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Abstract- The objective of this study was to establish Emotion Work performed by Managers, specifically those from the Manufacturing sector in India and to ascertain the relationship between Emotion Work performed and Burnout experienced. A cross-sectional survey design was used. The study population (n = 118) consisted of managers from the manufacturing industry. Six subscales from the Frankfurt Emotion Work and Pines & Andersons Burnout Scale were used as measuring instruments. Cronbach alpha coefficients, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients, regression analysis were used to analyse the data. The results revealed that the Managers reported performing a significant amount of Emotion Work. Furthermore, the analysis of the data uncovered that the correlations between the studied dimensions of Emotion Work and Burnout were statistically and practically significant. Emotion Work predicted 28% of the variance explained in the Burnout experienced by these Managers.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Emotions are feelings that people experience, interpret, reflect upon, express, and manage (Thoits, 1989; Mills and Kleinman, 1988). They arise through social interaction, and are influenced by social, cultural, interpersonal, and situational conditions (Martin, 1999). Quintessential as emotions are to Human Behaviour they permeated the walls of the work place a long time, yet only recently have organizational behavioural frameworks started giving both, acceptance and consideration to their presence (Brief and Weiss, 2002). Consequently ‘research’ for a very long time ignored the importance of Emotions at the workplace, primarily because emotions were viewed as ‘inappropriate & irrational behaviours’ in what was believed to be an extremely ‘logical & rationale workplace’ – Put another way researchers adhered to Weber’s advice and practiced “Administrative Rationality” (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1995). However, as the years passed Organizations themselves evolved into ‘Learning’ (Senge, 1990), ‘Thinking’ (Howard, 2012) and ‘Emotional’ (Finman, 2009) ‘Beings’ (Hardy & Shwartz, 1996). The realization that emotions were an integral part of an individual’s composition, that for obvious reasons, cannot just be checked in at the door of the workplace, slowly dawned upon researchers. Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995 set the context, by stating ‘Employees bring their emotions to work and it cannot be denied that, emotions are an inseparable part of everyday organizational life’. Almost instantaneously, researchers realized it was necessary to attempt to understand the ‘omnipresent & complex web’ (more an invisible mesh) of emotions that exists in all organizations.

Ever since the publication of the first book about emotion in organizations (Fineman, 1993), the research world has been ‘buzzing’ with ‘Emotion’. It is well known that emotions that people display, play a central role in the nature of the interactions that take place and in some kinds of work, the display of emotion is in fact a central feature of job or task requirements. However, Briner (1999) emphasized that although there appeared to be much interest in emotions within work and organizational psychology, this interests had not led to a large body of published theory and evidence, nor to a range of practical techniques for assessing or intervening in emotion at work. Researchers soon realized that Hochschild (1983), had hit the nail on the head, by describing a more synergistic view of emotion at work that allowed for a better understanding.

Hochschild (1983) coined the term ‘Emotional Labour’ or ‘Emotion Work’, as the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display. Now, Hochschild was a sociologist, so when she used the term ‘Emotional Labour’, it was to denote; the exchange value of work which is sold for a wage. She specified that Emotional Labour differed from Emotion Work. i.e. Emotion Work was emotional labour performed in the ‘private context’ or without any assurance of receiving a wage in return. However, the term labour is usually used where sociological or societal concepts are involved, e.g., in the division of labour, labour– management relations, conflict resolution, and collective bargaining, Zapf (2002) therefore, made a valid point, when he pointed out that the term (labour) is seldom used for individual behaviour and intrapsychic concepts. For eg. Physical and mental work demands, work motivation, work involvement, work design, etc. Psychological studies focus on psychological processes, such as the regulation of Work actions, rather than societal and economic aspects of labour.

Hochschild did also mention, that from the psychological point of view, Emotion work inside and outside (implied or not) of the job – both had possessed the same acts and as a result so are most of the intrapsychic processes involved.

Hence, in order to be compatible with other fields of work and organizational psychology – it may be better to use the term Emotion Work.
Researchers primarily conceptualized Emotion Work as a duty of the front line ‘service’ employees (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Ashkanasy and Daus, 2002; Brotheridge and Grandey, 2002; Morris and Feldman, 1996; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987). Broadly it may be categorized that Emotion Work has been studied in 3 main types of service workers: (1) customer service jobs; (2) caring professions; and (3) social control jobs.

