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Abstract

Emotional labor is the regulation of emotions in order to meet organizational expectations (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Since it is important in service organizations, understanding formal human resources practices in improving emotional performance is necessary. Selection, monitoring, and rewarding emotional labor have been explored in previous research (Leidner, 1999; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Recently, however, authors have argued that in order to increase, improve, and maintain emotional performance, it may be necessary for organizations to provide emotional labor training (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Kim, 2007; Tan, Foo, & Kwek, 2004). Thus, training is a logical next step in furthering our understanding of emotional labor. The current research attempts to answer several research questions about the occurrence and consequences of emotional labor training. Using field survey data, study 1 answers questions about whether emotional labor training 1) occurs less frequently than rewards or monitoring, 2) occurs more frequently in jobs with high customer contact, 3) is more common in jobs with lower turnover, and 4) predicts emotional performance. Results indicate that training occurs less frequently than social rewards and monitoring for emotional labor and occurs more frequently in jobs with higher customer contact; however, training was unrelated to occupational turnover. Training for emotional labor was also found to positively relate to self-reported emotional performance beyond demographics and customer contact frequency. Study 2 was designed to test whether emotional labor training resulted in more or less negative reactions than other typical forms of training. Using a between-person experimental design and vignettes to manipulate type of training, results indicate that training for emotional labor does not result in negative reactions but actually enhances perceived social benefits more than other (technical skills) training. Implications for future research in emotional labor and customer service practices are discussed.
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“The more often tips about how to see, feel, and seem are issued from above and the more effectively the conditions of the ‘stage’ are kept out of the hands of the actor, the less she can influence her entrances and exits and the nature of her acting in between” (Hochschild, 1983, pg. 189).

Introduction

Emotional labor is defined as emotion management for a wage, which is likely in jobs with frequent interactions with the public, where one must evoke feelings in the public, and management monitors or controls emotional displays (Hochschild, 1983). In other words, emotional labor is the regulation of emotions to meet organizational expectations (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). Emotional labor was shown to be perceived as “in-role” or as a specific job requirement of most jobs (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006). These expectations, or display rules, are beneficial for organizations because they act as behavioral goals, thus directing and motivating emotional behavior (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). They enhance interpersonal service performance compared to display autonomy (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007). Moreover, when sales clerks show more positive displays, customers tend to react more positively and report higher service performance and willingness to return to the store and recommend it to their friends (Barger & Grandey, 2006; Gountas, Ewing, & Gountas, 2007; Tsai, 2001).

Because of the importance of emotional labor in service organizations, formal human resources practices are used to improve employees’ emotional performance (Leidner, 1999). The importance of emotional labor and training has also been discussed in the medical field (e.g. Haller, 2005; Larson & Yao, 2005). Organizations communicate display rules to employees concerning the emotions they should express to customers (Grandey, 2008; Leidner, 1999) through selection, socialization, monitoring, rewards, and training (Leidner, 1999; Rafaeli &
Sutton, 1987). Although evidence exists for the impact of some forms of management control, such as monitoring displays (e.g. Holman, Chissick, & Totterdell, 2002), less is known about formal emotional labor training. Recently, authors have argued that in order to raise and maintain service levels, organizations need “to teach service providers emotion management skills” (Tan, Foo, & Kwek, 2004, p. 294) by “providing instructions for engaging in deep acting” (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007, p. 316) and in fact “Education and training may be necessary to change employee’s acting mode into a proper one” (Kim, 2007, p. 160). However, there is little systematic evidence about whether emotional labor training is a practical or effective approach for improving performance. Training is a logical and key next step in furthering our knowledge of emotional labor.

The current study attempts to further our understanding in this area by answering several research questions about emotional labor training. First, the occurrence of formal training for emotional labor is investigated. Given the costs of training and yet the likelihood of EL jobs having high turnover, how common and how effective is formal training for emotions? Second, given claims that EL is a form of management control, would training to regulate emotions have a negative impact on trainees, and under what conditions? Thus, I propose to provide unique empirical evidence of the occurrence of emotion labor training and reactions to training for emotional labor. In the following sections, I will briefly review relevant emotional labor and training literature separately, before combining the two in describing my hypotheses.

Literature Review

Emotional Regulation and Emotional Labor

Emotion regulation is the process by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express them (Gross, 1998b). Research
by Gross and colleagues (Gross, 1998a, 1998b; Gross & John, 2003; Richards & Gross, 2000) have identified different times at which emotional regulation can occur. Antecedent-focused emotional regulation takes place at the beginning of the emotional response process. One example of antecedent-focused approaches is the reappraisal of a situation. Response-focused emotion regulation occurs at the back-end of the emotional response process. An example of response-focused regulation is the suppression of the natural emotional response or expression to a situation. Both reappraisal and suppression have been found to be effective in reducing emotion-expressive behavior (Gross, 1998a).

Emotional labor is emotional regulation performed for a wage, with two main ways employees can follow organizational display rules and perform emotional labor: surface acting and deep acting (Hochschild, 1983). In deep acting, one changes the internal feelings and then the public display of the emotions changes as well, and can best be considered as antecedent-focused emotional regulation. In surface acting the expression is “put on” or the emotion is suppressed by the employee, a process that is similar to response-focused emotion regulation (Grandey, 2000). Surface acting only changes the public display and not the internal feeling (Côté, 2005; Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Surface acting (managing expressions) and deep acting (managing feelings) match the definition of emotional labor as a process of emotion regulation (Grandey, 2000). As suggested by Grandey (2000), both surface and deep acting can be conceptualized as potentially occurring at separate parts of the emotional labor process. Deep acting is antecedent-focused emotion regulation in which one regulates the precursors of emotion by either thinking of events that elicit certain emotions or by reappraising the current situation. Surface acting is response-focused emotion regulation in which one modifies the observable signs of emotion.
These two ways of regulating emotions have very different outcomes for the employee and the organization. “When feelings are successfully commercialized, the worker does not feel phony or alien; she feels somehow satisfied in how personal her service actually was. Deep acting is a help in doing this” (Hochschild, 1983, pg. 136). Performing deep acting has been found to be satisfying to employees and customers, while surface acting is related to employee strain or dissatisfaction (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Côté & Morgan, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). In addition, suppression of emotions has been shown to have negative outcomes, including experiences of poorer memory of the situation during which suppression was used (Richards & Gross, 2002). Thus, surface acting may drain employees’ cognitive and motivational resources since it requires constant attention paid to the expression (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, et al., 2005). Deep acting, however, modifies feelings and may actually restore resources by reducing the discrepancies between actual feeling and expressions (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 1983). Thus, deep acting may have benefits for employees while surface acting is more taxing, both emotionally and physically.

