue that people who have lost their jobs begin to move on and remedy their situation while people who are facing a possible job loss are, in a sense, stuck and have fewer formal resources.

The most commonly examined mediator of job stressors is social support. Seers et al. (1983) illustrate the complex relationship between social support and stressors with their comprehensive examination of the buffer and the coping hypotheses. These hypotheses propose different ways in which social support mediates the effects of stressors on an individual. The buffer hypothesis posits that social support, in a sense, shields people from the negative impact of stressors. That is, simply having social support negates the negative impact of job stressors. The coping hypothesis, on the other hand, sees the relationship between stressors and social support differently. Social support is seen as a resource that people may choose to call on during times of stress. Seers et al. (1983) also demonstrate how different types of job stressors (including role conflict and role ambiguity) may be affected differently by social support and how various types of social support may have different effects. Similarly, Abdel-Halim
BURNOUT

There are various outcomes that have been studied in regards to job stress. They may include physical or mental health measures, or job measures such as job satisfaction or turnover. Burnout is a unique outcome because it is specific to job stress and has been solely applied to jobs that involve interaction. In fact, burnout is treated as more than an outcome related to job stress, it is treated as a specific conceptualization of the stress process in the workplace. Burnout is largely regarded as a specific type of stress that is a response to stressful work conditions (Ganster & Schaubroeck 1991). “Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (Maslach & Jackson 1981, p.99). Maslach and colleagues (1976, 1980, 1981) argue that burnout is an important outcome to study because it has effects on many other aspects of individual and organizational health, including work performance, job satisfaction, alcohol and drug abuse, and marital strain. Research has identified varied antecedents of burnout including job demands, conflict in relationships with coworkers or supervisors, little autonomy, high external control, and high ambiguity (Savicki & Cooley 1994).

The most frequently cited measure of burnout is Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (1981, 1982). The MBI is a 22-item inventory administered to individual workers and measures both the frequency and the intensity of three components: emotional
exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson 1981, Cordes and Dougherty 1993). High levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization coupled with low levels of personal accomplishment indicate high levels of burnout, which is conceptualized as a continuum. Cordes and Dougherty (1993) describe these components: Emotional exhaustion is defined as an overall lack of energy or a feeling that emotional resources are drained. A symptom of emotional exhaustion is great unhappiness at the thought of going to work. Depersonalization is defined as the treatment of clients as objects rather than people or an overall sense of detachment. Symptoms may include cynicism towards co-workers, clients, and organizations and withdrawal through longer breaks. Finally, a diminished sense of personal accomplishment is defined as feelings of being incompetent or bad at one’s job. Some symptoms of a diminished sense of personal accomplishment are feelings of being powerless in a bad situation and disciplinary citations. Burnout is important to study because it is linked to both organizational and personal dysfunction (Maslach & Jackson 1981).

Much research has been done to try to untangle the relationship between individual characteristics, job characteristics, and burnout components. There is no consensus regarding the causal order of the three aspects of burnout (Toppinen-Tanner, Kalimo, and Mutanen 2002). Some argue that the three components of burnout can be viewed as a comprehensive measure of overall burnout. Others argue that burnout is a process in which one component of burnout may lead to the other components. In the simplest format, role stressors in service work lead to burnout. Further, burnout is not seen as a stressor itself but as a cumulative result of job stressors, particularly role
stressors. Although this is debated, burnout may also be seen as a mediator of the stress process at work. In this conceptualization, burnout mediates the effect of role stressors on job outcomes. Singh et al. (1994) even argue that burnout may be a more powerful predictor of job outcomes than are role stressors. In their “partial mediator thesis” (p. 560), they argue that burnout is a more powerful predictor of job outcomes because it is inherently a sum measure of the effects of job stressors coupled with the possible moderating effects of coping resources.

There are two main models proposed regarding the specific causal order of the three burnout components. In the first, one of the components of burnout, emotional exhaustion, is argued to be the core concept of the three burnout components. In fact, many recent studies cite “work exhaustion” as synonymous with burnout (Moore 2000). This initial model also views emotional exhaustion as an initial stage of the burnout process that may lead to the other components of burnout (Gaines & Jermier 1983, Lee & Ashforth 1993, Wright & Bonett 1997). One widely cited example is Leiter and Maslach’s (1988) study of the burnout process among nurses. They note a process of burnout in which emotional exhaustion leads to a sense of depersonalization which, in turn, a diminished personal accomplishment. Cordes, Dougherty, and Blum (1997) describe the process:

“Employees faced with a steady stream of problems requiring some display of emotion as an occupational tool or instrument may experience emotional fatigue when the stream never lets up. They feel they have nothing left to give. As a coping response, individuals may distance themselves psychologically in order to stem the demands on their emotional reserves. They depersonalize their interactions, adopting a callous, cynical, or detached way of dealing with the situation and the individuals with whom they interact. This provides a type of emotional buffer. As they devote less time and energy to their interactions, they
experience a feeling of diminished personal accomplishment in their jobs. They feel inadequate in their ability to relate effectively and successfully with the very people they had once ideally believed they could help.” (p. 687)

Leiter (1991) terms emotional exhaustion as the “critical event” in the burnout process (125). He argues that emotional exhaustion is the “emotional reaction” component of the burnout process and that workers who feel this emotional exhaustion are then more likely to experience the “cognitive” components of burnout: depersonalization and a sense of diminished personal accomplishment. He argues that social support may act as a moderator on the relationship between emotional exhaustion and the two cognitive components of burnout.

There are many variations of this model. For example, Gaines and Jermier (1983) combine multiple perspectives of the burnout model to develop a model in which job stressors lead to emotional exhaustion, which is seen as a strain, and emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment, which are seen as coping mechanisms. Further, they argue that a focus on emotional exhaustion extends the concept of burnout to include not only people who have a lot of customer interaction, but people that experience other types of both interaction-based and non-interaction based strain. They argue that antecedents of emotional exhaustion can be categorized into five groups based on the mixed findings of previous studies: personal characteristics, the nature of interactions at work, the nature of work itself, structural aspects of an organization, and organizational context. Personal characteristics include such things as age, marital status, and level of seniority. The nature of interactions at work examines the relationships between a worker and
clients/customers as well as formal and informal interactions with coworkers and managers. The nature of work itself includes various aspects of jobs such as level of autonomy, level of supervision, task complexity, and the physical demands of work. The structural aspects of an organization include internal labor markets, grievance procedures, and reward or punishment systems. Finally, the organizational context refers to the specific location or organization in which an individual is working. They argue that this organizational-level view is critical to understanding the process of burnout within an individual’s contextually situated life. Schulz, Greenley, and Brown (1995) propose a similar model examining environmental context, organizational structure, management processes, and staff characteristics, but also include measures of “client severity” in their model of the burnout process.

The competing model is proposed by Golembiewski and colleagues (1981, 1984, 1986). In this model, the causal order is almost reversed. Golembiewski proposes that depersonalization is the first component and is usually the result of the detachment that many interaction-based jobs require. This depersonalization eventually leads to a sense of diminished personal accomplishment, which, over time, leads to emotional exhaustion.

The debate over causal order may remain, in part because there are few longitudinal studies that examine the burnout process (Cordes, Dougherty & Blum 1997). Toppinen-Tanner, Kalimo, and Mutanen (2002) have conducted one of the few longitudinal studies of the burnout process, hoping to identify the casual order of the components. In their eight-year study of burnout, they find that emotional exhaustion does act as a central component, preceding cynicism (depersonalization) and efficacy (accomplishment). They argue that differing job characteristics, which they categorize as
job stressors, resources, and demands all play a role in the development of burnout. In specific, time pressure, conflict, and lack of appreciation are antecedents of emotional exhaustion which leads to depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment. Further, they also have direct effects on depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment. Toppinen-Tanner et al. (2002) describe a limitation in their study – and many others – as the absence of individual personality-level factors as another influence on the development of burnout. As Pearlin (1989) argues in his review of thirty years of stress research, they are pointing to the complex, multi-level context in which burnout occurs in the lives of workers. One of the few qualitative studies of burnout shows how individual perceptions and occupational and organizational culture may greatly influence the experience of burnout: Meyerson (1994) finds that burnout is viewed as both normal and positive among social workers in her ethnographic study. This finding points to the importance of varied research in identifying the nuanced experiences of burnout across the multiple contexts of workers’ lives.
CHAPTER 2

EMOTIONAL LABOR

One of the primary organizational antecedents of burnout is interpersonal interaction (Cordes & Dougherty 1993). Specifically, researchers have examined the effects of intensity and frequency of client interactions on burnout. I extend this conceptualization of interaction and examine specific aspects of emotion work in addition to the conceptualization of burnout. My measures of emotion work extend previous conceptualizations by capturing the target of the interaction (including customers, coworkers, and employers) and the nature of the interaction (suppressing negative emotions, evoking positive emotions or showing deference) as well as the frequency of interaction. The inclusion of this detailed emotion work measure aids in uncovering the subtleties of the relationship between one important organizational antecedent, interpersonal interaction, and experiences of burnout.

The addition of new measures of emotional labor and of consequential emotional stress to an existing ethnographic dataset will provide several contributions to the study of emotional labor. First, unlike many existing case studies, the modified dataset will allow for emotional labor to be studied differently in terms of sample. The ethnographic data represents a sample that is not selected based on the presence or absence of emotional labor. This research will also span occupations and organizations, which most
Exiting studies have not done (Wharton 1999). Second, emotional labor is extended to include the management of emotions towards coworkers, subordinates and superordinates and is not restricted to customer interactions. In this chapter, I will review the existing literature on emotional labor and I will describe the measure I include in Chapter Three.

**EMOTION WORK**

Emotion work is defined by Hochschild as "...the act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling...Emotion work refers more broadly to the act of evoking or shaping, as well as suppressing, feeling in oneself" (1979, p. 561). Emotion work is necessary to make displayed emotions be in accordance with "feeling rules" - shared societal norms of appropriate or expected feelings in given situations or with other people (Hochschild 1979, p. 568). Hochschild notes that emotion work occurs in both private and public realms. She also identifies three techniques to performing emotion work. People may perform emotion work cognitively (by altering ideas, images or thoughts), bodily (by altering physical displays of emotion), or expressively (by altering expressions of emotions). When emotion work is commoditized, it is known as “emotional labor”. Emotional labor may also be defined as “the act of displaying the appropriate emotion” (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993, p.90).

Hochschild argues that there are three characteristics shared by jobs that require emotional labor. First, they require direct contact with the public. In addition, they require that the worker "produce an emotional state" in the customer (1983, 147). For example, an employee might need to make a customer feel appreciated and secure.
Lively (2002) finds that paralegals dealing with clients who are filing for divorces must effectively manage clients’ emotions as well as their own responses to the clients’ emotions to “get on with the business of practicing law” (p.208). Finally, jobs that require emotional labor allow the employer some control over the emotion management of the employees through either supervision or training.