However recently, the scope of emotion work research has extended itself to consider some service-aligned yet uncommon professions, such as; Adventure guides (Sharpe, 2005; Torland, 2013), Flight attendants (Hochschild,1983;Williams,2003), Fast-food employees (Tan, Foo and Kwek, 2004), Hotel employees (Hwa, 2012), Call centre employees (Zapf et. al., 2003), Waitresses (Paules,1991), Amusement park employees (Van Maanen and Kunda, 1989), Cashiers (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), bill collectors Sutton (1991), 911 Dispatchers (Shuler and Sypher, 2000), Police officers(Martin, 1999),Construction professionals (Lingard and Francis, 2005), Health care workers (Karl and Peluchette, 2006; Lewis, 2012), Teaching professionals (Naring et al., 2006), But rarely has research ever included a study of the Emotion Work of ‘Managers’.

A study that did include Managers, was conducted by Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) and they uncovered that a manager’s frequency of performing emotional labour was higher than that of physical labourers and *matched* that of sales/service workers and human service workers. In fact Brotheridge (2006) imploded that emotional labour in managers was ‘one of the areas that needs additional study’.

Managers by the very definition of their Organizational role, display a wide variety of emotions, ranging from friendliness, to sympathy and support, to anger. Correlating this to the 3 broad categories of service workers under which Emotion Work has been studied in the past (mentioned above), it is clear that they (Managers) must be able or are required to display all of the emotions required by all of them. Moreover, in the absence of clear display rules, (which is common parlance in manufacturing organizations), they have to bank upon their own judgment about which emotion to display and in what magnitude at a particular time. Considering that this decision is to be made almost spontaneously, increases the complexity and the erratic consequences. Hence, it would be safe to say that in such a scenario, performing Emotion Work for Managers may prove to be more arduous than that of the ‘typical service worker’, who often has to display the same emotion in a repetitive fashion.

**Significance of the Research**

This study has been undertaken to a) Explore & empirically establish the performance of Emotion Work in ‘Managers’; b) Broaden the scope of Emotion Work research by proving it exists in the ‘non-service’ i.e. manufacturing industries too, i.e. Managerial Jobs are impervious to the nature of industry; c) Establish a relationship between Emotion Work performed & burnout experienced by Managers in selected Indian Manufacturing organizations and d) Add to the succinct emotion work research conducted in India.

Plausibly this study shall add impetus to the research of Emotion Work, in several ways; Firstly, by empirically establishing “Managerial Jobs” (irrespective of service or non-service industry) as a Job category that has Emotion Job requirements or what may be referred to as an Emotion Work occupational category. Secondly, it shall add to the recent but scantily research in the Indian context and Lastly by establishing the relationship between Emotion Work performed and Burnout experienced it will allow organizational psychologists & HR managers to improve their understanding of a manager’s experiences under an intensive emotion work environment, where display rules are tenuous. From the organizational perspective employee Engagement/Talent Retention could be enhanced if Emotional Dissonance and its negative consequences (if found significant) are buffered against. Managers will need to learn how to perform the Emotion Work involved in their jobs, Training & Development could help with this.

**Research Objectives**

The major objective of this study is to broadly examine the perceived Emotion Work performed by Managers from the selected organizations from the manufacturing sector in India. And to study the relationship of emotion work performed with the feeling of burnout experienced.

- To measure & study the Various Dimensions of Emotion Work that are experienced / performed by the Managers of the selected organizations.
- To measure the Burnout experienced by the Managers of the selected Organizations.
- To analyze and establish a relationship between Emotion Work (EW) and its dimensions with Burnout experienced by the Managers of the selected organizations.
- To measure the impact of various Dimensions of Emotion Work on Burnout experienced by the Managers of the selected organizations.

**II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

This section briefly shares several researches conducted in the area of Emotion Work and highlights those that bring forth the proposed relationship between Emotion Work and Burnout.

There are several operating constructs or definitions of Emotion Work; Hochschild (1990) defined it as ‘regulating one’s emotions to comply with social norms’. She used the term emotion work to refer to ‘any attempt to modify the experience or expression of a consciously felt emotion’ and stated that when an individual performs emotion work as a required part of his/her actual job, it may be called emotional labour. Adding to this, Callahan & McCollum (2002) interpreted that the term emotion work’s usage, is appropriate for situations in which individuals are personally choosing to manage their emotions for their own non-compensated benefits.