Furthermore, engaging in deep acting may result in positive outcomes for the organization. Employees performing deep acting create more authentic expressions, resulting in higher customer service ratings when compared to surface acting (Gountas, Ewing, & Gountas, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Kim, 2007). Suppression, a type of surface acting, has been shown to cause disruptions in communication with others (Butler, et al., 2003) indicating it may not be the best customer service method. In addition, employees’ authentic expressive displays positively influence consumers’ willingness to choose a service again (Gountas, et al., 2007; Tsai, 2001). Deep acting is also positively associated with greater proactivity in helping customers and
displayed happiness, unlike surface acting (Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Overall, deep acting may be the best strategy for employees in emotional labor jobs (Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Kim, 2007) and thus, may be the best set of skills to develop in training.

Types of Training

Workplace training is a systematic approach to learning and development to improve employee and organizational effectiveness (Kraiger & Ford, 2007; Goldstein & Ford, 2002). It is defined as a “systematic acquisition of skills, rules, concepts, or attitudes that result in improved performance in another environment” (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). Training is used to increase employee competence, employee motivation, organizational effectiveness, and employee knowledge of organizational values (Kraiger & Ford, 2007; Ryan & Ployhart, 2003; Salas et al., 1999). Training is recognized as the main way to improve performance (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005), and it is likely this extends to emotional performance.

There are many different types of workplace training. The most common is technical skills training (i.e. training to use equipment in the workplace) followed by professional skills training (i.e. which trains profession or industry specific skills) while customer service training is typically used less frequently in organizations (Bassi & Van Buren, 1998; Goldstein & Ford, 2002). However, due to the shift in the economy from manufacturing to service, service training is becoming increasingly more important (Goldstein & Ford, 2002; Ryan & Ployhart, 2003). In the service climate literature, it has been suggested that customer service training has three different content areas: job technical skills, interpersonal and customer relation skills, and knowledge concerning values and norms (Schneider & Bowen, 1992). Emotional labor training would be considered a subset of customer service training, which in itself, has received little attention in the literature (Ryan & Ployhart, 2003).
Emotional labor training may be different from training for other types of labor, thus requiring specific research focus. In other words, theories and research on job training may not directly translate to emotional labor. Unlike other technical job tasks, each customer creates a different situation and experience for the employee (Ryan & Ployhart, 2003; Schneider & Bowen, 1992) making standardized training extremely difficult. There is not just one specific way to effectively display emotions and not the same emotions are appropriate in each encounter. Thus standardized training simply for “service with a smile” or training for display rules and norms is less likely to be effective than training for emotional regulation.

Occurrence of Training for Emotional Labor

Emotional labor training has been shown to occur in one of two ways: training for interpersonal skills and training for knowledge concerning values and norms. Training for interpersonal skills includes training on how to regulate emotions, such as through deep acting. Training for knowledge concerning values and norms includes training on organizational display rules and expectations.

A few case studies have been done on specific organizations to describe emotional labor training (Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Hochschild, 1983; Korczynski, 2003; Leidner, 1996; Seymour & Sandiford, 2005) or training interventions (Cooper & Oddie, 1972; Komaki, Blood, & Holder, 1980). Hochschild (1983) conducted qualitative research to describe the emotion regulation training of flight attendants for emotional labor at Delta Airlines. This training instructed employees to modify feeling states by thinking of passengers as personal guests in their own living room. They had an initial training that focused on the passenger’s feelings. The training taught employees to reappraise the situation (using deep acting) in order to feel more welcoming and positive. They were told to act “from the heart” (deep acting) and that “your smile is your
biggest asset – use it” (surface acting). They also had a recurrent training that focused on the flight attendant’s feelings and avoiding anger. They were told to focus on what the other person is thinking and to “work on anger for yourselves”. This type of reappraisal training could also be considered a type of deep acting skills training. Hochschild’s book was an important introduction to emotional labor and an example of how emotional labor training is performed.

Though Hochschild’s examples incorporated training for both emotion regulation and knowledge of display rules, many other service organizations have been found to only use training for knowledge of display rules. Van Maanen (1991) described emotional labor at Disneyland, including the process of selection, training, and monitoring emotions. According to this qualitative study, the Disneyland training manual discussed display rules by emphasizing wide smiles as vital to park operations. Disneyland also had a training and orientation called the University of Disneyland in which instructors tell new employees that “First, we practice the friendly smile. Second, we use only friendly and courteous phrases. Third, we are not stuffy” (VanMaanen, 1991). Employees were taught how to respond to “guests” and were frequently retrained in which emotions were appropriate. Furthermore, Leidner (1996) discussed McDonald’s display rules of being “cheerful and polite” with customers. McDonald’s routinized the jobs and provided employees with very strict scripts for each type of interaction, in order to ensure the correct display rules were being performed. They did not provide any type of emotion regulation training, simply training for knowledge of organizational norms and expectations. In addition, the supermarket chain, Safeway, created a customer service program where employees who accumulated too many low secret shopper performance scores were sent to an 8-hour “Smile School” (McNichol, 1998). This training incorporated a video stressing the types of smiles and greetings the employees should use, again focusing only on display rules.
Furthermore, Martin and colleagues (1998) discussed the emotional culture at The Body Shop, including some information about emotional labor training. The Body Shop is a unique organization due to its feminist values that allow for a wider range and visibility of emotions in the workplace; however, the organization still trained employees to hide emotions (surface acting) that may impede a sale. Similarly, Seymour and Sandiford (2005) also attempted to qualitatively examine training in the United Kingdom public-house sector but found very little training within the organizations. Overall, there exist a few qualitative descriptions of training programs in specific service organizations, but we know little about the occurrence emotional labor training is across organizations or occupations.

Moreover, little is known about the frequency of emotional labor training compared to other practices to promote emotional labor. Emotional performance may be selected for, monitored, and rewarded (Leidner, 1999; Van Maanen, 1991). In the Disneyland qualitative study, not only were employees trained in emotional labor, they were a “well-screened bunch” and were constantly monitored by supervisors hiding throughout the park (Van Maanen, 1991, p. 60). Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) discussed the importance of selecting people who convey the appropriate emotions, rewarding them to maintain those emotions, and monitoring behavior to ensure the correct displays. Leidner (1999) also stressed the importance of selecting for traits such as extroversion that promote emotional labor. Emotional labor monitoring (e.g. Holmann, Chissick, & Totterdell, 2002) and rewards for emotions (e.g. George, 1998) have also been shown to be used to enforce emotional labor. No known research has looked at the frequency of emotional labor training compared to other human resources (HR) methods.