Hochschild (1983) details two ways in which emotional labor is performed. “Surface acting” is when workers display (or do not display) various emotions in work interactions. Surface acting is truly acting, in the sense that workers are managing their display of emotions. “Deep acting” is when those emotions are actually evoked or attempted during interactions. Workers perform deep acting by either trying to evoke the appropriate emotion or by thinking of various images or scenarios that will evoke the appropriate feelings (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993).

Hochschild notes that, although the management of emotions is not inherently harmful, there are significant consequences to this commoditization of feeling that is emotional labor. She details three harmful outcomes faced by workers who regularly perform emotion labor. First, workers may risk burnout because they identify too strongly with their jobs. In a sense, it becomes difficult to distinguish between the self and the performance. Next, workers may distinguish themselves from their work and do not believe their own performances of emotion management. They consequently feel that they are insincere. Hochschild defines this experience as emotive dissonance. Finally, workers may become cynical if they accept the necessity of their insincere performances.
In addition to these negative consequences that workers face, two other characteristics of emotional labor make it an increasingly important area of study. First, as the service sector grows, the number of jobs that require emotional labor increases. Emotional labor is a crucial part of this service sector as it dictates interactions between workers and customers. This has consequences for both workers and organizations. “…It is becoming increasingly clear that successful management of emotional labor by employees plays a critical role in the process of customer retention, recovery, and delight” (Ashkanasy et al. 2002, p.321). Second, as noted by Hochschild, there are gender, racial, and class differences in the concentration of workers within occupations that require emotional labor and in the type of emotional labor that is required. Hochschild argues that women are more likely to be in jobs that require emotional labor and that women and minorities are more frequently required to perform emotional labor that shows deference to customers.

In the twenty years since Hochschild's *The Managed Heart* detailed emotional labor, scholars have examined emotional labor in three main areas of research. First, researchers have further examined the conditions under which there are employee consequences for the performance of emotional labor and what those consequences are. Researchers view emotional labor as a specific type of work that may have both distinct and significant effects on workers than other types of work (Wharton 1999). This is due, at least in part, because emotional labor involves so many aspects of the self (Wharton 1999). Although some researchers have noted positive consequences of emotional labor such as increased job satisfaction (Wharton 1993, Schuler & Sypher 2000, Morris & Feldman 1997), these are the exceptions, and many others have detailed negative worker
consequences (See Leidner 1993 for a discussion of the moral implications of the negative consequences of emotion work). These include psychological consequences such as an increased risk of burnout or a sense of numbness, inauthenticity, low self-esteem, reduced job satisfaction, and depression (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993).

Researchers have also noted some physiological consequences of performing emotional labor. These range from cancer (Grandey 2000) to insomnia (Schauboeeck & Jones 2000, Ashkanasy et al. 2002). Wharton (1999) reports that there are mixed findings concerning the negative impact of performing emotional labor, but that this may be due in part to the effects of moderators within the process.

Researchers have tried to identify those employee and workplace characteristics that may moderate the negative consequences of emotional labor. Various employee characteristics are found to moderate the negative consequences of emotional labor. For example, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) find that social and personal identities moderate the negative consequences of the performance of emotional labor for employees. Gender is a main issue in this sense. Many researchers find that women are required to perform more emotional labor than men and may be more adversely affected by it. Wharton (1999) argues that gender must be considered both on the individual-level and in terms of the gendered nature of jobs. She believes that women are not only more likely to be in those jobs which require emotional labor but may be required to perform emotion work more often in other life roles, making them more susceptible to burnout. Further, these personal characteristics may interact, affecting different groups in different ways. For example, women may be more significantly affected by their social identities at work.
than are men, which lessens the negative impacts of performing emotional labor (Wharton 1999).

Next, the characteristics of the emotional labor itself play a role in the consequences of the emotional labor. For example, Erickson and Ritter (2001) find that the particular type of emotion involved in emotional labor plays a large role in the consequences of emotional labor and, further, varies by gender. Specifically, the experience and management of agitation has the most negative consequences on employees.

In addition, organizational and job characteristics are found to moderate the negative consequences of emotional labor. Lopez (2006) argues that the specific organization of emotional labor within organizations is crucial in determining both how effective and how difficult emotional labor is. Karabanow (1999) finds that identification with work and coworker solidarity moderate the negative consequences of emotion work. Similarly, Morris and Feldman (1997) argue that identification with ones work organization moderates the negative consequences of emotional labor. In explaining her unusual finding that emotional labor increases job satisfaction for some workers, Wharton (1993) argues that job characteristics such as job involvement and autonomy are important considerations in examining the consequences of emotional labor. Bellas (1999) argues that gendered perceptions of work is the strongest moderator noting that job duties that are considered feminine include more emotional labor duties and are less highly rewarded than masculine job duties.

Finally, researchers have attempted to develop appropriate methods for studying emotional labor. There are three major contributions. First, Morris and Feldman (1997)
argue that there are four main components in the measurement of emotional labor. These include frequency of emotional display, attentiveness to display rules (which captures both the duration and intensity of emotional labor), variety of emotions to be expressed, and emotional dissonance. Steinberg & Figgart (1999) represent one of the first attempts to treat emotional labor as more than a dichotomous variable measuring its presence or absence. They create an index of emotional labor based on a five-point scale in which the frequency of the performance of emotional labor is measured. Kruml & Geddes (2000) use interviews to generate itemized measures of emotional labor. They develop two constructs, emotive effort and emotive dissonance, to measure the amount, type, and consequences of emotional labor in qualitative workplace studies. Emotive effort measures employees' efforts to mask their true emotions or display situationally appropriate emotions in their dealings with customers. Emotive dissonance captures the disjunction between displayed emotions and workers' true feelings.

My research makes two major contributions to the study of emotional labor. First, as others have argued, there are few studies of emotional labor in which the occupational sample is not selected based on the presence or absence of emotional labor (Wharton 1999, Steinberg & Figgart 1997). Further, researchers have called for emotional labor to be studied across occupations and organizations:

“…Emotional labor…is found across the occupational spectrum. This occupational diversity suggests that variations between jobs that require emotional labor call for serious attention, as this variability may be even greater that the variation between jobs requiring emotional labor and those not requiring this effort” (Wharton 1999, p. 161).
I propose to add several measures of emotional labor and stress to Hodson et al.'s (1993) ethnographic data set. This dataset consists of 204 cases of coded workplace ethnographies. These books are largely based on participant observation within the workplace. By using Hodson et al.'s dataset, this study of emotional labor will be one of the most representative workplace samples in an emotional labor study to date. The books are not chosen based on the presence or absence of emotional labor, customer service interaction, or service sector industry. In addition, the nature of this data set allows for a combination of the strengths of observational studies and survey studies. The authors are primarily performing qualitative case studies to which I am applying survey methods. Previous emotional labor research has focused primarily on one of these two methods.

An additional contribution of my research is that I will expand the concept of emotional labor to include labor that is performed towards coworkers, subordinates, and superordinates within the workplace. Although Hochschild limits her study of emotional labor to emotional labor performed in contacts with customers, others have argued that emotional labor is present in other work interactions (Pierce 1999, Kunda 1992). For example, Pierce finds that the deference and care taking abilities that paralegals direct towards their lawyer employers are crucial components to their evaluations and consequent success. Few studies, however, have expanded the examination of emotional labor to other interactions.
I examine how stress occurs within organizations and its relationship with organizational-level variables by adapting an individual-level psychological survey of burnout to a coding instrument that may be used to code burnout within workplace ethnographies. Additionally, I extend one of the primary organizational antecedents of burnout, interpersonal interaction (measured as aspects of emotion work), to uncover the relationship between the two.

An ongoing problem with the application of the study of stress to the workplace is the heavy reliance on individual-level data. While this data is helpful in illuminating many aspects of stress, it is not as useful for examining the relationship between stress and organizational-level variables. Further, a reliance on individual-level data limits the methods of research that are used to examine workplace stress. Burnout has also not been studied frequently across occupations (Toppinen-Tanner, Kalimo, and Mutanen 2002). Further, researchers believe that different aspects of work may have different effects on the three distinct components of burnout, but this has not yet been widely studied.
I add measures of emotional exhaustion and burnout to Hodson et al.’s (1993) ethnographic dataset (N=204). This data set is derived from the content coding of information from the existing population of book-length, English-language workplace ethnographies. Use of data derived from such in-depth descriptions evaluated across a range of organizational contexts provides a unique opportunity to investigate both the nature of burnout and its organizational antecedents. Further, researchers believe that different aspects of work may have different effects on the three distinct components of burnout, but this has not yet been widely studied (Savicki & Cooley 1994). The current data set allows for this analysis because it spans both occupations and organizational settings.

Hodson’s dataset includes the codings of ethnographies that meet certain criteria. The ethnographies were selected via a two-part procedure. First, the population of workplace ethnographies was identified via computer-assisted searches of libraries and records, and the examination of bibliographies in already located ethnographies. In the second phase of selection, each book was examined individually. The purpose was to generate a sample of distinct workgroups with information on organizational, managerial, and workforce characteristics. Workplace ethnographies are coded for various information that is broadly divided into the following categories: organizational factors, community factors, management characteristics, worker characteristics and actions, the nature of work, and focal group characteristics. To be included in the dataset, ethnographies must meet three criteria. They must represent at least six months of study. They must also focus on one organizational setting. Finally, they must include a focus on a clear workgroup for which the variables are coded. Books not identifying at least one
clearly identifiable work group (workers at the same organizational level responsible for a limited, identifiable set of tasks) in a single organizational setting were thus eliminated from the sample.

Next, a coding instrument was developed for the ethnographic dataset. First, a list of variables and preliminary response categories representing core concepts in the workplace literature was developed. Second, initial team members each read and coded a common selected ethnography, and then met to compare their respective codings and to discuss the variables, response categories, and coding protocols. This process of reading, coding, and refinement was repeated for eight selected ethnographies. The goal was to create an instrument that trained coders could complete for all ethnographies with maximum reliability. (See Appendix for codesheet).

Once the coding instrument was finalized, the full set of ethnographies was read and coded by the same initial team of four researchers, participants in a year-long graduate research practicum, and additional graduate research assistants supported through a National Science Foundation grant. I worked as one of these coders for three years. All coders were trained to use a common protocol. Coders worked individually, documented their conclusions with page numbers, and regularly met to review each case in detail. Problems and questions were resolved as a group. In the case of conflicts, the team reviewed relevant passages and came to a consensus regarding the best answer. To evaluate the reliability of the content coding process, thirteen percent of cases were recoded. The average correlation was .79, indicating a relatively high degree of agreement among coders.
I conceptualize stress outcomes in the workplace as burnout. I argue that the definitions and symptoms of the MBI are indicators that are discussed by workplace ethnographers in their descriptions of workplace interactions and culture. I have adapted the Maslach’s three-component definition of burnout (1981) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory’s (MBI) (1982, 1981) conceptualization of burnout into a coding instrument. This allows the three components of burnout, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment, to be adapted into a codesheet that may be used to code these instances in workplace ethnographies. (See Appendix for codesheet and protocol). For example, an ethnographer may record discussions between workers about not wanting to return to work, indicative of emotional exhaustion or may observe workers withdrawing through longer breaks or conversations with coworkers, indicative of depersonalization.