Grandey (2000) attempted to explain the process of Emotion Work by stating that ‘Emotion Work may involve enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions to modify the emotional expression’. According to Schultz, Bagrain, Potgieter, Vredge, and Werner (2003) Emotion Work represents the ‘difference between the felt and displayed emotions’ of employees. Whereas, Beal, Trougakso, Weiss & Green (2006) defined Emotion Work...
as the managing of outward expressive display that is desired by the organisation.

However, most researchers are in agreement that Emotion Work possesses the following characteristics (Hochschild, 1983; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Zapf, 2002): (a) Emotion work occurs in face-to-face or voice-to-voice interactions with clients; (b) Emotions are displayed to influence other people’s emotions, attitudes and behaviors; and (c) The display of emotions has to follow certain rules.

Another common observation in this context is that in order to perform a service in a desired manner, the organisation usually has in place, explicit or implicit ‘Emotional Display rules’ (Van Dijk & Kirk, 2007). The more demanding and strict these display rules are, the greater the sense of obligation (Grandey, 2000). In almost all customer service jobs, employees are specifically asked to or are usually expected to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions (Adelmann, 1995; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988). Such emotional demands may be referred to as ‘Display rules’ (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). Concerning however is the fact that some service organizations may go to the extent of attempting to control an employee’s positive displays such as smiling, eye contact, and rhythmic vocal tone as well as their task-based skills for encounters with customers (Grandey et al., 2005), this is done by using a variety of techniques such as training, monitoring, and rewards (Hochschild, 2003).

When Emotion Work is being performed for a wage, clear Display rules – not bring out a sense of obligation to perform it, but covertly communicate a promise of a reward – this further strengthens the impact of the display rules. Therefore employees, in an attempt to conform to the implied or explicit display rules, adapt different strategies to regulate their emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2000, 2003; Hochschild, 1983; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Surface acting and Deep acting are the two main emotion regulation strategies that have been described in the literature reviewed (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Grandey, 2003). There is however a third scenario – where there is a possibility of an employee simply expressing what (s)he feels i.e. Genuine expression (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff et al., 2005). Emotion work in this case is done in the ‘automatic mode’ which is supported by emotion theory (Ekman, 1984; Izard, 1977; Scherer & Wallbott, 1990). Or ‘Genuine Deep Acting as Hochschild called it. However, this aspect has been paid very little attention in the research conducted which primarily focus on surface acting and deep acting (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Grandey, 2003).

Deep Acting & Surface acting differ at the very basic level i.e. ‘Deep Acting’ requires an individual to influence what they feel in order to express the reaction or ‘become’ the role they are asked to display. So not only does deep acting require the expressed behaviour to be modified but also requires that the inner feelings are regulated, Hochschild (1983). On the other hand Surface Acting refers to the strategy utilized when employees try to manage only the visible aspects of emotions i.e. those that appear on the “surface” and can be noticed by the interaction partner. So they align their outward expression to the organizational display rules, but their inner feelings remain unchanged. Repeated surface acting results in a state of ‘emotional dissonance’ which is the differential that exists between ones inner feelings and the outer expression. Emotional Dissonance, may be defined as the gap between an employees’ felt emotion and his/her expressed emotion (Abraham, 1998, 1999a; Morris & Feldman, 1996a, 1997; Zapf, 2002; Zapf, Vogt, Seifert, Mertini, & Isic, 1999).

Emotional Dissonance has several mentions in the emotion work studies reviewed (e.g., Abraham, 1998; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Bu¨ssing & Glaser, 1999a; Grandey, 1998; Mann, 1999; Morris & Feldman, 1996, 1997; Nerdinger & Ro´per, 1999; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini, & Holz, 2001; Zapf et al., 1999).