I argue that emotional labor training may be less frequent than other HR practices for several reasons. First, training may be more expensive than monitoring, and rewards, thus,
training is more of an investment in the employees compared to other strategies. In many service organizations, the front-line employees are low in status and their turnover is too high to warrant a large financial and time investment. For example, the food service industry is plagued by enormous turnover rates, often exceeding 100 percent annually (Kacmar, et al., 2006). Relatedly, organizations with high turnover may find it less useful to train and develop their employees and would rather implement more immediate forms of behavioral control over their employees’ emotions, such as performance-contingent rewards and monitoring, that do not depend on the employee remaining to regain the investment. Forms of control from management may be more common in service organizations due to the low status of the front-line service employee (Hochschild, 1983). Furthermore, emotional labor training, specifically deep acting training, may be difficult. Organizations would not have an established or pre-existing way to teach reappraisal and other deep acting techniques, and since the service context requires customized or personalized interactions this increases the complexity of effective training transfer (Ryan & Ployhart, 2003; Schneider & Bowen, 1992). Even though some evidence does exist that simply telling college students to reappraise can create effects in lab research (Butler, et al., 2003; Richard & Gross, 2000), the extent of its effectiveness in a real organizational setting is unclear.

Therefore, given the higher costs and lower immediate return-on-investment for the organization, and the difficulty inherent in its success, I expect that, on average, emotional labor training would be less common than other more direct and immediate forms of behavioral control:

*Hypothesis 1: Emotional labor training occurs less frequently than monitoring and rewards for emotional labor.*
Though emotional labor training may generally be less common than rewards or selection for emotional labor, certain factors make it more likely that emotional labor training will be provided. Management’s decisions in holding emotional labor training may be affected by the amount of emotional labor job demands, such as the centrality of customer interactions to the job. Employees who are frequently interacting with customers, as opposed to occasional or intermittent interactions, suggest greater impact on the public and greater importance for the employee to manage the impressions that the public holds of the organization (Grove & Fisk, 1989). In fact, “service with a smile” is more likely to be perceived as an in-role job requirement in jobs with frequent customer contact (Diefendorff, et al., 2006). Several examples of emotional labor training exist in the airline industry, in which flight attendants are trained to deliver sincere emotions to passengers (Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Hochschild, 1983). Flight attendants are in constant contact with their passengers during flights.

Thus, in jobs with constant contact with the public, organizations convey the importance of the emotional displays as part of job requirements through training. Furthermore, in jobs with frequent customer contact, emotional labor is highly critical to customer satisfaction and organization success, therefore training in emotional labor to teach skills and personalize service may be an important way organizations maintain the quality of customer service.

*Hypothesis 2: Emotional labor training is more common in jobs with frequent customer interactions than with less frequent customer interaction.*

Training tends to be expensive, with organizations spending 134.39 billion dollars on training in 2007 (ASTD, n.d.). Organizations are forced to consider the costs and benefits of training before implementation, while keeping in mind the employee’s probability to turnover (Royalty, 1996; Sieben, 2007). Training is more likely in occupations with lower turnover where
the investment can pay off (Sieben, 2007). This should also be true for emotional labor training. Many emotional labor jobs have exceptionally high turnover rates (Kacmar, et al., 2006). Employees in emotional labor jobs with high turnover rates should be less likely to report an investment from the organization, such as in providing training. Therefore, it is predicted that emotional labor training will be provided less frequently in jobs with higher turnover rates than jobs with low turnover.

**Hypothesis 3:** Emotional labor training is more common in jobs with lower rates of turnover than jobs with higher turnover.

**Emotional Labor Training Reactions: Should it be done and how?**

As stated earlier, emotional labor training has been proposed as a way to enhance customer service performance (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Kim, 2007; Mann 2007; Tan, Foo, & Kwek, 2004). In general, training is recognized as one of the best ways to improve performance (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005) for several reasons. First, training increases knowledge about job requirements. Organizations emphasizing job requirements, such as display rules, creates a standard for which employees compare their perceptions of their displays (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). Second, training can create self-efficacy, a belief in one’s capabilities to have control over goals and the means to accomplish them (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005; Lock & Latham, 2002). Self-efficacy has been shown to predict both task and interpersonal skills performance after training (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Locke, Fredrick, Lee, & Bobka, 1984; Locke & Latham, 2002; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993; Tai, 2006).

There is limited evidence that employees can learn emotion regulation strategies and apply them post-training. In one study, teachers were able to successfully use the strategy of
mood regulation they were instructed in during and post-intervention (Totterdell & Parkinson, 1999), showing that emotion regulation strategies can be taught and learned. Training in deep acting – such as reappraisal and positive refocusing - should improve employee performance since deep acting has generally been found to be positively related to performance (Grandey, 2003; Gountas, et al., 2007; Totterdell & Holman, 2003).

Employees who report receiving training for EL should be more aware of the EL requirements and feel more skilled at meeting those requirements. Therefore, training for emotional labor should be positively related to the frequency of engaging in positive displays to customers, or emotional performance as part of the service delivery.

*Hypothesis 4: Emotional labor training is positively related to emotional job performance.*

Reactions to Training

As stated above, emotional labor training has the potential to increase performance (Mann, 2007); however, this increase may occur only if it positively influences trainee reactions. Hochschild (1983) had suggested that when management controls emotional behaviors there are negative reactions, as shown in the opening quote. If employees respond negatively to training for how to regulate emotions, there may be resistance to the training. Trainee reactions are subjective evaluations made about the training experience and are typically measured using a post-training survey. Training reactions predict post-training self-efficacy and knowledge (Sitzmann et al., 2008), which are evidence of training transfer.

Trainee reactions are the most widely used method by which organizations evaluate training effectiveness (Sitzmann et al., 2008) and have been suggested to be positively related to learning in various training effectiveness models (Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992;
Stizmann et al., 2008; Tracey et al., 2001). Reactions capture the degree to which the training provided a satisfying, meaningful learning experience for the trainees (Sitzmann et al., 2008). Using path analysis, Clement (1978) showed trainee reactions had a causal impact on learning and learning had a significant influence on behavioral change (increased performance) (as cited in Noe, 1986). Training reactions have also been found to predict different organizational outcomes such as training reputation among employees and enrollment rates (Brown, 2005; Kraiger, 2002; Sitzmann et al., 2008), motivation, post-training self-efficacy, and declarative (such as knowledge of display rules) and procedural (such as deep acting) knowledge (Sitzmann et al., 2008). The existence of a relationship between trainee reactions and self-efficacy (Mathieu, et al., 1993; Sitzmann et al., 2008; Tai, 2006) helps argue that trainee reactions are important for performance.