For each component of burnout, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment, I capture the frequency and intensity. Each component generates two variables. The frequency and intensity measures for each component record the modal experience of a worker in the focal workgroup of each ethnography. The frequency values are “Never”, “Rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Frequently”, and “Constantly. The intensity values are “Mild”, “Moderate”, and “Strong”.

The first burnout concept I code is the frequency of Emotional Exhaustion. This is coded on a five-point scale. For a code of “Never”, ethnographies never report feelings of emotional exhaustion among workgroups. For “Rarely”, workgroups may experience
feelings of emotional exhaustion once in a great while. For a score of “Sometimes”, workgroups regularly but occasionally experience feeling of emotional exhaustion. “Frequently” means that workgroups often experience feelings of emotional exhaustion. “Constantly” indicates that workgroups always experience emotional exhaustion throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study.

Next, I code the intensity of Emotional Exhaustion on a three-point scale. A score of “Mild” indicates that workgroups report feeling a lack of energy and enthusiasm in the workplace. “Moderate” refers to workgroups in which they are reports of feeling that emotional resources are used up by the work. “Strong” is the appropriate code when workgroups report feeling overwhelmed and exhausted by the work.

The next concepts I code are the frequency and duration of depersonalization. Depersonalization refers to feelings of detachment from the people workers are working with/for or caring for. Depersonalization is coded as “Never” when workgroups never report feelings of depersonalization. The code “Rarely” is used when workgroups experience feelings of depersonalization once in a great while. “Sometimes” indicates that workgroups occasionally experience feelings of depersonalization. “Frequently” is when workgroups often experience feelings of depersonalization. Finally, “Constantly” is appropriate when workgroups always experience depersonalization throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study.

I code the intensity of depersonalization on a three-point scale. “Mild” is when workgroups develop a sense of detachment form the people and work. There is a sense of compartmentalization of the work interactions. Workgroups may develop or utilize scripts in their interactions. Workgroups may make occasional jokes about the subjects
of their feelings or work or use disparaging language about the subjects of their feelings. I code depersonalization as “Moderate” when workgroups develop a unsympathetic attitude towards work or people and feel and/or illustrate unfeeling or impersonal feelings. Workgroups may make frequent jokes about the subjects of their feelings or work. Finally, a code of “Strong” is used when there is evidence that workgroups dehumanize the people with whom they regularly interact. They may use abusive language about the subjects of their feelings. Jokes are both frequent and cruel.

The final component of burnout that I code is Diminished Personal Accomplishment. Diminished Personal Accomplishment refers to workgroups’ feelings about their own work and themselves as workers and people. This is a feeling that one’s work is not good, and relates to low levels of self-efficacy (Kalliath 2001). Again, I code for the frequency and intensity of diminished personal accomplishment. The frequency is coded as follows: “Never” when workgroups never report feelings of diminished personal accomplishment, “Rarely” when workgroups experience feelings of diminished personal accomplishment once in a great while, “Sometimes” when workgroups occasionally experience feeling of diminished personal accomplishment, “Frequently” when workgroups often experience feelings of diminished personal accomplishment, and “Constantly” when workgroups always experience diminished personal accomplishment throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study. Again, I use a three-point scale to identify the intensity of Diminished Personal Accomplishment. “Mild” is indicated when workgroups feel that they are unappreciated in their jobs and may limit their efforts. “Moderate” is the appropriate code when workgroups feel
incompetent, unsuccessful, and unable in their jobs and may limit their efforts. Finally, “Strong” is when workgroups feel guilt, shame, embarrassment by their job performance and regularly limit their efforts.

EMOTION WORK MEASURES

Building on the work of Morris and Feldman (1997), I intend to capture the frequency, type, and source of emotional labor. I propose to add seven new variables to Hodson et al.'s (1993) dataset and removal of the existing variable "Emotional Stress of Work". (Please see the appendix for code sheets).

EMOTIONAL LABOR INTERACTION

The first variable is intended to capture the frequency, duration, and intensity of emotion labor. This variable will be named "Emotional Labor Interaction" and will be coded as the frequency of this type of interaction. The values for this variable include “Never”, “Rarely”, “Sometimes” “Frequently”, and “Constantly”. This variable is intended to account for impression management performed by workers that is for the purpose of working itself and beyond the normal amount of impression management one generally puts forth in public situations. “Never” is the appropriate code when the workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is an assembly line in which there is no contact with customers and little to no interaction with other workers, none that could be considered managing emotion. “Rarely” is coded when there is a mention of emotional labor interaction in the ethnography but the author
notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently. “Sometimes” refers to an ethnography in which there are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, a workgroup may have very infrequent customer contact but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. “Frequently” is coded when emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday. This is exemplified by typical service industry jobs. Finally, I code Emotional Labor Interaction as “Constantly” when the emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working for an employer to complete the job satisfactorily.

**EMOTIONAL LABOR WITH CUSTOMERS, COWORKERS, AND SUPERVISERS**

The next set of variables will account for the same type of impression management but allows for emotional labor interactions between workers and customers, coworkers and supervisors. For example, this type of variable would capture the emotional labor performed by a worker that does not deal directly with customers but must use emotional labor to effectively work with a team of coworkers. These variables are coded separately as the frequency of emotional labor performed in interactions with customers, coworkers, and employers. The values for each of these variables are “Never”, “Rarely”, “Sometimes” “Frequently”, and “Constantly”. For emotional labor
with customers, “Never” indicates that the workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is an assembly line in which there is no contact with customers. “Rarely” is coded if there is a mention of emotional labor interaction with customers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently. “Sometimes” is the appropriate code if there are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, a workgroup may have very infrequent customer contact but does need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Also, workgroup members may have frequent contact with customers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts. “Frequently” is when emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday. This is exemplified by typical service industry jobs. “Constantly” is indicated when the emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working with a customer to complete the job satisfactorily – there is a high level of contact and constant management required.

There are similar codings for emotional labor with coworkers. ”Never” indicates that the workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is a job in which there is no interaction with coworkers or no coworkers. “Rarely” is appropriate when there is a mention of emotional labor interaction among coworkers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.
“Sometimes” is the code when there are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, workers may have very infrequent contact with their coworkers but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Another example is the workgroup in which workers may have frequent contact with coworkers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts to do their jobs it is important to note the distinction between emotion work – which is a regular occurrence of everyday life- and emotional labor that it is necessary for workers to manage their emotions to complete their given tasks in this situation..

“Frequently” indicates that emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday. Finally, “Constantly” is coded when the emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day.

The same scale is used for emotional labor with employers. “Never” indicates that the workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type with employers. (Again note difference between emotion work and emotional labor). “Rarely” is appropriate when there is a mention of emotional labor interaction with/for employers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.

I coded “Sometimes” if there are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, workgroups may have very infrequent employer contact but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Workgroups may also have frequent contact with employers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts. “Frequently” is coded for emotional labor interaction that is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday between workgroup and employer. Finally “Constantly” is coded if the
emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working with an employer to complete the job satisfactorily – high level of contact and constant management is required. An example is domestic workers.

EMOTIONAL LABOR TYPE – EVOCATION, SUPRESSION, DEFERENCE

The next three variables will measure the type and variety of emotional labor involved. These variables are based on Morris and Feldman's (1997) discussion of the variety of emotions expressed in emotional labor and Hochschild's (1983) discussion of gender and race differences in the type of emotional labor performed and will capture the variety of emotional labor performed by workers. These will be dummy variables that account for the presence or absence of three distinct forms of emotional labor. The first is the "Evocation of Positive Emotion". Examples of this include greeting customers warmly and frequent and performed smiling. This also includes many care taking behaviors (See Pierce 1999). I coded “Yes” if workgroups must shape their emotions and exemplify a positive emotion. Common examples include enthusiasm, happiness, interest, and care. Note that in this type of emotional labor, the emotion that must be displayed is initially absent from the interaction. I coded “No” if there is evidence of emotional labor, but it is not the act of evoking a positive emotion.
The next is the "Suppression of Negative Emotion". This includes not expressing agitation, fear, or anger in work interactions. Many conceptualize this type of emotional labor as more difficult, stressful, and causing more negative consequences to workers than the evocation of positive emotion (Erickson & Ritter 2001). Gutek (1995, 1997) argues that the type of interaction often dictates whether workers perform evocation or suppression of emotion. I coded this as “Yes” if the workgroup must hide their authentic initial feelings. Note that in this type of emotional labor, the respondent is focusing on not displaying an emotion that is present in the interaction. Common examples include not showing anger, frustration, fear, or apathy. I coded this as “No” if there is emotional labor, but it is not the act of suppressing a negative emotion.

The final category is "Deference". Hochschild notes that women and racial minorities are most likely to perform emotional labor that includes deference. I believe this category will be especially benefited by the inclusion of emotional labor performed towards supervisors. This will, again, be limited to acts of deference that are required by employers and not indicative of broader societal relations of power and powerlessness. Deference is unique because it has a component of power differential between emotional labor performer and audience. This is coded as “Yes” if the work requires workgroups to show and mimic the power differentials that exist between them and the source of the emotional labor. They might have to defer to another’s opinion or allow their work to be interrupted. This is a formal or informal job requirement. I coded “No” if there is evidence of emotional labor, but it is not deference.
A NOTE ON VALIDITY

The current project requires some statements regarding validity. First, there is the issue that one coder, me, coded the ethnographies for the additional variables. I spent approximately eighteen months coding the ethnographies for my new variables. To code the ethnographies, I relied on page numbers of related variables for guidance as well as my familiarity with most of the ethnographies in the dataset. I have had nearly five years experience coding ethnographies, selecting ethnographies for the dataset, and retrocoding ethnographies for new variables. I have been a member of several research teams in which I was trained to code the ethnographies by coding a common book and discussing why I coded which variable as I did. On the research team, I then coded and retrocoded many ethnographies and debriefed on each coding as a group. I have also coauthored two articles using this dataset. Although it would have been ideal for a group of trained researchers to retrocode the ethnographies for the new burnout and emotion work variables, I argue that my familiarity with the books and my experience with coding lends strength to this addition to the dataset and to the validity of my work.

Another important issue highlights both the strength and weaknesses of this dataset: in essence, the data is the collection of codings of ethnographers’ observations of a workgroup. Very few of the ethnographies examine stress or emotions directly, although they many may graze these subjects. I treat the ethnographers’ accounts as unbiased and factual in that the authors are trained researchers usually doing doctoral-level research. I view their accounts as I would a videotaping of a work setting. The ethnographers provide a picture of average workdays for a workgroup. The dataset
allows for the nuances and honesty that an ethnographers’ observations provide (versus individual-level surveys on the subjects) but they are also limited in that they do not represent the population of all workplaces (rather the population of workplace ethnographies) and are twice filtered: once by the ethnographer and once by the coder. This information must be understood and statistical results are reflective of the population of workplace ethnographies rather than all workplaces.