Once researchers had figured out that individuals regulated their emotions (performed emotion work), that they did so using different strategies, they then set about exploring why employees chose the strategies they did and how this affected their work outcomes (Grandey, 2000). So the initial studies on emotion work (in this context) were mostly focused on performance (e.g., Rafaeli, 1989a,1989b; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988). In the words of Ashforth & Humphrey (1993) Emotion Work was likely to help employees successfully fulfill their task requirements and may even increase task effectiveness by making interactions more predictable and by avoiding interpersonal problems that might disrupt interactions with customers. However, it was Briner (1999), who made a very pertinent point (one which seemed to gain support) when he highlighted that even though Emotion Work performed was necessary, it needed to be reviewed from both, the employees and the employers perspective. He highlighted that while it was vital to perform Emotion Work to ensure the quality of product or service, it is imperative to ensure that the Emotion Work being performed was ‘safe’ per se in terms of its possible effects on individual well-being. It may be surmised that although Emotion Work is required because of its positive effects for the organisation, specifically because it may be a necessary part of accomplishing a task, many researchers, including Tschan, Rochat, & Zapf (2005) and CÔté (2005) have identified unfavourable long-term consequences for employees that have to perform Emotion Work. In fact, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) described emotional labour as a double-edged sword.

Postulating, on this researchers argued that there must be a manner to perform emotion work in a way that is ‘effective’. Shortly afterwards, organizational research began to show some consistent relationships between self-efficacy beliefs and task performance. For example, Barling and Beattie (1983) showed that strong self-efficacy beliefs were associated with high levels of sales performance, while Taylor, Locke, Lee, and Gist (1984) found a similar relation between self-efficacy beliefs and the productivity of faculty research. This indicated that employees may not always view emotion work as problematic. In fact, they felt good about performing it. Those with low efficacy, on the other hand, lack the skill to cope efficiently and effectively when emotional expression is demanded. Researchers also investigated the relationships between emotion work and psychological strain, in particular burnout and job satisfaction (e.g., Abraham, 1998; Adelmann, 1995; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Grandey, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Zapf et al., 1999, 2001). Some studies also investigated disengagement, exhaustion, burnout and
negative emotions (Beal et al., 2006; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Heuven et al., 2006; Lewig & Dollard, 2003; Montgomery et al., 2006).

During the last decade the influence of certain Organizational and Individual Factors that could influence, mediate or moderate the relationship between Emotion work and its outcome have also come under the scanner. There have been numerous studies pertaining to Organisational factors like Social support (Gallagher & Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Gray, 2002; Montes-Berges & Augusto, 2007), Service culture (Syed, 2008; Curtis & Upchurch, 2008), Role stress (Harris, 2002; Williams, 2003; Zapf et. al., 2003; Lewig & Dollard, 2003; Lingard & Francis, 2005; Pravettoni et. al. 2007; Murray and Rostis, 2007; Biron et. al. 2008), Role efficacy, Role overload, burnout, Emotional exhaustion (Hochschild, 1983; Kahn, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Zapf et. al., 1999; Bakker et. al., 2003; Lewig & Dollard, 2003; Michinov, 2005), Aesthetic labor (Stevens, 2012; Williams, 2003), Sales performance (Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988), Self-monitoring (Scott, Barnes & Wagner, 2012), Job dissatisfaction (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Grandey, 1999; Wharton, 1993).

The impact of performing Emotion Work on an individual’s psychological well-being has also been discussed in the literature. This includes poor self-esteem, depression, cynicism, role alienation, and self-alienation (Richman, 1988; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Fineman, 1993; Tolich, 1993; Wharton, 1993) Also individual factors like Gender (Guy & Newman, 2004; Meier, Mastracci, & Wilson, 2006) and Emotional intelligence (Austin, Dore, & Mc Donovan, 2008; Mikolajczak, Nelis, Hansenne, & Quoidbach, 2008) that influence these outcomes have been researched too.

Among those mentioned above several studies have specifically explored the relationship between emotion work & Burnout. Maslach (1982) defined burnout as the stress that results from the social interaction between helpers and then-recipients. And according to Schwab et al., (1986), burnout tends to occur when an employee becomes emotionally over involved in interactions with customers and has little way to replenish those emotional resources being spent. Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) highlighted that even though emotional exhaustion is at the core of burnout, burnout literature seldom considered emotion work demands as predictors of burnout.

Burnout is a stress outcome typically experienced in situations or jobs that induce repeated emotional responses that the employee must continuously regulate. It is only natural that employees experience emotional exhaustion, or energy depletion and fatigue. Sometime, to cope with these feelings, employees detach from the customers by objectifying or depersonalizing themselves (emotional dissonance). This may further lead to them feeling negative about their work, to the point where they experience a diminished sense of personal accomplishment (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). It is important to note that specifically burnout has been associated with important organizational outcomes like performance and turnover (Singh et al., 1994; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). And that it is considered a central part in work within the health professions and human service sector (Jackson et al., 1986; Zapf, Seifert, Schonutte, Mertini, & Holtz, 2001). Dormann and Zapf (2004) summed it up by stating that burnout usually occurs in jobs that deal with a variety of customers and clients.