In general, trainees are likely to respond positively to training and the idea of training if they view the training as an opportunity or resource provided by the organization (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). However, training for emotional labor, in particular, may be less likely to be viewed as a resource and more likely to be viewed as an invasion of privacy. In other words, employees may view the way they express emotions as a more personal aspect of self that is involuntary and reveal a person’s central, valued identity (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). “A mandatory smile cheapens the real thing and turns courtesy into another commodity” (McNichol, 1998). Forcing employees to express specific displays can create discomfort and feelings of being controlled. Since emotions can be considered as “prized, personal attributes over which we normally feel in control” (Van Maanen, 1991), making them commodities can be unnerving (Hochschild, 1983; Van Maanen, 1991). Thus, people may be wary of any organizational attempts to influence something as personal as emotions. These attempts can be perceived as giving company
executives more control over employees (McNichol, 1998). I argue that whether the trainee reactions to EL training are positive or negative depends on how the training influences the trainee’s perceptions of personal control over their own behaviors.

Perceptions of personal control

The term control can be used to refer to personal control or self-regulation and as external demands over one’s behavior, such as management control (Grandey, et al., 2005). I will be using the term personal control to describe the perceived extent of choice and freedom over one’s own behavior. One perspective on personal control, self-determination theory (SDT) (an approach to intrinsic motivation based on innate psychological needs), argues that there are three basic psychological needs, including the need for autonomy, that are essential for optimal human functioning, growth, development, and well-being (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Autonomy, here, was defined as having the experience of choice, similar to personal control.

In fact, intrinsic motivation is an important outcome of training that leads to training transfer (Salas, et al., 1999) and can influence trainee’s learning and confidence (Tannenbaum, 2002). In order for training to create this type of intrinsic motivation, according to SDT, it should satisfy the psychological need for autonomy or personal control (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000). As stated in the introductory quote (Hochschild, 1983, p. 189), if an employer dictates exactly how the employees perform the required emotional labor, control over their emotions will be taken away from them and the need for autonomy will not be met. Not only will less autonomy decrease motivation (Gagne & Deci, 2005) but it has been shown that emotional labor outcomes are more aversive among workers with less job autonomy (Wharton, 1993). Since emotional labor training can be seen as controlling, leading to a subsequent decrease of motivation, employees should react negatively to emotional labor training.
Furthermore, training in emotion regulation strategies can be seen as more controlling than training in technical skills. Employees expect their employers to train and require certain behaviors in them that are related to the job. Being trained in a technical area necessary for the job will be seen as necessary while training in emotion labor can be seen as controlling, as explained previously. Since emotions are inherently more personal than technical skills and training in them can be viewed as invasive and controlling, I argue that emotional labor training will be perceived more negatively than training for technical skills.

Hypothesis 5: Emotional labor training will create less positive reactions (5a) and more negative reactions (5b) than technical skills training.

Related to the idea that EL training might influence a sense of personal control, I was also interested in whether the trainees had choice over whether they received the training. In a field study, Hicks and Klimoski (1987) discussed trainees’ degree of choice in training. Those who had a high degree of choice in training had the chance to select training opportunities on the basis of their own needs. Those with a high degree of choice believed the training was appropriate for them, were better able to profit from the training, showed more commitment to their decision, were more satisfied, and were more motivated to learn. On the other hand, individuals who were unable to make a choice about the training were less likely to conclude their participation in training had any implications for attitudes and future behavior.

I argue that mandatory emotional labor training would be perceived more negatively than a voluntary training. An interaction is hypothesized in which type of training interacts with the choice in training (mandatory vs. voluntary). Since mandatory training will be seen as more personally controlling, combined with the low control perceptions of emotional labor training in
general, trainees should have strongest negative reactions to mandatory emotional labor training than all other types of training.

*Hypothesis 6: There will be an interaction between type of training and choice in training, such that mandatory emotional labor training will be viewed less positively (6a) and more negatively (6b) than voluntary emotional labor training and this effect will be stronger than for the mandatory technical skills interaction.*

**Study 1**

**Method**

Field survey data used for study 1 was collected as part of a larger study; I will be using a subset of the measures to test hypotheses 1 through 4. Since these hypotheses are about the actual occurrence of emotional labor training, a field survey was the best approach. A field survey allows for descriptive research by gathering information in the workforce from full-time employees.

**Participants**

As part of a required class project, students in a senior level undergraduate psychology class recruited at least 5 adults to participate in a survey about their work experience. To be included in the study, adults needed to work at least 20 hours per week, have at least some contact with the public, and be over the age of 18. Students were given recruitment letters that they emailed to their participants. These letters included information about the study and a link to the online questionnaire on SurveyMonkey.com.

There were 320 participants that completed the survey. The total employee sample was 55.6 percent female (45.4 percent male), 89.7 percent Caucasian, and ranged in age from 19 to 78 ($M = 37.4$), with over a third holding a supervisory position (36.2%). There was a wide range
of education levels, including no degree (1.9%), high school degree (22.5%), junior/tech college (8.1%), bachelors (44.1%), masters (14.7%), and doctorate (5%). Majority of participants had jobs that fit in the category of professional or business services (47.5%). Other job categories included information (2.8%), finance and insurance (6.6%), education (10%), health services (13.1%), accommodations and food services (7.2%), and retail trade (7.5%). On average, employees had been in the organization for eight years (SD = 9.07).

Measures

Management practices. For the purposes of the larger project, a set of items was developed to assess perceptions of management practices in regards to emotional labor/customer service. They answered eight questions regarding how frequently their management monitored, rewarded, and trained interpersonal or emotional performance, on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = don’t know, 2 = never, 3 = rarely, 4 = sometimes, 5 = often, 6 = all the time). Example items are “Supervisors monitor employees’ interactions with customers” and “There are financial rewards if you interact well with customers.” (See Appendix A for full scale). A principal axis factor analysis suggested four factors, with rewards unexpectedly forming two separate factors (see Table 1). The reliabilities for the items representing these four dimensions – two items for monitoring (Cronbach alpha = .917), two items for social rewards (Cronbach alpha = .851), two items for financial rewards (Cronbach alpha = .922), and two items for training (Cronbach alpha = .923) – were acceptable. Thus composite variables were formed for each dimension.