ANALYSES

I use multiple regression techniques to examine the ways in which various workplace characteristics, including my new codings of various aspects of emotion work, lead to experiences of different components of burnout in the workplace. This allows me to determine the specific effects of stressors on the various components of burnout. In regards to emotion work, I am able to determine the specific effects of the type of emotion work as well as the target of emotion work (e.g. coworker, supervisor or customer) on the components of burnout.

Initially, I examine the separate components of burnout and examine how each may be affected differently by emotion work towards different people (customers, coworkers, supervisors) and by different types of emotion work. In both of these analyses, I hypothesize that emotion work with customers will have the greatest impact on both overall levels of burnout and components of burnout because workers who have high levels of emotion work with customers are 1) likely to also have high levels of emotion work with coworkers and supervisors and 2) more likely to practice all three
forms of emotion work regularly. This is an important contribution since there are conflicting results of the positive and negative consequences of emotional labor and since most studies of the effects of emotional labor do not include a sample with jobs that require various degrees of emotional labor. In short, many of them lack a comparison group in detailing the effects of emotional labor.

I then turn to the effects of emotion work on overall levels of burnout (defined as high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and low levels of personal accomplishment). I am able to identify how emotion work towards customers, coworkers, and supervisors may have differing effects on overall burnout levels. I am also able to identify how the evocation of positive emotion and the suppression of negative emotion may have different impacts.

Next, I investigate the role of social support in moderating the interaction between doing emotion work and experiencing burnout. I hypothesize that formal social support (from supervisors) is most effective in moderating the effects of emotion work on burnout because it is indicative of an organizational environment in which other types of both formal and informal social support (e.g. formal and informal coworker training and workplace friendships) are present. Further, Hochschild argues that the potential harms of emotional labor could be lessened if "workers feel a greater sense of control over the conditions of their work lives" (1983, 187). This has been shown in terms of worker autonomy, but I extend this to include formal social support. I argue that workers who feel they have formal channels of support within their organization will also feel this greater sense of control over their work lives and this will lessen the impact of performing emotional labor.
Finally, using existing variables in Hodson et al.’s (1993) dataset, I am able to look at the differing effects of various components of burnout on outcomes such as job satisfaction, pride in work, and meaning in work. This analysis allows me to connect the process of burnout to larger job outcomes. I will also examine the effects of the experience of burnout on worker strategies – the strategies workers employ to cope with negative work situations.
CHAPTER 4

THE EFFECTS OF EMOTION WORK ON BURNOUT

In this chapter, I will discuss my findings regarding the effects of different types of emotion work on the various components of burnout. For many of the organizations in the study, burnout is not a regular finding. Please refer to Table 4.1 for descriptive statistics. Approximately one third of the workplaces show evidence of emotional exhaustion. Of those that do, the vast majority (73%) report that emotional exhaustion occurs occasionally rather than rarely or more frequently. One quarter of cases demonstrate moderate or strong levels of emotional exhaustion. Depersonalization is also reported in approximately one third of the ethnographies. Approximately twenty percent demonstrate mild levels of depersonalization, eleven percent demonstrate moderate levels, and four percent demonstrate strong levels. Depersonalization is described in Diamond’s (1992) ethnography of work in a nursing home as both purposeful and necessary for a worker’s mental survival in a setting which requires a great deal of care:

“God, how do you get some of these people out of your mind?” I asked her, with Charlotte’s moans still echoing in my ears.

“Well,” she said after a moment’s reflection, “you’ve got to treat everybody a little different. But when you walk out of the room, you’ve got to leave them there and start moving on to somebody else. You’ve got to practice hallway amnesia.” (159)
Finally, thirty percent of the cases have evidence of a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. Twenty percent report mild levels, nine percent report moderate, levels and less than two percent report strong levels.

Similarly, for many of the organizations included in the study, emotion work is not a regular feature of work. Please see Table 4.2. Fifty-three percent of the ethnographies included in the study have some type of emotional labor interaction. Of those that did, the majority report frequent emotional labor interaction. Jackall’s (1988) ethnography of managers describes frequent emotional labor.

Managers also stress the need to exercise iron self-control and to have the ability to mask all emotion and intention behind bland, smiling, and agreeable public faces. One must avoid both excessive gravity and unwarranted levity. One must blunt aggressiveness with blandness. One must be buoyant and enthusiastic but never pollyannish. One must not reveal one’s leanings until one’s ducks are in a row. One must be able to listen to others’ grievances and even attacks on oneself while maintaining an appropriately concerned, but simultaneously dispassionate countenance.

One third of ethnographies report emotional labor with customers, and one third report emotional labor with coworkers. Twenty-one percent have evidence of emotional labor interaction with employers. The suppression of negative emotion was found more often than the evocation of positive emotion. Thirty-seven percent report the evocation of positive emotion, and forty-five percent have evidence of the suppression of negative emotion. Approximately one in five workplaces has evidence of required deference in which workers must demonstrate subservience to customers, coworkers, or employers.
Table 4.1 Burnout Variables (N=204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BURNOUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emotional Exhaustion Frequency</em></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emotional Exhaustion Intensity</em></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Non-Existent/Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depersonalization Frequency</strong></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depersonalization Intensity</strong></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Non-Existent/Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diminished Personal Accomplishment Frequency</strong></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diminished Personal Accomplishment Intensity</strong></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Non-Existent/Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Emotion Work Variables (N=204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Labor Interaction</strong></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Work with Customers</strong></td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Work with Coworkers</strong></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Work with Employer</strong></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evocation of Positive Emotion</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression of Negative Emotion</strong></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deference</strong></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTS OF EMOTION LABOR ON BURNOUT COMPONENTS

In my initial analyses, I investigate the effects of components of emotional labor – overall levels of emotional labor interaction, emotion work with customers, coworkers, and employers, the evocation of positive emotion, the suppression of negative emotion, and demonstrating deference - on my measures that measure the frequency of burnout symptoms: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. See Table 4.3. I do this in two parts: first, I examine the effects of emotional labor components on the measures of burnout frequency. I then examine effects of emotional labor on additive variables that capture both the frequency and intensity of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. Please note that occupational controls are not included because those analyses have no effects on outcomes, or significance levels and patterns.

In examining both effects on the frequency of emotional exhaustion and effects on the combined frequency and the intensity of emotional exhaustion, I find no significant effects of any component of emotional labor. The frequency of experiencing depersonalization yields some interesting results. As expected, both the frequency of overall levels of emotional labor interaction as well as the frequency of emotional labor with customers increase the frequency and the intensity with which workers experience depersonalization. Interactions with coworkers and employers do not have significant effects.
Table 4.3 Regression of Burnout Variables on Emotional Labor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Diminished Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency and Intensity</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency and Intensity</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency and Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.182*</td>
<td>0.330*</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.267***</td>
<td>0.504***</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.141*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.195**</td>
<td>-0.282*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evocation of Positive</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.196*</td>
<td>-0.333*</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Suppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Negative Emotion</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.669**</td>
<td>0.994*</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Deference</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.368*</td>
<td>0.721*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.253***</td>
<td>1.448***</td>
<td>0.746***</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>1.020***</td>
<td>1.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports unstandardized regression coefficients. Significance levels denoted by: *<.05, **<.005, ***<.000.
These analyses were also run with controls for occupation and percent female, no change in significance or direction were found.
Surprisingly, the evocation of positive emotion reduces the likelihood of depersonalization. The suppression of negative emotion increases the likelihood of experiencing depersonalization. This is somewhat consistent with previous research that suggests that suppressing negative feelings is more damaging than evoking positive emotions (Erikson & Ritter 2001), although the negative relationship between evoking a positive emotion and depersonalization has not been examined. Deference has no significant effect.

The effects on the frequency with which workgroups experience a diminished sense of personal accomplishment also yields some surprising findings. There is no significant effect of either overall levels of emotion work or emotion work performed in interactions with customers. Interactions with coworkers significantly diminish feelings of personal accomplishment; however, interactions with employers have the opposite relationship. Deference, as expected, decreases feelings of personal accomplishment at work. These findings mirror results that examine burnout components as having aspects of both frequency and intensity.
Table 4.4 Regression of Burnout Scale on Emotional Labor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Burnout Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor Interaction</td>
<td>0.260 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Customers</td>
<td>0.183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Coworkers</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Employers</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evocation of Positive Emotion</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Negative Emotion</td>
<td>4.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>4.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.959***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports unstandardized regression coefficients. Significance levels denoted by: *<.05, **<.005, ***<.000
EFFECTS OF EMOTION WORK ON OVERALL LEVELS OF BURNOUT

Finally, to examine the effects of emotion work on overall levels of burnout, I create a scale of the three components of burnout that include both frequency and intensity. I regress this scale onto the emotional labor indicators. Please see Table 4.4. This analysis shows that emotional labor interaction and emotion work with customers have significant positive effects on overall levels of burnout. These effects are not surprising, and the absence of significant effects for interaction with coworkers and employers again gives weight to the argument that there is something unique about interactions with customers as opposed to coworkers and employers. Again, I argue that interactions with customers are more likely to be scripted and required and less likely to be seen by workers as their own strategies.

MODERATING EFFECTS

In my analyses, I identify that there are significant positive effects on feelings of depersonalization for emotional labor interaction, emotion work with customers, and the suppression of negative emotion. Evocation of positive emotion has a negative relationship with feelings of depersonalization. Emotion work with coworkers and deference are found to increase feelings of a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. In contrast, emotion work with employers is found to decrease those feelings. In this section, I will analyze the effects of moderators on the impact of these emotional labor variables on experiences of burnout. There are varied findings in terms
of the role of social support in the stress process (Seers et al. 1983). I will include measures of formal and informal social support to identify the ways in which the effects of emotional labor variables may be moderated. I include three measures of social support: supervisor relationships, coworker relationships, and social friendships. In addition to examining social support, I will also investigate the role of job characteristics as moderators of the relationship between emotional labor and burnout. I will include measures of autonomy as well as creativity. These measures are important for two reasons. First, they illustrate important aspects of job characteristics that have documented effects on job satisfaction, turnover, and other job related aspects (see Bradley et al. 2004). Thus, their effects on the relationship between emotional labor and burnout are of interest. In addition, I am particularly interested in these variables because of the differences I have found between emotion work performed for different sources.