Another important revelation of the literature reviewed was that Emotion Work has almost always been studied in ‘classic emotional labour jobs’ i.e. in Jobs where the expectations of emotional display are relatively explicit, and involve frequent interactions between an employer and a customer or client and where the employee could not probably do their job if they did not engage in emotional displays. However, it would be safe to say that many, if not most jobs, involve the management of feelings and Display of emotions, hence the distinction between jobs that have emotion work requirements and those that do not is blurred. Yet most studies have continued to focus on the service’ industry. Almost any managerial or supervisory job is likely to involve an element of emotion work as managing people effectively is likely to involve the suppression of some emotions and the display of others.

From the India(n) perspective, Modekurti-Mahato, et al.’s (2014) review of literature revealed that emotional labour studies in India hardly have a presence and just about 1% of studies have been researched empirically. Most of studies focus on call centers (Taylor & Bane, 2005; Shankar & Kasturi, 2006; Bryson, 2007; D’cruz & Noronha, 2008; Surana & Singh, 2009; Chong, 2009; Agrawal & Sadhna, 2010, Nath, 2011; Rajan-Rankin, 2012), a few on pharmaceutical representatives (Mishra et al, 2012), family care giving ( D’cruz, 2010), retail sector (Gupta & Mishra, 2010), Medical representatives (Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010; Mishra, 2014), Hotel & Hospitality executives (Augustine & Joseph, 2008; Satyanarayana & Shankar, 2012; Rathl et al, 2013; Shani et al., 2014), Teaching / Academicians (Gaan, 2012), Aviation Industry (Waddar & Aminabhavi, 2012), Hospital workers (Mathur et al., 2013; Thomas & Abhiyankar, 2014; Pandey & Singh, 2015), Postal services (Raghavendra, 2015), Customer service employees (Sarkar & Suresh, 2013), Banking Sector, (Sharma & Sharma, 2014) etc.

Hypothetical Consideration: After reviewing a large body of literature, there appears a clear need to explore the prevalence of Emotion Work in Managers. Especially those in the non-service arena such as manufacturing where the display rules are non-existent or sketchy, relying entirely on the Managers judgement on how to perform the Emotion Work. There already exists sufficient evidence of burnout being a negative outcome of such Emotion Work, on an individual’s well-being and it is linked to organizational outcomes such as hindered performance, turnover intention and reduced employee engagement – it warrants further exploration in all Managerial Jobs. And even though Emotion Work is slowing gaining interest among Indian researchers, yet apart from a few studies in certain ‘typical’ fields, the literature on emotional labour in India is scanty.

On the basis of the review of literature, hypothetical considerations & the research objectives, the following Hypotheses were framed:

H1: Managers of the selected organizations shall perform Emotion Work as part of their Managerial role.

H2: There shall exist a significant relationship between Emotion Work (EW) and its dimensions and the Burnout experienced by the Managers of the selected organizations.
H3: To measure the impact of the various dimensions of Emotion Work on Burnout experienced by the Managers of the selected organizations.

III. METHOD

Sample
Using a cross sectional research design, 150 cross functional managers were chosen with the help of snowball sampling from 5 manufacturing organizations in India and were asked to participate in the survey. The organizations were those whose business was manufacturing – Products / Power and Managers who had at least one direct reportee were included.

Measures
Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect data. Emotion Work was measured using 6 subscales from Zapf (2004) FEWS; Frankfurt Emotion Work Scale (permission was sought). The original FEWS, developed in Germany by Zapf et al, includes 61 self-reported items measuring the frequency of expression of organizationally desired emotions (Individuals indicated their responses on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very rarely/never) to 5 (very often/several times an hour), responding to items such as: “How often in your job do you have to display Unpleasant emotion towards ‘clients’ (i.e. Strictness or Anger if rules are not followed)”. With Client being explained as both External & Internal – Colleagues / Subordinates / supervisors. “How often is it necessary in your job to empathize with the client’s emotions?”