Customer interaction frequency. Two blind-to-hypotheses undergraduate research assistant raters coded job titles and occupation information using the O*NET database in the summer of 2008. This process included matching participant-provided job title with an occupation title in the O*NET database. After the coding was complete, agreeability of coding
(occupation title choice) was assessed. The raters met to discuss differences and came to an agreement on each occupation title choice. Raters then entered the scores for several items provided on the O*NET database for each participant, using the occupation title chosen. The scores used for this study were “Deal with External Customers” under Work Context and “Performing for or Working Directly with the Public” under Work Activities. These scores exist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Description</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Financial Rewards</th>
<th>Social Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors monitor employees’ interactions with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors pay careful attention to how employees interact with customers or clients.</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my work, employees receive praise for appropriate interactions with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workplace recognizes employees for treating customers well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my job, having positive interactions with customers results in monetary benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are financial rewards if you interact well with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees receive training in how to manage emotions with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for how to express appropriate emotions with customers is done in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Factor loadings below .40 were excluded.*
in the database and are based on expert and incumbent ratings. Both ratings concern the
frequency of contact with external customers. The reliability for these two items representing the
frequency of customer interaction was acceptable (Cronbach alpha = .814) and thus, a composite
was created.

**Turnover.** Occupational turnover was assessed using the Bureau of Labor Statistics
website (www.bls.gov) (see Table 2). I used the January 2009 annual data (which encompassed
the fall of 2008 when the data was collected), which provided specific job categories and the
percentage of voluntary and involuntary turnover for that occupation. In order to apply this data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Turnover Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations and Food Services</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Govt.</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Job categories and turnover percentages used from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.gov)*
to the current job categories, I had to match our job titles to the categories used on the BLS webpage (see Table 2). The BLS webpage provided detailed lists of occupations fitting within each category.

**Performance ratings.** Emotional performance was assessed using self-report ratings. Eight items asked participants to assess the frequency that they engaged in positive displays and suppressed negative displays with customers from 1 = “Never” to 5 = “Always” (Cronbach alpha = .889 for self-report). Example items are “Show a positive attitude with customers”, “Showing enthusiasm for your work during interactions with customers”, and “Smiling and being friendly with all customers” (see Appendix A).

**Covariates.** Employee sex was gathered from participants to be used as a covariate since women report greater frequency of emotions than men, with the exception of anger (Shields, 2002). We also controlled for length of experience in the organization since those with more experience may report different amounts of training than those with less experience at their organization. Education level was also used as a covariate as a proxy for status and a likely influence of training. Education level was rated as follows: 1 = no degree, 2 = high school, 3 = junior/technical college, 4 = bachelors, 5 = technical/certificate (RN, teaching), 6 = masters, 7 = doctorate.

**Results**

Correlations were performed to test for bivariate relationships among the variables (see Table 3). Training for emotional labor was significantly positively correlated with the other human resource practices: social rewards \( (r = .430, p < .01) \), financial rewards \( (r = .362, p < .01) \), and monitoring \( (r = .343, p < .01) \). Training was also positively correlated with O*NET rated frequency of customer contact \( (r = .173, p < .01) \) and self-reported emotional performance \( (r = \)
.189, \( p < .01 \). However EL training was unrelated to turnover percentage (\( r = -.023, p > .10 \)) or the demographic variables—organizational tenure (\( r = -.027, p > .10 \)), education (\( r = .013, p > .10 \)), and gender (\( r = -.076, p > .05 \)).

The first prediction was that emotional labor training occurs less frequently than monitoring or rewards for emotional labor. A Repeated Measures ANOVA was used to compare mean differences between all four human resource practices (Training, Monitoring, Social Rewards, and Financial Rewards). A significant effect would suggest differences in the different HR practices, and then mean levels could be examined to test the specific hypothesis. The results were significant, \( F(3, 312) = 76.5; p = .000; \eta^2 = .197 \), indicating differences in the reporting frequency of the different practices. Examining the means and paired comparisons, training was reported less frequently than monitoring and social rewards consistent with Hypothesis 1, though was not significantly different from financial rewards (see Table 4 for mean comparisons). A more conservative Repeated Measures ANCOVA was performed to control for organizational tenure, education level, and gender. The overall effect became non-significant, \( F = 1.103, p > .10 \); however, the pairwise comparisons were still significant and provided the same conclusions supporting hypothesis 1. Unexpectedly, the interaction between the human resource practices and gender was significant, \( F(3, 873) = 8.734; p = .000; \eta^2 = .029 \). Men (\( M = 3.737 \)) were more likely to report human resource practices for emotional labor than women (\( M = 3.522 \)).

The second hypothesis predicted that emotional labor training is more common in jobs with frequent customer interactions than those with less frequent customer interactions. There was a significant correlation between emotional labor training and O*NET rated frequency of customer contact, \( r = .173, p < .01 \) (Table 3). A regression was performed to further explore the prediction of the occurrence of emotional labor training, controlling for other potential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Org. Tenure</td>
<td>8.069</td>
<td>9.072</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training</td>
<td>3.2422</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Soc. Rewards</td>
<td>3.998</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fin. Rewards</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.251**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Freq. customer interaction</td>
<td>63.120</td>
<td>17.242</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.173**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turnover %</td>
<td>51.046</td>
<td>15.923</td>
<td>-.113*</td>
<td>-.365**</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self Report Performance</td>
<td>4.216</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Gender was coded 1 = male and 2 = female.

* p < .05  ** p < .01
predictors, to see the unique impact of the occupational coding for frequency of customer interactions. Organizational tenure, education level, and gender were included as controls and O*NET rated frequency of customer contacted was added in as the predictor of interest. This full model explained 3.9% of the variance where the change in $R^2$ was significant ($p < .05$) (See Table 5). The regression coefficient was significant and positive (Table 5), indicating that there is a positive relationship between emotional labor training and frequency of customer contact, such that as one increases, so does the other, supporting hypothesis 2.