I find limited and mixed support for the effects of my moderators on the relationship between emotion work and stress. Table 4.5 identifies the moderators that have significant effects. Mainly, I find that formal avenues of support as measured by good relationships with managers moderate some of the negative psychological impacts of doing emotion work. I argue that these more formal relationships have a greater impact as moderators because they act as both instrumental and affective resources – that is, managers may provide the psychological and social support that friendships and coworkers also provide but give an additional benefit – that of instrumental avenues of help within the organization. Autonomy and creativity have no significant moderating effects.
Table 4.5 Moderators with Significant Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Diminished Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>Managerial Support</td>
<td>-0.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with</td>
<td>Managerial Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports unstandardized regression coefficients. Significance levels denoted by: *<.05, **<.005, ***<.000
One reason why emotional labor with customers may have significant negative effects that are not seen in interactions with coworkers and employers is that, in many cases, these interactions are prescribed and formal or expected. For example, fast food workers’ interactions with customers are scripted (Leidner 1993). Other interactions with customers may not be formally prescribed but emotional labor is expected as part of the job – this is the case for many domestic workers whose emotional labor is seen as not an optional component of work (Constable 1997). On the other hand, emotional labor performed for employers and coworkers may be optional – that is, it may help a person to do their job more easily and smoothly but is not formal or prescribed. For example, Wah (1999) describes a learning process that takes place among Chinese retail workers:

Anna taught me a lot about how to deal with the counter head and other counter members. I finally came to understand the key point: if your counter head blames you, just calm down and remain silent. Your counter head will think that you respect her very much. She will then wholeheartedly teach you selling skills or product knowledge (p.187)

In this example, it seems that performing emotional labor is not only a choice, but it serves as a conscious strategy that workgroups may use to better their work experiences.

These findings are consistent with the notion of certain types of emotion work serving as strategies. Interactions with coworkers and employers do not influence feelings of depersonalization, perhaps because they are conscious strategies that are perceived as such, but, as strategies, they have varying effects on feelings of
accomplishment. If it is regular for a workgroup to do emotion work among coworkers to ensure smooth functioning in the workplace, this may diminish feelings of success and competency. On the other hand, doing emotion work towards employers does not diminish feelings of success and competency because the recipient of the emotion work is a superior – and perhaps because in workplaces where emotion work towards employers is utilized as a strategy, many people must employ it.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EMOTION WORK

The other surprising finding from these analyses is that evoking positive emotion actually reduces feelings of depersonalization. This finding suggests that there is a difference between evoking a positive emotion and having to suppress negative emotions. Perhaps workgroups are more likely to claim positive feelings as their own, thus reducing feelings of emotive dissonance (Hochschild 1993). Fine’s (1996) analysis of the emotion work that restaurant workers do acknowledges that positive emotions can be manipulated and suggests that one can change one’s own feelings: “People can make themselves angry; happiness can be encouraged as when one is admonished to smile in order to get in a good mood, as server workers know well” (p. 66).

A different example supports the idea that there may be a fundamental difference between “positive emotion work” and “negative emotion work”. In his ethnography of
bank tellers, Kusterer (1978) details interactions in which workers suppress negative emotions as detached and impersonal. Tellers purposefully step back from the interaction to encourage customers to act with polite detachment as well:

The techniques, as listed by one of the tellers whom the other tellers felt was pretty good at this aspect of her job, include the following: looking customers in the eye and maintaining the eye contact, greeting them directly…saying something pleasant or complimentary about their apparent mood…or their clothes or the time or whatever…The techniques for handling angry or irritated customers are just the opposite. Customers who are upset are not interested in friendliness, they want business-like efficiency. The tellers respond by verbally distancing themselves from the interaction. They try to efface their own personality and become simply representatives of the bank. All the tellers felt that in this situation the most important thing to do is to keep one’s cool and not lose one’s temper…The teller’s basic strategy for handling this kind of customer, therefore, involves two steps. First, the teller becomes very business-like and impersonal himself. If this does not cause the customer to calm down and become more business-like also, then the teller passes the customer along to management. (p.91-92)
CHAPTER 5

THE EFFECTS OF BURNOUT ON WORKGROUPS

In the previous chapter I examined many aspects of the effects of emotion work on burnout. In this chapter, I will turn to the effects of burnout on workgroup outcomes. I have three main goals. First, I want to uncover whether the different components of burnout have different outcomes for workgroups. Few datasets have organizational-level data that also spans organizations and industries, so this is an important contribution. Next, I will examine workgroup outcomes that may be affected by burnout in the workplace. Finally, I will identify the different workgroup strategies affected by the experience of burnout in the workplace. Again, the unique data set allows me to look across organizations and uncover what costs burnout may have for both workgroups and organizations.

The means and standard deviations for my workgroup outcomes are found in Table 5.1. The majority of ethnographies report that workers take a great deal of pride in their work. Approximately 30% of ethnographies report high job satisfaction, although levels of average and somewhat low have similar percentages. Forty percent of
ethnographies reveal that workgroups find their jobs somewhat meaningful. The following passage describing engineers illustrates these levels of worker outcomes:

The social analysis revealed that most of the values at the heart of the HP Way were still strong. The majority of engineers felt that they were treated with trust and respect and that they could count on others for help when they needed it. They still took great pride in their work and were glad to work for the division (Zell 1997: 111).

Table 5.2 shows descriptive statistics for worker strategies. Eighty percent report procedure sabotage. Procedure sabotage refers to not following rules and procedures set in place by an organization. Graham’s (1995) ethnography of a car factory provides a clear example of procedure sabotage:

Sabotage occurred when workers on one of the car line teams discovered how to stop the assembly line without management tracing their location. Whenever one of their team members fell behind and the “coast was clear” (no team leaders or group leaders in sight), they stopped the line and the entire car side went down. This not only allowed people on their team to catch up, it gave everyone time away from the line. In addition, it provided entertainment as workers watched management scramble around trying to find the source of the line stoppage. At one morning team meeting, our team leader reported that the line had stopped for a total of twenty minutes the day before and the company was unable to account for the time. Clearly, that team was taking a chance; however, the workers who were aware of the sabotage never told management. Whether the reason for complicity was selfish, because of the appreciated breaks, or was based on loyalty to other workers, their silence was a direct act of resistance and evidence of lack of commitment to the company. (125)

Approximately 63% report social sabotage. Social sabotage is defined as the purposeful sabotage of a supervisor or manager through gossip. The following example from Wah’s (1999) ethnography of a retail department store demonstrates how powerful social
sabotage can be. In this example, a worker sabotages a supervisor who he believes does not have good priorities.

As Numaguchi said, ‘Naruyama is interested more in how to baby-sit his son than in how to run a store.’ When he was store general manager in Hunghom, Naruyama sometimes even took Sundays off in order to spend more time with his family. He did not notify Monguchi about his schedule of days off, and when Monguchi telephoned Naruyama on a Sunday and did not find him in, according to his secretary he was very angry and said, ‘How can a store general manager take his day off on Sunday?!’ Therefore, other members of the Yamamoto faction did not respect Naruyama and always isolated him. (139)

Sixty-eight percent of ethnographies find evidence of workers who purposefully withhold enthusiasm throughout their day as a strategy to limit effort. Approximately 65% of ethnographies have evidence of withdrawal and absenteeism. Withdrawal is purposeful work avoidance – such as taking extended breaks or walking around a workplace to avoid doing work. It can also be more subtle, such as limiting interaction and the level of emotion work required for a situation. Workers may give extra effort freely, workers may give conditional effort – for example, extra effort for extra pay, or workers may largely practice reticence. Over half of the ethnographies report workers who give extra effort freely. Approximately ten percent report widely practiced reticence. The following example of subway conductors is evidence of a workplace in which the majority of workers do not give extra effort: “It may not have been universal, but among many workers there was a strong conviction that a worker should never do one iota more
Table 5.1  Worker Outcome Variables (N=204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pride in Work</strong></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Rare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – A Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Moderately Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Fulfilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 Worker Strategy Variables (N=204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedure Sabotage</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sabotage</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withhold Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Bargain</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Reticence Practiced Widely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Conditional Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Effort Given Freely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than he was required to do” (Swerdlow 1998: 194). Finally, turnover is described as low in 36.4% of the ethnographies, medium in 23.3%, and high in 40.3%.

EFFECTS OF BURNOUT COMPONENTS ON WORKER OUTCOMES

Table 5.3 shows the worker outcomes I expected would be significantly increased by burnout. Instead, I find no significant effects of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or a diminished sense of personal accomplishment on worker pride, job satisfaction, and meaning. Indeed, my components of burnout do not significantly decrease these important outcomes for workgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnout Components</th>
<th>Pride in Work B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Meaning B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminished Personal</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports unstandardized regression coefficients.
EFFECTS OF BURNOUT COMPONENTS OF WORKER STRATEGIES

Table 5.4 shows the effects of the separate burnout components on other elements of workgroup experiences of work. I find several significant effects. Elements of burnout are found to increase several strategies.

The results of my logistic and multinomial regressions of worker strategies on components of burnout show some interesting results. As expected, the experience of one aspect of burnout – emotional exhaustion- makes workgroups more likely to engage in social and procedure sabotage. They are also more likely to withhold enthusiasm. Workgroups who experience higher levels of diminished personal accomplishment are also more likely to have high levels of turnover. Finally, and unexpectedly, diminished personal accomplishment has a negative and significant relationship with withholding enthusiasm and absenteeism and a positive relationship with effort bargain. Withdrawal is unaffected by the burnout components.
Table 5.4 Logistic and Multinomial Regression of Worker Strategies on Burnout Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnout Components</th>
<th>Procedure Sabotage</th>
<th>Social Sabotage</th>
<th>Withhold Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Effort Bargain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.397***</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminished Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.524*</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>-.309*</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.070*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports unstandardized regression coefficients. Significance levels denoted by: *<.10, **<.05, ***<.005
These analyses were also run with controls for occupation and percent female, no change in significance or direction were found.
There are several interesting findings from these analyses. First, the components of burnout used in this study do not predict workgroup outcomes. They do not reflect changes in job satisfaction, pride in work, or meaning in work. Instead, they do have effects on workgroup strategies. This reflects the fact that workgroups who experience one or more of the components of burnout may not view the experience as reflective of the nature of their jobs – rather, they may view it as one of the aspects of their jobs with which they must cope. For example, if a workgroup views the experience of burnout as a facet of their organization or related to a lack of support from management, members of the workgroup are likely to cope with that experience using a workgroup strategy rather than viewing their occupations and job tasks as lacking meaning or satisfaction.

In addition, this finding of significant effects on strategies but not on workgroup outcomes may show the agency of people as they cope with burnout. Workers in workgroups who experience burnout are not passively or unknowingly experiencing a loss in job satisfaction, pride or meaning in work. Instead, they are experiencing feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or a diminished sense of personal accomplishment and are acting to relieve the experience of these strains.

The other unique finding from my analyses is that the different components of burnout have very differing effects on workgroup strategies. This underscores the notion that the burnout components are unique experiences and have different causes and
consequences. This may also provide some insight in terms of the ways that workgroups experience burnout. Workers in workgroups who experience emotional exhaustion – defined as emotional fatigue, and argued by many to be the critical first step in the burnout process (see Leiter and Maslach 1998, Cordes, Dougherty, and Blum 1993) – are likely to engage in social sabotage and procedure sabotage. Of the workgroup strategies, these strategies are the most overt. The effect on social sabotage may be due to the close ties between emotional exhaustion and supervisor support found by many (Leiter 1991).

If a workgroup is experiencing higher levels of emotional exhaustion, members of the workgroup are perhaps also looking for social support – if this is not found, they are more likely to engage in social sabotage. Procedure sabotage may also be overt, but it may also be reflective of a growing state of exhaustion and the resulting apathy that is symptomatic of emotional exhaustion.