However, since the prime objectives of this study is to establish an ‘Emotion Work Requirement’ within the jobs of ‘Managers’, i.e. establish Emotional Demands, the subscales 1, 2 and 4 were used (also seen in Giardini and Frese, 2006). In sync with the definition of Managers as someone who had at least one subordinate it was decided to add the sub scales that measured ‘Demands for Sensitivity’ and ‘Emotion Control’. An important consideration was to keep the questionnaire comprehensible to managers from both different functions and different companies, therefore it was decided to not use the sub scales 6, 8, 10 and 11. By using only 6 sub scales the length of the instrument was also limited to 37 questions, which ensured that it was not too time consuming but the validity & reliability of the instrument were not compromised. The subscales utilized along with their corresponding reliability were tested & have been mentioned alongside the dimension: Display of Positive emotions - 9 items (0.72), Display of Negative emotions - 8 items (0.76), Demands for Sensitivity – 4 items (0.91) and Emotional Dissonance - 5 items (0.75).

Burnout was measured using Pine & Andersons 21 item scale. It uses a five-point scale ranging from Never (1) to Always (5), individuals responded to items such as: “Being tired” and “Feeling disillusioned & resentful”.

Procedure
With the consent of the organizations, the authors administered the surveys. An online form (in addition to the paper one) was made available to encourage participation via mobile/ laptops. 118 usable surveys were obtained, accounting for a response rate of 66 percent. 86 percent of the sample was men and 14 percent were female managers. While 80 percent of the managers were married. 29 percent of the respondents were between the ages of 20-29, 41 percent were between the Age of 30-39, 22 percent were between the age of 40-49 and the remaining 8 percent of the respondents were between 50 and 59 years of age.

Data Analysis
For descriptive and relational analysis, Mean and standard deviation (SD) of each of the six FEWS sub-scale scores were calculated for the whole sample. Reliability values for each subscale regarding burnout and emotion work were calculated. Pearson’s correlation was conducted in order to assess the strength of the relationship between Emotion Work & Burnout. In order to identify the dimensions of emotion work that are associated with burnout, hierarchical regression Analysis was conducted. The relationships between the burnout subscales (dependent variables) and the aspects of emotion work (independent variables) were evaluated by determining regression coefficients (standardized coefficients, β). A P value of <0.05 was considered significant for all tests. SPSS software, version 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for all analyses.

IV. RESULTS

In total, 118 questionnaires were returned (response rate 66 %) from 150 Managers. Demographic variables i.e. Age, Gender & Marital Status related information were studied (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>171.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of the instrument used to measure Emotion Work & Burnout are shown below (Table 2).
Table 2. Reliability Statistics of scale used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Work</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics revealed that the Mean and SD value of ‘Display of Certain Emotions’, ‘Emotion Control’, ‘Display of Positive Emotions’, ‘Demands for Sensitivity’ ‘Emotional Dissonance’ and ‘Display of Negative Emotions’, were 37.39(5.05), 12.43(2.85), 17.25(3.41), 12.60(2.42), 14.59(3.16) and 17.75(4.01) respectively, Shown below in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Emotion Work & Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Work</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table the values of standard deviation for the dimensions of Emotion Work, range from 2.47 to 5.05, since the data is concentrated around the mean i.e. the smaller the standard deviation, this indicates that the responses were not too concentrated. Data was also viewed from a thumb rule that indicates that in case the value of the standard deviation is one fourth of the mean value of the series, the data is high on homogeneity. It is reviewed and found that data is homogeneous for all Dimensions except ‘Display of Certain Emotion’ (DCE), where the values of standard deviation and mean are 5.05 and 37.39 respectively – indicating that in this dimension of Emotion Work had the highest variance in responses from Managers.

The Correlation between the dimensions of Emotion work & Burnout was examined. (Table 4).

Table 4. Correlation statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Display of Certain Emotions</th>
<th>Display of Positive Emotions</th>
<th>Demands for Sensitivity</th>
<th>Emotional Dissonance</th>
<th>Display of Negative Emotions</th>
<th>Emotion Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.225(*)</td>
<td>-0.314(**)</td>
<td>-0.330(<em><strong>).630(</strong></em>).431(<em><strong>).089.266(</strong></em>).084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicated that Emotion Work and burnout were significantly related (r=0.266**, p=0.004). Emotion Control was moderately (negatively) significantly correlated with Burnout (r= -0.225*, p=0.014) Whereas, Display of Positive emotions (r=0.314**, p=0.001), Demands for Sensitivity (r=0.330**, p=0) & Emotional dissonance (r=0.431**, p=0), were strongly correlated with Burnout. Surprisingly, the data did not show a relationship between burnout and the requirement to Display Negative Emotion in this study.