The third hypothesis predicted that emotional labor training is more common in jobs with lower rates of turnover than jobs with higher turnover. The correlation between occupational turnover rates and emotional labor training was negative as expected, but non-significant, $r = -.023, p > .10$ (see Table 3). In addition, turnover rates were added in a second step to the regression described in hypothesis 2. Not surprisingly, this also resulted in non-significant effects (see Table 5). To further explore this relationship, the turnover categories were split into high and low turnover. Since most of the jobs held by this sample fit into one of the categories...
(Professional and Business Services), the continuous variable was not normally distributed. Splitting job categories into two groups with sample sizes that are closer to even may help alleviate this issue. Jobs were coded as high turnover when the turnover percentage was higher than 50 percent. Low turnover jobs had turnover percentages below 50 percent (see Table 2). To test differences between these two groups in the occurrence of emotional labor training, a univariate ANOVA was performed. The results were non-significant, $F(1, 316) = .023, p > .10$, $eta^2 = .000$. Jobs with low turnover ($M = 3.259$) do not predict a higher occurrence of emotional labor training than jobs with high turnover ($M = 3.235$). Furthermore, it is possible that turnover would predict training only in jobs with high frequency of customer contact. To explore this possibility, a regression was performed selecting for participants with high O*NET rated frequency of customer contact (above the 50th percentile) with turnover percentage predicting emotional labor training. The results were non-significant, $F(1, 151) = .390, p > .10$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that emotional labor training is positively related to emotional job performance. Self-reported emotional performance had a positively significant correlation with emotional labor training, $r = .189, p < .01$ (Table 3). A hierarchical regression was performed to provide information about the unique influence of EL training on emotional performance beyond the covariates, and to assess the effect size. In the first step, education, gender, and organizational tenure were entered as control variables predicting performance. Occupational customer contact was also included since it is associated with the likelihood of training and may also predict the frequency of emotional behaviors, thus creating a spurious relationship between
### Table 5

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting EL Training and Self-Report EL Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>EL Training</th>
<th>EL Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Tenure</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONET Ext. Cust.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Tenure</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONET Ext. Cust.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Percent</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01
those two variables. In this step, organizational tenure was marginally significant, $b = .009$, $t(279) = 1.707, p < .10$, and gender, $b = .119$, $t(279) = 2.069, p < .05$, and O*NET rated frequency of customer contact, $b = .252$, $t(279) = 4.400, p < .01$, were significantly related to emotional labor performance (see Table 5). Those with longer tenure, female employees, and those who were rated as being in occupations with higher customer contact reported more frequent emotional labor with customers. Emotional labor training was added in the second step of the regression. This step was significant, $F(4, 279) = 6.839, p < .01$, and emotional labor training explained 1.8% of the variance above and beyond organizational tenure, education, gender, and frequency of customer contact (see Table 5). Thus, hypothesis 4 is supported; emotional labor training predicts one’s self-reported emotional performance.

From this analysis, however, it is not clear whether there is something unique about EL training that enhances emotional performance, or if any of the management controls would have the same effect. The correlation matrix reveals that training, $r = .189, p < .01$, was more highly correlated with emotional performance than financial rewards, $r = .120, p < .05$, but less correlated with performance than social rewards, $r = .271, p < .01$, and monitoring, $r = .199, p < .01$ (see Table 3). Furthermore, in a regression analysis with all four of the HR practices included, only social rewards had a significant regression coefficient, $b = .198, t(1, 311) = 2.851, p < .01$. Thus, while EL training is positively and significantly associated with more emotional behaviors with customers, other management practices, such as social rewards, may have more robust effects.

Discussion

The results of study 1 attempt to answer questions about the occurrence and effectiveness of emotional labor training. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported such that emotional labor
training was reported less frequently than both monitoring and social rewards for emotional labor yet did not differ from the occurrence of financial rewards for emotional labor. However, this null finding is consistent with the original argument that management practices that are more costly in terms of finances or time (training, financial rewards) would be done less frequently than those that are less costly (monitoring, social rewards). It should also be noted that the mean levels suggests that training was reported as happening “rarely” on average (3.1 on a 6 point scale), supporting again the idea that this is not typically done, while monitoring occurred “sometimes” on average. Surprisingly, the results also indicated that men reported more EL training and other HR practices for customer service than did women. It should be noted that gender and supervisory status were correlated resulting in a significant correlation, $r = -.242$, $p < .01$, such that men were more likely to hold supervisory positions. Supervisors may be provided with more resources (training and rewards) than lower-level employees.

Hypothesis 2 was supported such that participants in occupations rated as requiring more frequent customer contact reported more emotional labor training, even beyond gender, tenure and education, which might influence both variables. Occupations with frequent customer interactions suggest “emotional labor jobs” (Hochschild, 1983), where employees need to express the appropriate emotions in order to manage impressions of the public (Grove & Fisk, 1989). In line with this argument, this study suggests that people in jobs where customer contact is central to their work are provided with more training about emotions and how to regulate them. It should be noted that frequency of customer contact was not a self-reported variable, but was expert-coded at the occupational level; thus the significant relationship is unlikely to be due to common method biases.
Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was no relationship between emotional labor training and occupational turnover rates or turnover level (high/low). This may suggest that EL training is more a function of the job characteristics than whether the employees are likely to quit. At the same time, the measure of occupational turnover rates may have made it difficult to find an effect. The occupational categories for which turnover rates could be obtained were not very well differentiated, and in fact, most of the current sample fell into one category. Another potential approach to examining this question is to look at education as a proxy for status and the value an employee has on the market; those who are viewed as more ‘valuable’ should be more likely to receive investments from the organization, such as training. However, the bivariate relationship between EL training and education was essentially zero. Overall, it is difficult to draw conclusions and further research is needed to fully answer this question.

Finally, hypothesis 4 was supported. This provides preliminary evidence that the more that employees report that emotional labor training is available, the more frequently those employees report engaging in positive emotional displays with customers. Importantly, this effect was observed beyond the occupational differences in frequency of customer contact. At the same time, other HR practices also had a positive relationship with emotional performance, suggesting that training has weak relationships even when relying on self-reported variables that may be inflated by common method variance. Emotional labor training may prove effective, however, more evidence is needed for its relationship with performance since this study relied on self-report of the availability of training and not actual training. Moreover, this weak relationship may also be due to the fact that some participants may have received training in emotional labor training through their education and not their organization. In addition, there may be other factors that may influence the relationship between training and emotional performance.
Study 2

Method

Study 1 was able to answer empirical questions about the occurrence of real emotional labor training in the workforce and the potential effectiveness of emotional labor training on performance. One factor that may influence the relationship of training with emotional performance is trainees’ reactions to emotional labor training (Noe, 1986). Study 2 manipulates the management practices of emotional labor training through an experimental design using vignettes to assess such reactions.

As an exploratory question, I also examine whether certain types of people respond differently to emotional labor training. Specifically, emotional intelligence (EI) was included in the study because it is unclear whether those who believe they are more skilled in understanding and regulating emotions would respond more positively or negatively to training. Some research suggests that those who are more skilled at emotional labor tend to respond positively to emotional labor training (Feldman et al., 2009). On the other hand, those who believe they are skilled at regulating emotions may find training insulting. Thus, EI was included to explore this possible moderating effect.

Participants

Participants were 201 introductory undergraduate psychology students who volunteered to participate in the study for class credit. The sample was mostly Caucasian \(N = 160\) and included 113 females and 88 males ranging in age from 18-31 \(M = 19.4\).