It is somewhat surprising that depersonalization has no significant effects: particularly on withholding enthusiasm and effort. One explanation may be that depersonalization itself is a strategy for protection and, thus, very different from emotional exhaustion. This finding lends support to the burnout model proposed by many in which emotional exhaustion is the key event that leads to other components (Gaines & Jermier 1983, Lee & Ashforth 1993, Wright & Bonett 1997). The act of depersonalization is, by nature, a worker protection strategy. The following illustration from Bosk (1992) reveals how genetic counselors purposefully disengage from their clients and limit the emotion work required to complete their jobs:
The boundaries of care are those of service. As medical professionals, as trained physicians, the genetic counselors defined their obligations as narrowly as they could. For clinic patients, they were experts on diagnoses and recurrence risks. Patients visibly upset by this information were, in the short run, handed over to the clinic coordinator so that they could “ventilate” or “flood out” (112).

It is surprising however, that depersonalization did not significantly affect withdrawal from work, as it is closely related. This may have been affected by the fact that depersonalization is a cognitive response to emotional exhaustion – which is also a cognitive aspect of the burnout process. On the other hand, work avoidance/withdrawal is often not so much a mental strategy as it is a physical one in which workers physically withdraw themselves from their work areas.

Finally, a diminished sense of worker accomplishment affects turnover as expected, but also has an unexpected relationship with enthusiasm, effort bargain and absenteeism. The findings regarding absenteeism and turnover are interesting because they note that workgroups are not skipping work – perhaps because many workers who do emotion work are hourly paid service workers – but they are turning over. This finding is compatible with models who view this diminished sense of accomplishment as the final experience of burnout. Once workgroups reach this level, they are more likely to experience turnover because members are leaving their jobs. Metz (1981) describes this process in his description of ambulance work:

As the attendants’ attitudes change, so does their behavior. They look and act tired, they complain, they admit to being depressed, they are apathetic about their duties and indifferent toward their patients, and they speak cynically. (p.107)
The surprising relationships with the remaining strategies again points to the distinct nature of each of the burnout components. If a diminished sense of personal accomplishment is the end stage of burnout in which members of a workgroup lose hope and, in a sense, feel resigned to their work life, they are less likely to employ protection strategies – which may have been so far ineffective if an individual has progressed to having a diminished sense of accomplishment. At this point, the strategy that is feasible for workgroup members is to leave.

**CONSIDERING EFFECTS ON INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

One of the interesting aspects of the worker strategies of withholding enthusiasm is that it may affect overall levels of burnout and represent a cyclical relationship when we look at burnout at the organizational level. That is, perhaps I did not find evidence of social support as an effective coping mechanism in the relationship between emotion work and burnout because, when workgroups are experiencing high levels of emotional exhaustion, one of the ways members protect themselves is at an individual level – that is, they withhold enthusiasm. Part of withholding this enthusiasm in the workplace may be withholding enthusiasm in relationships with coworkers, and, thus, not providing coworkers with social support that may alleviate their experience of burnout.

In this sense, burnout and the resulting coping strategies workers employ could increase the evidence of burnout on an organizational level. This is interesting because, in light of the fact that workgroups are not experiencing decreases in some key aspects of work due to burnout – job satisfaction, meaning, and pride in work – perhaps worker
strategies are effective protectants at the individual level at the same time that some strategies may aggravate burnout at the organizational level. This also suggests one of the mechanisms by which burnout may be contagious – that is, organizations in which workgroups are experiencing high levels of burnout may be protecting themselves in ways that eliminate social support and increase overall burnout levels. In this sense, an organization may have a culture of burnout.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This analysis of emotional labor, burnout, and the consequences of burnout has several main findings. First, I find that the source and type of emotion work have different effects on the burnout components. There are significant differences in the consequences for workgroups who must do emotional labor for customers than there are for those that must do emotional labor for coworkers or employers. It seems that doing emotional labor with customers is different in that it significantly increases depersonalization. This may be due in part to the scripted nature of many interactions with customers. Emotional labor with coworkers increases feelings of incompetence while the opposite is true for doing emotional labor with employers. This suggests that people look for authentic relationships with their coworkers in the workplace and a lack of these is damaging not only in terms of a lack of social support, but also in terms of burnout directly. There is little research done on emotional labor directed towards coworkers and employers. Future research should investigate these differences and could identify the particular combinations of sources of emotional labor. Also, any cumulative effects of emotional labor could be identified.

The type of emotional labor also matters. Suppressing negative emotion is more damaging than evoking positive emotion. This finding corresponds to previous literature
that underscores the damage of not being able to regularly express negative feelings (Erickson & Ritter 2001). Formal avenues of social support matter the most in moderating the negative effects of doing emotional labor. Managerial support may be the most effective moderator because it is formal and may provide both expressive and instrumental support. Further, support from managers may reflect an organizational culture in which workgroups feel they have support and care. This finding is significant because it identifies one of the organizational-level ways in which burnout can be alleviated. In stressful work situations, the support of management is crucial to alleviating the negative impacts of burnout on workers. As the service sector grows, management should understand this as a central part of its role.

I also find that the different components of burnout have different effects on workgroups’ experiences and consequences. I find no effects of the burnout components on job satisfaction, pride in work, or meaning of work. This finding may indicate how workgroups view their experiences of burnout and how they respond to them. I argue that workgroups see burnout as an organizational-level phenomenon and respond to it accordingly. That is, they do not respond in terms of feelings about their occupations, they respond in terms of feelings about their organizations. I find that emotional exhaustion leads to more overt workgroup strategies such as procedure and social sabotage. Workgroups are also more likely to withhold enthusiasm. Diminished personal accomplishment significantly increases turnover and has unexpected relationships with withholding enthusiasm and effort and absenteeism. This leads me to identify diminished personal accomplishment as the last step in the burnout model, in which workgroups turn towards individual solutions or move on.
DEPERSONALIZATION AS A MODERATOR

Depersonalization has no effects on workgroup outcomes. This surprising finding leads me to conclude that depersonalization should also be seen as a strategy: that is, one of the ways that workgroups actively protect themselves as they experience emotional exhaustion. This argument is inline with models of burnout that do not view burnout as a comprehensive measure but, instead, see it as a process (Gaines & Jermier 1983, Lee & Ashforth 1993, Wright & Bonnet 1997). Gaines and Jermier (1983) argue that a model that starts with a focus on emotional exhaustion, and views depersonalization and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment as coping mechanisms that occur because of emotional exhaustion, allow us to understand and study burnout in contexts other than solely interaction-based work. I agree with this notion and think that the insights of the ethnographies used in the dataset point to the importance of this new direction.

OTHER POSSIBLE PATHS TO BURNOUT

Use of this dataset has an additional advantage – it presents the opportunity to reap one of the benefits of qualitative research, grounded theory. In coding the ethnographies and examining them for evidence of burnout, it became evident that some ethnographies are illustrating new and different pathways to burnout. I have separated these new pathways into two categories: jobs which clearly require a management of emotion but not emotional labor and jobs in which the work characteristics may lead to burnout without emotion work. The experience of ironworkers who must work at great
heights is a good example of the first category in which emotions must be managed but emotional labor is not a requirement. In this case, workers must manage their fear for both themselves and to coworkers: “I lay awake most of the night wondering what the hell I was doing and why people like me tell lies about whether or not they are scared” (Cherry 1974: 24).

Factory work provides some of the clearest examples of situations in which the nature of work may lead to burnout with little or no emotional labor or emotion management. Chinoy’s (1992) ethnography of automobile workers describes this:

Without dissent, assembly-line work was looked upon as the most exacting and most strenuous. Its coerced rhythms, the inability to pause at will for a moment’s rest, and the need for undeviating attention to simple routines made it work to be avoided if possible and to escape from if necessary…Because of its physical and psychological demands, none of the men who had worked on the line in the past would have willingly returned to it. “I’d quit before I go back to the line,” a repairman with fifteen years of seniority said heatedly…An ex-line worker in parts and service commented: I used to work on the chassis line. When I used to get home my hands would go like that [He held hands over the edge of the couch he was sitting on and let them shake helplessly]. When I worked on the line I felt so bad that when I cam home I couldn’t do anything. (p.70-71).

There is also evidence of this in work in the meat packing industry. Strenuous, physical work leads to burnout. A retired packinghouse worker describes:

The plant closed in 1981, but I left before then. I took early retirement, My body was not capable of doing anything. I can barely walk. My feet hurt. My back hurts…Gosh sakes, I can’t tell you where I didn’t hurt…in fifty-five years I was all burned out. I couldn’t do nothing. (p.111)

The strictest definitions of burnout define it as a stress process that takes place in jobs with interaction (Ganster & Schaubroeck 1991, Maslach & Jackson 1981). Few authors expand their conception of burnout to include non-interaction based work
experiences, although there are some exceptions. Mannon (1992) argues that some of the work experiences of EMTs beyond their interactions with patients may lead to burnout. These include limited opportunities for advancement, long shifts, the trappings of bureaucracy, and the threat of danger on the job. These ethnographic examples shed light on the need to expand the conceptualization of burnout to include other aspects of work – including but not limited to doing emotion work. It may be that the specific components of burnout – emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment are affected differently by different work conditions, just as they are affected differently by different types of emotion work.

Preliminary results with the ethnographic dataset show some interesting findings. Emotional exhaustion has a significant positive relationship with injuries. A lack of freedom of movement is associated with increased levels of depersonalization and with increased levels of a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. A diminished sense of personal accomplishment is also significantly positively affected by high physical demands of work. The ethnographic literature coupled with these initial findings illustrates the importance of looking at burnout further in terms of work experiences that are not necessarily tied to interaction. This process may lie behind varying levels of turnover and job satisfaction that are seen across organizations, occupations, and industries.

Future research should examine these aspects of burnout with a focus in emotional exhaustion as the initial strain felt by workgroups in stressful situations (both interaction and non-interaction based). If depersonalization and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment act as moderators in this model, and were mainly developed in
the study of burnout caused by emotional labor, perhaps other coping strategies will be identified if the conceptualizations of the antecedents of burnout are broadened.