To investigate the second and third hypothesis, regression analysis was used (Table 5a &b). Three different regression models were employed to explore the full diversity of the effects using different sets of variables. Model 1 investigated whether the emotional dissonance reported by the Managers predicted burnout – which it did strongly. Next we added the dimension of Emotion Control, in Model 2 – this too enhanced the feeling of burnout. Model 3 investigated whether the requirement to display positive emotions also predicted burnout.

Table 5a. Model of Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.433(a)</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>8.338</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.523(b)</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>7.906</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.553(c)</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>7.766</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5b. Coefficients of Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>3.641</td>
<td>9.397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>41.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Dissonance</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>4.572</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>52.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Dissonance</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>5.949</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Control</td>
<td>-0.973</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>-3.746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.684</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>49.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Dissonance</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Control</td>
<td>-1.121</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>-0.348</td>
<td>-4.258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of Positive Emotion</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis of the study was to empirically establish that ‘Managers’ and specifically those from the manufacturing sector (a segment ignored in earlier emotion work research) too, Perform Emotion Work. The mean score of emotion work in this study was reported as (113.9±13.51). Managers showed the greatest agreeableness to the ‘Display of Certain Emotions’ in their job context – laying the foundation for considering “managerial jobs” as an Emotion Work job category.
This prepares the basis for the need for explicit Display rules – so that the Emotion Content of a Manager’s job design is acknowledged and Managers are apprised on how to conform. Not only will this (adherence to the Display rules) ensure an enhanced feeling of self-efficacy but also a heightened sense of personal accomplishment (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Hochschild, 1983), it will also pave the way for ensuring a job-person fit.

The second hypothesis was to explore the Manager’s emotion work’s predictive impact on burnout in a manufacturing scenario. The data indicated that Emotion Work and Burnout were significantly related, Zapf et al (2001) had also showed a unique contribution of emotion work variables in the prediction of burnout. Most previous researchers have analysed the relationship between specific aspects of emotion work (mostly emotional dissonance) and emotional exhaustion. Emotional Exhaustion is a key component of burnout (Pugliesi, 1999; Wharton, 1993; Kruml & Geddes, 2000). A strong statistically significant correlation between Emotional Dissonance and Burnout is corroborated by several studies; Abraham, 1998; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Grandey, 1998; Kruml & Geddes, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Nerdinger & Ro¯per, 1999; Zapf et al., 1999, 2001. The moderate yet negatively significant relationship between Emotion Control and Burnout (r= -0.225*, p=0.014) could be explained by the fact that Emotion control for organizational purposes can also be referred to as Display Rules (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Wharton, 1993). Since Display rules are non-existent in most manufacturing set ups, it is likely that Managers will welcome emotion control of some sort, as dealing with ‘organized chaos’ or a wild array of emotions with no formal structure – could understandably, be stressful. It could be inferred that Managers of this study showed an aversion to emotional autonomy. There have been a few other studies such as Sarkar & Suresh (2013) and Kovacs et al (2010) that uncovered a significant relationship between Emotion Control & psychological well-being (the theoretical opposite of burnout). The emotional compliance with organizational and social requirements is likely to lead to a predictable emotional display, which reduces the possibility that an embarrassing interpersonal situation may arise (Gross and Stone, 1964), that too shall enhance one’s feeling of personal efficacy (Markus & Kitayama, 2001) and in turn reduce burnout. The finding that Demands for Sensitivity also correlate, in a statistically significant manner, to a feeling of Burnout, corroborated what Zapf et al (2001) had found in their sample i.e. that the requirement to be sensitive to the emotions of others was positively correlated to Emotional Exhaustion (the main component of Burnout). The correlation of the requirement to Display Positive Emotions and a feeling of Burnout as ironic as it sounds – may be explained by the ‘requirement’ being a forced one, of sorts. The fact that Display of Positive Emotions contributes to the feeling of Personal Accomplishment (the diminishing of which results in Burnout) as found by Zapf et al. (1999, 2001), Dieendorff et al (2005) and more recently by Kim (2008) could also explain the relationship uncovered.