Procedure

A 2 (training: emotional labor vs. technical skills) x 2 (choice: mandatory vs. voluntary) between person, fully crossed research design was used. Participants were randomly assigned to
one of the four conditions and read one vignette that asked them to imagine they held a designer shoe retail job in which a new training is being implemented. They read either about emotional labor training or a technical skills (efficient shoe retrieval) training. The technical skills training included strategies about cognitive self-regulation to create some consistency with emotional regulation strategies. The vignette described the training as mandatory or voluntary (see Appendix B for vignettes). Following the vignette, participants answered several demographic questions and completed a questionnaire with the measures listed below.

*Measures*

*Manipulation checks.* To assess whether choice was effectively manipulated, four items were written: “this training is required”, “I felt like I had little choice over whether I engage in this training”, “The shoe store controlled my behaviors in this job and training”, and “my participation in training would be a function of the job requirements, not my own choices”. These were combined to create a composite (Cronbach alpha = .821). To assess whether participants viewed the two types of training as distinct, two items were written: “the main purpose of the training is to improve my emotional skills” and “the main purpose of the training is to improve my efficiency” and examined separately to assess the effectiveness of the training manipulation. All manipulation check questions were rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

*Reactions to training.* Participants completed a modified version of subscales of the trainee reactions scale created by Tan and colleagues (2003) that assessed five factors. A positive evaluation subscale included items such as, “I would recommend this program to other employees who have the opportunity” and “I would participate in this training”. The negative evaluation subscale included “this training would teach me nothing I will use on the job”. The
scale is rated using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale (see Appendix A for all items included). A principal axis factor analysis with a Varimax rotation supported two factors – positive reactions (Cronbach alpha = .917) and negative reactions (Cronbach alpha = .879).

Participants also answered questions written by the author about perceived social and financial benefits from the training. These were used as an exploratory measure of different reactions to the training. Participants were asked whether they agree that they “think the main benefits from this training would be…” to 6 items. Financial benefits items included “the financial gain from being a better service employee”, “the commission I can make by providing better service”, and “the organization’s increased profits”. Social benefits items included “the social relationships I could develop” and “the networking opportunities” (see Appendix A). A principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation supported a 2-factor solution. Composites were created that had good reliabilities for both financial benefits (Cronbach alpha = .812) and social benefits (Cronbach alpha = .819).

Individual and group differences. Emotional Intelligence (EI) was assessed using the scale created by Wong and Law (2002). It is a 16-item measure (Cronbach alpha = .912), which has been used as four subscales and one general measure, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), including items such as “I have good control over my own emotions” and “I really understand what I feel” (see Appendix A). Participants also indicated their gender, which was included as a covariate in order to ensure gender does not explain or change the effects.

Results

Manipulation Check

To check the effectiveness of the type of training manipulation, a 2x2 MANOVA was performed to test mean differences between emotional labor and technical skills conditions on
the two one-item manipulation check items. The item asking about whether interpersonal skills were trained showed the expected significant difference between the emotional labor ($M = 3.630$) and technical skills ($M = 2.204$) conditions, $F(1.196) = 117.950, p = .000$. Choice in training, as intended, had no effect, $F(1,194) = .916, p = .340$, nor was there a significant interaction between the conditions. Similarly, the item asking whether efficiency was trained also showed a significant difference between the emotional labor ($M = 3.500$) and technical skills ($M = 4.388$) conditions, $F(1,196) = 55.296, p = .000$. Choice, again, had no effect $F(1,194) = .362, p = .548$, nor did the interaction term. Therefore, the manipulation worked in the way intended such that those in the emotional labor conditions believed they were being trained in interpersonal skills and those in the technical skills conditions believed they were being trained in efficiency skills.

To check the effectiveness of the choice manipulation, a 2x2 ANOVA was performed to test mean differences between voluntary and mandatory conditions on the choice manipulation check item composite. The choice in training was significant, $F(1,197) = 319.289, p = .000$, such that those in the mandatory condition ($M = 4.170$) were more likely to agree that the training was required compared to those in the voluntary condition ($M = 2.179$). Type of training, as intended, had no effect, $F(1,197) = .011, p = .918$, nor did the interaction of the two conditions.

Overall, the type of training and control manipulations were effective and further hypothesis testing could continue.

**Hypothesis Testing**

First, a correlation matrix was created with all of the variables of interest (see Table 6). Training type was only significantly correlated with social benefits, $r = -.173$, $p < .05$. Training was not related to positive reactions, $r = -.020, p > .10$, negative reactions, $r = -.070, p > .10$, or
Table 6

Study 2 Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training Type</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training Choice</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pos. Reactions</td>
<td>4.827</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neg. Reactions</td>
<td>3.158</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>-.593**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EI</td>
<td>5.261</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>-.112**</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fin. Benefits</td>
<td>5.275</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.589**</td>
<td>-.402**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Benefits</td>
<td>4.323</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
financial benefits, $r = .097, p > .10$ or to any of the covariates: gender, $r = -.024, p > .10$, or EI, $r = .026, p > .10$.

Next, a 2x2 MANCOVA, including gender and EI as covariates, assessed the effects of type and choice on positive and negative reactions overall (see Figure 1 for means). A MANCOVA was used because it allows for multiple categorical independent variables to predict related dependent variables, while including both continuous and categorical covariates. The multivariate effects of gender, $F(2, 188) = 4.592, p = .01$, EI, $F(2, 188) = 12.960, p < .01$, and manipulated choice, $F(2, 188) = 4.017, p < .05$, on reactions were significant. However, the effects of type, $F(2, 188) = 1.144, p > .10$, and the interaction between type and choice, $F(2, 188) = 1.153, p > .10$, were non-significant.

Another 2x2 MANCOVA, including gender and EI as covariates, assessed the effects of type and choice on perceived financial and social benefits overall. The multivariate effects of gender, $F(2, 188) = 4.988, p < .01$, EI, $F(2, 188) = 24.880, p < .01$, and type, $F(2, 188) = 5.704, p < .01$, on perceived benefits were significant. However, the effects of choice, $F(2, 188) = .547, p > .10$, and the interaction between type and choice, $F(2, 188) = 1.190, p > .10$, were non-significant. Hypothesis 5 predicted that emotional labor training creates less positive/more negative trainee reactions than technical skills training. The MANCOVA resulted in no effect of training type on positive reactions, $F(1,194) = .169, p > .10$ or negative reactions, $F(1,194) = .962, p > .10$ (see Table 7). Social and financial benefits were assessed as other exploratory positive reactions to the trainings. There were no significant effects on financial benefits. However, a significant effect of training type on social benefits was found, $F(1,195) = 6.300, p < .05$, such that participants believed that emotional labor training ($M = 4.571$) would result in
Figure 1. Means of positive and negative reactions to emotional labor training and cognitive regulatory (technical skills) training.
more social benefits than technical skills training (\(M = 4.074\)) (see Table 8 and Figure 2).