LIMITATIONS

Future research should also examine the individual effects of burnout across occupation and industry. The current data does not allow for any conclusions to be made in terms of how emotional labor and burnout affect individual workers. Instead, the data allows for the investigation of workplace effects and emergent group phenomena. While this is an important contribution, it does not truly allow for an understanding of the effects of burnout on both organizations and workers. Instead, it allows for the understanding of the effects of emotional labor and burnout on workers as members of workgroups but not as individuals. Also, this data is reflective of the current population of workplace ethnographies, not workplaces. As such, the statistics should be seen as reflections of informed observations across occupations and industries but not as reflective of workplaces in general.
APPENDIX

CODESHEETS AND PROTOCOL
SUPPLEMENTAL CODESHEET

CASEID: ___________
T1 BOOK TITLE AND AUTHOR’S LAST NAME:

BURNOUT

Emotional Exhaustion (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes
4 -Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Emotional Exhaustion (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong 7 – N/A
9 – No Info Page #’s:

Depersonalization (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes
4-Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Depersonalization (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong 7 – N/A
9 – No Info Page #’s:

Diminished Personal Accomplishment (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely
3 – Sometimes 4-Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Diminished Personal Accomplishment (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong 7 –
N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

EMOTION WORK

4 -Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Emotion Work with Customers: 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes
4-Frequently 5 – Constantly 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Emotion Work with Coworkers: 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes 4 –Frequently
5 – Constantly 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Emotion Work with Employer: 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes 4 -Frequently
5 – Constantly 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Evocation of Positive Emotion: 1 – Yes 2 – No 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Suppression of Negative Emotion: 1 – Yes 2 – No 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s:

Deference: 1 – Yes 2 – No 7 – N/A 9 – No Info Page #’s
### ORIGINAL CODESHEET

(By Randy Hodson, available at: www.sociology.osu.edu/people/rdh/Workplace-Ethnography-Project.html)

| CASEID: | _____ | Debriefer: |
| DATE: q1(Mo=) q1a(Da=) q1b(Yr=) |
| CODER q2 (2 col): BOOK CODE q3 (3 col): |
| T1 BOOK TITLE AND AUTHOR'S LAST NAME: |
| T2 MODAL OCCUPATION: |

Page #s: (Include in Text)

| T3 INDUSTRY: |
| Page #s: (Include in Text) |

| T4 COUNTRY/REGION: |
| Page #s: (Include in Text) |

| T5 OBSERVER'S ROLE: |
| Page #s: (Include in Text) |

### ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS:

| of1 YEAR STUDY BEGAN: | _____ | 9999 - No Info Page #s: |
| of1a YEAR STUDY ENDED: | _____ | 9999 - No Info |

### TECHNOLOGY/ORGANIZATION

<p>| of2a Occupation: | 00 - Professional | 01 - Management/Supervisor | 02 – Clerical | 03 - Sales | 04 - Skilled trade | 05 - Assembly | 06 - Unskilled labor | 07 - Service | 08 - Farm | 09 - No Info |
| Page #s: |
| of2b Craft: | 1 - Yes | 2 - No | 9 - No Info |
| Page #s: |
| of2c Direct Supervision: | 1 - Yes | 2 - No | 9 - No Info |
| Page #s: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #s:</th>
<th>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</th>
<th>9 - No Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of2d Pay scheme:</td>
<td>1 - Straight Piece 2 - Quota/Bonus 3 - Hourly Guaranteed 4 - Salary 7 - NA 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2e Assembly Line:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2f Automated:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2g Microchip:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2h Bureaucratic:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2i Corporatist:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of2j Worker Ownership:</td>
<td>1 - Co-op/participatory 2 - ESOP 3 - None 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of3 Employment Size: (6 col)</td>
<td>999999 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of4 Employment Growth:</td>
<td>1 - Declining 2 - Stable 3 - Growing 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of5 Level of Competition:</td>
<td>1 - Low 2 - Medium 3 - High 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of6 Product Market Stability:</td>
<td>1 - Stable 2 - Unstable 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of7 Productivity:</td>
<td>1 - Declining 2 - Stable 3 - Increasing 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of8 Locally Owned:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of9 Subcontractor:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 3 - Franchisee 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of10 Divisional Status:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of11 Owned by a Conglomerate:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of12 Corporate Headquarters:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Corporate Sector: 1 - Core 2 - Periphery 3 - Non-profit 4 - Public 9- No Info

Page #s:

of Unions (Type): 1-None 2-Craft 3-Industrial 4-Combined 9-No Info

Page #s:

of Unions (Strength): 1-Weak 2-Average 3-Strong 7-NA 9-No Info

Page #s:

of Turnover: 1-Low 2-Medium 3-High 9-No Info

Page #s:

of Layoff Frequency: 1-Never 2-Seldom 3-Sometimes 4-Frequent 9-No Info

Page #s:

of Grievance Procedure: 1 - Union Run 2 - Company Run 3 - None 4 - Government Run

Page #s:

of Ilm (Range): 1 - No Workers 2 - Few 3 - Some 4 - Many 5 - Most 6 - All 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of Ilm (Steps): (2 col) 99 - No Info

Page #s:

of Sexual Division of Labor: 1 - Yes 2 - Integrated 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of Racial Division of Labor: 1 - Yes 2 - Integrated 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of Quality Control: 1 - Govt Inspector 2 - QC Inspector 3 - Supervisor 4 - Self 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of Solicitation of Worker Involvement: 1 - Never Asked 2 - Informal 3 - Formal 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of QWL Program: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Page #s:

of Team Organization of Work: 1-No 2-Naturally occurring 3-Consciously engineered

80
(partial) 4-Consciously engineered (fully developed) 9-No Info  Page #s:

of26 Union-Management  1 - Yes  2 - No   9 - No Info  Page #s:
Partnership:
of27 Organizational  1-Poor  2-Average  3-Good  9-No Info
Communications:
of28 Organizational  1-Little Effort  2-Average Effort  3-Great Effort  9-No Info
Reproduction  (Recruitment):
of29 Level of Repair:  1-Poor  2-Average  3-Good  9-No Info  Page #s:

LABOR FORCE COMPOSITION:
of30a  Gender (% Female in workgroup): _____ (3 col)  999 - No Info  Page #s:
of30aa Gender (% Female at location): _____ (3 col)  999 - No Info  Page #s:
of30b  Race (% Minority in workgroup): _____ (3 col)  999 - No Info  Page #s:
of30bb Race (% Minority at location): _____ (3 col)  999 - No Info  Page #s:
T6  Name of Ethnic Group:
   Page #s: (Include in Text)
of30c  Age (Median): _____ (2 col)  99 - No Info  Page #s:
of30d  Seniority (Median year): _____ (2 col)  99 - No Info  Page #s:
   (Code 00 = LE 6 months; 01 = approximately 1 year)

MANAGEMENT:
mt1  Leadership:  1-Catastrophic  2-Marginal  3-Adequate  4-Good
      5-Exceptional  9-No Info  Page #s:
mt2  Organization of Production:  1-Catastrophic  2-Marginal  3-Adequate  4-Good
      5-Exceptional  9-No Info  Page #s:
mt3  Abusive:  1-Never  2-Rarely  3-Sometimes
     4-Frequently
mt4 Paternalistic: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt5 Sexual Harassment: 1 - None 2 - Condescending 3 - Jokes 4 - Overly Personal 5 - Touch 6 - Threats/Promises 7 - Forced Sexual Contact 9 - No Info

CONTROL STRATEGIES

mt6a Increase Inspections: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6b Reorganize Tasks: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6c Change Technology: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6d Restrict Pay: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6e Restrict Hours: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6f Demotions: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6g Firings: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

mt6h Electronic surveillance: 1 - No 2 - Cameras 3 - Computers 4 - Drug testing 5 - Other 9 - No Info

COMMUNITY FACTORS:

cf1 Unemployment: 1 - Low 2 - Medium 3 - High 9 - No Info

cf2 Rural/Urban: 1 - Rural 2 - Small Town 3 - Medium Town 4 - City 9 - No Info

WORKERS:

w1 Job Satisfaction: 1 - Very Low 2 - Moderately Low 3 - Average 4 - High 5 - Very High 9 - No Info

w2 Pay: 1 - Very Low 2 - Moderately Low 3 - Average 4 - High 5 - Very High 9 - No Info
Benefit Package: 1-None 2-Minimal 3-Average 4-High 9-No Info
Page #\'s:

Job Security: 1-None 2-Minimal 3-Average 4-High 9-No Info
Page #\'s:

Effort Bargain: 1-Extra Effort Given Freely 2-Conditional Effort Given
3-Reticence Practiced Widely 9-No Info Page #\'s:

CONFLICT WITH MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISORS

Frequency of Conflict 1-Never 2-Infrequent 3-Average 4-Frequent
With Managers: 5-Constant 9-No Info Page #\'s:

Frequency of Conflict 1-Never 2-Infrequent 3-Average 4-Frequent
With Supervisors: 5-Constant 9-No Info Page #\'s:

TRAINING

Job Required 1-Speed and Dexterity Only 2-Some Complexity 3-Highly Complex
Skill: 9-No Info Page #\'s:

Modal Completed 1-Grade School 2-Secondary School 3-Two Year Program
Academic Education: 4-Bachelor's Degree 5-Graduate 9-No Info Page #\'s:

Modal Vo-Tech 1 - None 2 - Less Than One Year 3 - More than One Year
Education: 9 - No Info Page #\'s:

OJT Training: 1-None 2-Very Little 3-Average 4-More Than Average
5-Extensive 9-No Info Page #\'s:

Informal Peer Training: 1-None 2-Very Little 3-Average 4-More Than Average
5-Extensive 9-No Info Page #\'s:

Experience/Insider Knowledge Used: 1-None 2-Very Little 3-Average 4-More Than Average
5-Extensive 9- No Info Page #\'s:
Previously Existing Skills: 1-Life Experiences 2-None 9-No Info

WORKER STRATEGIES

Strikes: 1-None 2-Informal Nonviolent 3-Informal Violent
4-Formal Nonviolent 5-Formal Violent 9-No Info

Strike Length (in days): (4 col) 9997 - NA 9999 - No Info

History of Strikes: 1 - No 2 - Infrequent 3 - Frequent 9 - No Info

Machine Sabotage: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Procedure Sabotage: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Social Sabotage: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Subvert Particular Manager: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Theft: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Playing Dumb: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Withhold Enthusiasm: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Work Avoidance/ Withdrawal: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Absenteeism: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Quits: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info

Good Soldier: 1-None 2-Some 3-Half 4-Most 5-All 9-No Info

Smooth Operator: 1-None 2-Some 3-Half 4-Most 5-All
### CONDITIONS OF CONSENT/COMPLIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w8p  Making Out:</th>
<th>1-None 2-Some 3-Half 4-Most 5-All 9-No Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w8q  Brown-Nosing:</td>
<td>1-None 2-Some 3-Half 4-Most 5-All 9-No Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8r  Making up Games:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8s  Making Up Social Activities:</td>
<td>1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATURE OF CONSENT/COMPLIANCE

| w9a  Economic Necessity: | 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info |
| w9b  Loyal to Particular Manager: | 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info |
| w9c  Commitment to Organizational Goals: | 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info |
| w9d  Pride in Work: | 1 - Rare 2 - Average 3 - A Great Deal 9 - No Info |
| w9e  Social Friendship: | 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info |