The results of the regression analysis between the various dimensions of Emotion Work and Burnout experienced by Managers revealed (and answered the third hypothesis) that in this study the dimensions of Emotion Work influenced 27.9% of Burnout experienced by Managers. These findings clearly highlight the need for interventions that are designed to make Display rules explicit and reduce dissonance to prevent burnout.

VI. CONCLUSION

The literature reviewed suggested that individuals in the work arena (usually a service organization) frequently performed Emotion Work as part of their effort to influence a client’s moods and emotions. Because the client’s moods and emotions are likely to have a substantial effect on their performance or appraisal of it, employees who are successful at influencing moods are likely to be considered more ‘effective’. In tandem with this we know that an effective ‘Manager’ (from any organization) interacts frequently with internal and external clients: However, the manner & quantum in which they perform emotion work is circumspect.

While service workers perform emotion work in a predictable or highly repetitive fashion, they usually have a narrow range of emotions that they are required to display as part of their organizational role. Added to this is the ratification of display rules that are well communicated and the high probability that they have even been given adequate training on the same. But Managers, in contrast, need to display a much wider range of emotions in their efforts to manage employees, team members and clients on a daily basis. The larger gamut also implies switching between emotions of varying magnitude at the blink of an eyelid.

Let’s visualize, a Manager in his cabin expressing disappointment to a team worker who hasn’t delivered work as per a committed deadline (faking & exaggerating it slightly in an attempt to coach him into realistic goal setting as the actual deadline is still a day away) and the phone starts ringing- its an external auditor appointed by the board who wants to discuss the findings and during the call a message from the boss flashes asking for an immediate video call. This is just an average 2 minutes in the life of a Manager. The complexities of handling diametrically opposite emotions within microseconds for long durations is bound to be exhausting. Managers that perform emotion work ‘effectively’ on a regular basis are likely to be emotionally expressive and better communicators but are also likely to be emotionally exhausted.

Sadly it is this ‘Emotion Work requirement’ of Managers which is rarely acknowledged let alone documented. Moreover, in a manufacturing setup (the scope of this study) – in the absence of display rules Managers are required to exercise a considerable amount of judgment about which emotions to display. Not only do Managers perform Emotion Work in interactions but even as a demeanour, which may be considered a prolonged expression. They may for example need to publically display emotions indicative of exuding confidence and optimism, in times of crisis or when confronting Negative workplace situations i.e. at times when it is most important emotion work is required to hide their feelings of anxiety in front of a subordinate or client. Their choice of display could be beneficial or not, they may have adapted the correct emotion strategy merely by chance. However it is evident that they have no way of experiencing the
positive outcomes of Emotion work performed – until is not acknowledged, documented or linked to performance. Restructuring the Emotion Job Design, putting in place Interventions that help Managers master the basic skills behind genuine emotional expression and deep acting may make the workplace more productive and enjoyable for them. Besides enhancing Engagement & Personal Efficacy at the individual level, this shall also add impetus to the already proven Organizational Gains such as Low turnover intention, etc.

VII. LIMITATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study has certain limitations that should be acknowledged. Relying exclusively upon self-report measures, which could lead to common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The use of a cross-sectional design, does not allow the establishing of causal relationships among study variables and limits the ability to make generalizations about the total population from this sample. This study focused only on the ‘negative consequence’ of performing Emotion Work i.e. Burnout. It did not explore if there was a positive consequence or whether the individual outcome of performing Emotion affected the ‘Managerial effectiveness’. The present study focused only on Managers of one non service sector. Larger samples of Managers from more occupations need to be studied. Also a greater understanding of display rules (and how they differ across context and target) can help managers and employees identify emotions and given this information, improve both workplace communications and interpersonal interactions. There is also a need to examine the task effectiveness of emotion work on such outcomes as organizational / team performance (e.g., win-loss record), Manager’s perceived organizational climate, Manager’s Job satisfaction, and subordinate / Client’s trust toward Managers are recommended. Interestingly several authors have suggested that emotion work and especially the frequency of emotional dissonance could be dependent on personality variables, such as positive or negative affect and extraversion (e.g., Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1996). However, little empirical support exists and this could be explored further as it could form the basis of several HR processes. Except for a few studies in certain fields, the literature on emotion work in India is very limited. An extensive research would be needed to understand the importance of emotion work in Managerial jobs across various sectors.
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