### NATURE OF WORK:

| nw1  Autonomy: | 1-None 2-Little 3-Average 4-High 5-Very High 9-No Info |
| nw2  Creativity: | 1-None 2-Little 3-Average 4-High 5-Very High 9-No Info |
| nw3  Meaningful: | 1-Meaningless 2-Somewhat Meaningful 3-Fulfilling |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work:</th>
<th>9-No Info</th>
<th>Page #':s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nw4 Freedom of Movement:</td>
<td>1-Little or None</td>
<td>2-Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-No Info</td>
<td>Page #':s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw5 Pace:</td>
<td>1-Easy</td>
<td>2-Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page #':s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw6 Pace:</td>
<td>1-Steady</td>
<td>2-Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw7 Physical Demands of Work:</td>
<td>1-Easy</td>
<td>2-Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page #':s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw8 Comfort of Work Area:</td>
<td>1-Comfortable</td>
<td>2-Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw9 Injuries:</td>
<td>1-None or Rare</td>
<td>2-Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw10 Emotional Stress of Work:</td>
<td>1-None</td>
<td>2-Regular Emotion Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nw11 Temporary Workers Employed (percent):</td>
<td>9-No Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Never</td>
<td>2-Infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nw12 Part-time Workers Employed (percent):</td>
<td>nw13 Customer Service Interaction (percent of work time):</td>
<td>(3 col.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nw14 Frequency of Conflict with customers:</td>
<td>1-Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOCAL GROUP:</td>
<td>9-No Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fg1 Focal Group:</td>
<td>1-All Work Individual</td>
<td>2-Fluid Sub-Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fg2 Size of Focal Group</td>
<td>______(3 col)</td>
<td>999- No Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fg3 Focal Group Cohesion:</td>
<td>1-Absent</td>
<td>2-Infrequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fg4 Leadership (Within Group): 1-Little or None 2-Average 3-Strong 7-NA Page #'s:
9-No Info

fg5 Solidarity (Mutual Defense): 1-Little or None 2-Average 3-Strong 7-NA Page #'s:
9-No Info

fg6 Discipline Enforced By Workers: 1-Never 2-Occasionally 3-Frequently 4-Principally 7-NA 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg7 Group Boundaries: 1-Non-Existen 2-Weak 3-Average 4-Strong 5-Very Strong 7-NA 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg8 Alternative Status Hierarchies: 1-Non-Existent 2-Occasional 3-Clearly Articulated 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg9 Task Groups Self-Monitoring: 1-Yes 2-No 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg10 Organized Group Conflict 1-Absent 2-Infrequent 3-Average 4-Widespread 5-Pervasive 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg11 Within-Group Conflict: 1-Non-Existent 2-Occasional 3-Frequent 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg12 Between-Groups Conflict: 1-Non-Existent 2-Occasional 3-Frequent 9-No Info Page #'s:

fg13 Basis of Alternative 1-Age 2-Gender 3-Race/Ethnicity 4-None 5-Seniority
Social Groups at Work: 6-Success 7-Occupational Specialty 8-NA 9-No Info
Page #s:

fg14 Do Work Friendships Carry
Over to Outside? 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info Page #s:

METHODOLOGY:

Ethnographer's Theoretical Orientation:
1 - Conflict/Marxist
2 - Critical/Feminist
3 - Human Relations
4 - Interactionist (Dramaturgy, SI, Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology)
5 - Functionalist
6 - Weberian
7 - Structuralist/Comparative [added 6/1]
8 - Descriptive/Journalistic
9 - missing

Focus of Ethnography (topic):
1 - specific type of work
2 - conflict
3 - gender
4 - race
5 - class
6 - teams
7 - customer relations
8 - other 9 - missing

Ethnographer's Gender: 1 - Male 2 - Female 9 - No Info Page #s:

Data Collection Method: 1-Observation 2-Interview 3-Observation and interview
Page #s:

Supplemental Data Used: 1 - Yes 2 - No 9 - No Info Page #s:

Main Type of Supplemental Data Used:
1 - interview
2 - document/record collection
3 - data set
4 - attendance at training session
5 - observation at related organization
6 - popular literature
9 - missing
Position of Key Informant:

1 - worker in focal group
2 - worker outside focal group
3 - manager
4 - executive
5 - former worker
6 - other
9 - missing

Page #s:
CODING PROTOCOL
(Based on Maslach 1981, 1982)

EMOTION WORK


This variable refers to how frequently the work group has emotional labor interaction (of any source and type).

1 – Never – The workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is an assembly line in which there is no contact with customers and little to no interaction with other workers, none that could be considered managing emotion.

2 – Rarely – There is a mention of emotional labor interaction in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.

3 – Sometimes – There are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, a workgroup may have very infrequent customer contact but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions.

4 – Frequently – Emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday. This is exemplified by typical service industry jobs.

5 – Constantly – The emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working for an employer to complete the job satisfactorily.

Emotional Labor with Customers: 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes 4 – Frequently 5 – Constantly 7 – N/A 9 – No Info

1 – Never – The workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is an assembly line in which there is no contact with customers.

2 – Rarely – There is a mention of emotional labor interaction with customers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.

3 – Sometimes – There are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, a workgroup may have very infrequent customer contact but does need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Workgroup members may have frequent contact with customers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts.

4 – Frequently – Emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday. This is exemplified by typical service industry jobs.

5 – Constantly – The emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working with a
customer to complete the job satisfactorily – high level of contact and constant management required.

Emotional Labor with Coworkers: 1 – Never  2 – Rarely  3 – Sometimes  4 – Frequently  5 – Constantly  7 – N/A   9 – No Info
1 – Never – The workgroup never has any emotional labor interaction of any type. An example of this is a job in which there is no interaction with coworkers or no coworkers.
2 – Rarely – There is a mention of emotional labor interaction among coworkers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.
3 – Sometimes – There are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, workers may have very infrequent contact with their coworkers but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Another example is the workgroup in which workers may have frequent contact with coworkers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts to do their jobs (NOTE: Please be aware of the distinction between emotion work – which is a regular occurrence of everyday life and emotional labor – it is necessary for workers to manage their emotions to complete their given tasks in this situation).
4 – Frequently – Emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday.
5 – Constantly – The emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the workday.

Emotional Labor with Employer: 1 – Never  2 – Rarely  3 – Sometimes  4 – Frequently  5 – Constantly  7 – N/A   9 – No Info
1 – Never – The workers never have any emotional labor interaction of any type with employers. (Again note difference between emotion work and emotional labor).
2 – Rarely – There is a mention of emotional labor interaction with/for employers in the ethnography but the author notes it as an exception that occurs very infrequently.
3 – Sometimes – There are examples of emotional labor interaction in the text but it is not a regular, everyday occurrence. For example, workgroups may have very infrequent employer contact but do need to provide emotional labor in those interactions. Workgroups may have frequent contact with employers but do not need to manage their emotions for all of those contacts.
4 – Frequently – Emotional labor interaction is a regular part of the work, and there are regular interactions throughout the workday.
5 – Constantly – The emotional labor interaction rarely stops during the work day. This may be indicated again by typical service industry jobs but the emotional labor in this situation is more intense in terms of frequency. This may also be exemplified by jobs in which workers must manage their emotions the entire time they are working with an employer to complete the job satisfactorily – high level of contact and constant management required. An example is domestic workers.

Evocation of Positive Emotion: 1 – Yes  2 – No  7 – N/A   9 – No Info
1 – Yes - workgroup must shape their emotions and exemplify a positive emotion. Common examples include enthusiasm, happiness, interest, and care. Note that in this
type of emotional labor, the emotion that must be displayed is initially absent from the interaction.

2 – There is emotional labor, but it is not the act of evoking a positive emotion.

Suppression of Negative Emotion: 1 – Yes 2 – No 7 – N/A 9 – No Info
1 – Yes – The workgroup must hide their authentic initial feelings. Note that in this type of emotional labor, the respondent is focusing on not displaying an emotion that is present in the interaction. Common examples include not showing anger, frustration, fear, or apathy.
2 – No - There is emotional labor, but it is not the act of suppressing a negative emotion.

Deference: 1 – Yes 2 – No 7 – N/A 9 – No Info
1 – Yes – The work requires workgroups to show and mimic the power differentials that exist between them and the source of the emotional labor. They might have to defer to another’s opinion or allow their work to be interrupted. This is a formal or informal job requirement.
2 – No – There is emotional labor, but it is not deference.

BURNOUT

Emotional Exhaustion (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes 4 – Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info
1 – Never – Workgroups never report feelings of emotional exhaustion.
2 – Rarely – Workgroups may experience feelings of emotional exhaustion once in a great while.
3 – Sometimes – Workgroups regularly but occasionally experience feeling of emotional exhaustion.
4 – Frequently – Workgroups often experience feelings of emotional exhaustion.
5 – Constantly – Workgroups always experience emotional exhaustion throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study.

Emotional Exhaustion (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong 7 – N/A 9 – No Info
Emotional Exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally over extended by work.
1 – Mild – Workgroups report feeling a lack of energy and enthusiasm in the workplace.
2 – Moderate – Workgroups report feeling that their emotional resources are used up by the work.
3 – Strong – Workgroups report feeling overwhelmed and exhausted by the work.

Depersonalization (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely 3 – Sometimes 4 – Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info
2 – Rarely – Workgroups may experience feelings of depersonalization once in a great while.
3 – Sometimes – Workgroups regularly but occasionally experience feeling of depersonalization.
4 – Frequently – Workgroups often experience feelings of depersonalization.
5 – Constantly – Workgroups always experience depersonalization throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study.

Depersonalization (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong
7 – N/A 9 – No Info
Depersonalization refers to feelings of detachment from the people workers are working with/for or caring for.
1 – Mild – Workgroups develop a sense of detachment form the people and work. There is a sense of compartmentalization of the work interactions. Workgroups may develop or utilize scripts in their interactions. Workgroups may make occasional jokes about the subjects of their feelings or work or use disparaging language about the subjects of their feelings.
2 – Moderate – Workgroups develop a unsympathetic attitude towards work or people and feel and/or illustrate unfeeling or impersonal feelings. Workgroups may make frequent jokes about the subjects of their feelings or work.
3 – Strong – Workgroups dehumanize the people with whom they regularly interact. They may use abusive language about the subjects of their feelings. Jokes are both frequent and cruel.

Diminished Personal Accomplishment (frequency): 1 – Never 2 – Rarely
3 – Sometimes 4 -Frequently 5 – Constantly 9 – No Info
1 – Never – Workgroups never report feelings of diminished personal accomplishment.
2 – Rarely – Workgroups may experience feelings of diminished personal accomplishment once in a great while.
3 – Sometimes – Workgroups regularly but occasionally experience feeling of diminished personal accomplishment.
4 – Frequently – Workgroups often experience feelings of diminished personal accomplishment.
5 – Constantly – Workgroups always experience diminished personal accomplishment throughout their workday and throughout the time period of the study.

Diminished Personal Accomplishment (intensity): 1- Mild 2- Moderate 3 – Strong
7 – N/A 9 – No Info
Note that diminished personal accomplishment refers to workgroups’ feelings about their own work and themselves as workers and people. This is a feeling that one’s work is not good, and relates to low levels of self-efficacy (Kalliath 2001).
1 – Mild – Workgroups feel that they are unappreciated in their jobs and may limit their efforts.
2 – Moderate - Workgroups feel incompetent, unsuccessful, and unable in their jobs and may limit their efforts.
3 – Strong - Workgroups feel guilt, shame, embarrassment by their job performance and regularly limit their efforts.
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