Therefore, hypothesis 5 is not supported. However, there seems to be an effect in the opposite direction predicted, such that emotional labor training created more positive reactions in the form of perceived social benefits than technical skills training.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that there would be an interaction between type of training and choice in training, so that mandatory emotional labor training would have less positive and more
Figure 2. Means of perceived social and financial benefits of emotional labor training and cognitive regulatory (technical skills) training.
negative reactions that voluntary EL training, and this difference would be stronger than for
technical skills training. The MANCOVA predicting positive and negative reactions resulted in
no interaction effect between type of training and choice in training on positive reactions,
\( F(1, 194) = 2.296, p > .10 \). The interaction between type of training and choice in training on
negative reactions was also found to be non-significant in the MANCOVA, \( F(1, 194) = .526, p > .05 \).
There was a main effect of choice, \( F(1, 194) = 8.015, p < .01 \), such that those in the
mandatory conditions had more negative reactions than those in the voluntary conditions (see
Table 7). Furthermore, the MANCOVA predicting financial and social benefits also found no
significant interactions in predicting financial benefits, \( F(1, 195) = 1.986, p > .10 \), or social
benefits, \( F(1, 195) = 1.040, p > .10 \) (see Table 8). Thus, hypothesis 6 was not supported.

**Exploratory Analyses**

**EI.** In the MANCOVA, emotional intelligence was included as a covariate, and was
found to have a significant effect on positive and negative reactions and financial and social
benefits (see Table 7 and 8). These results suggest that those higher in EI have more positive
reactions and less negative reactions to training. In order to further explore these results to see if
individuals differ in how they react to the different types of training, the following steps were
taken. Following the Baron and Kenny (1986) method of testing interactions with both
categorical and continuous independent variables, I first created an interaction term by
multiplying the EI variable with training type, and then conducted four regression analyses with
the main effects and the interaction term of EI with training type predicting each reaction
variable (positive, negative, financial benefits, social benefits). In predicting positive trainee
reactions, EI was the only significant variable and remained significant through all steps, such
that those with higher EI scores reacted more positively to the trainings overall. The interaction
was not significant (see Table 9). In predicting negative trainee reactions, EI was significant in all steps, such that those with higher EI scores reacted less negatively to the trainings overall (see Table 9). In predicting perceived financial benefits, EI was the only significant variable and remained significant through all steps, such that those with higher EI scores perceived more financial benefits from any training (see Table 10). In predicting social benefits, EI was significant in all steps, such that those higher in EI perceived more social benefits from any

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.204</td>
<td>8.965**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>34.606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.606</td>
<td>50.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>2.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Choice</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Choice</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>134.949</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.762</td>
<td>3.449+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>7.652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.652</td>
<td>3.903*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>12.353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.353</td>
<td>6.300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Choice</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Choice</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>382.341</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01
Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis with EI Predicting Positive Reactions and Negative Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Positive Reactions</th>
<th>Negative Reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI*Type</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis with EI Predicting Financial Benefits and Social Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Financial Benefits</th>
<th>Social Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>-1.450</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI*Type</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
training, and training type was also significant as already discussed above, but the interaction of the two was non-significant (see Table 10).

**Gender.** In the MANCOVAs, gender was included as a covariate and had a significant effect on positive trainee reactions, perceived financial benefits, and perceived social benefits, such that women reported more positive reactions and more perceived benefits than men (see Table 7 and 8). Three hierarchical regressions were performed to explore the possibility of gender interacting with type of training, where men and women would react differently to the different types of training. Once again using the Baron and Kenny (1986) method, the interaction term was created by multiplying gender and type of training. In the first step of the regressions, gender was entered, followed by type in the second step, and the interaction in the third. Gender was a significant predictor of positive reactions in all steps, such that women reported more positive reactions to training than men (see Table 11). However, the interaction was not

Table 11

| Summary of Hierarchical Regression with Gender Predicting Positive Reactions |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Variable        | B   | SE B| Beta| t   | R²   |
| Step 1          |     |     |     |     | .052**|
| Gender          | .540| .164| .228| 3.292**|    |
| Step 2          |     |     |     |     | .000 |
| Gender          | .539| .164| .228| 3.279**|    |
| Training Type   | -.037| .163| -.016| -.229|    |
| Step 3          |     |     |     |     | .002 |
| Gender          | .647| .232| .273| .2784**|    |
| Training Type   | .300| .541| .128| .556|    |
| Gender*Type     | -.216| .329| -.157| -.655|    |

* *p < .05, **p < .01
significant. In predicting financial benefits, gender was significant in all steps, such that women, again, were more likely to report perceived benefits to the training (see Table 12). In predicting social benefits, gender was significant in the first and second step and marginally significant in the third step, such that women were more likely to report more perceived social benefits than men. In addition, type of training was significant in the second step, such that those in the emotional labor training conditions reported more social benefits than those in the technical skills training, supporting the results discussed for hypothesis 5 (see Table 12).

Discussion

The results of study 2 indicate that there may be no negative consequences to emotional labor training despite what others have previously hypothesized (Hochschild, 1983). Hypothesis 5 was not supported since there were no differences found in positive or negative reactions to the different types of training. Interestingly, contrary to the hypothesis, there were differences by type of training in which emotional labor training was seen more positively through social benefits, where participants who were in emotional labor training conditions perceived more social benefits to the training than those in the technical skills training conditions. Hypothesis 6 was also not supported. Not only was the main effect of training type not a significant predictor of reactions but it did not interact with choice in training in predicting positive or negative reactions. However, choice in training was a significant predictor of negative reactions.

In study 2, there is no indication that emotional labor training is seen as more negative than technical skills training and there may actually be some positive consequences to emotional labor training, such as perceived social benefits. However, more research is necessary to fully understand employee reactions to emotional labor training. The current study used vignettes to
Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression with Gender Predicting Financial Benefits and Social Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Financial Benefits</th>
<th></th>
<th>Social Benefits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>3.314*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>3.360**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>2.789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Type</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Type</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01
manipulate type and choice of training. However, initial reactions to a provided training may be different from reactions to actual participation in the training. In addition, the framing of the training included an explanation for the employees. It is possible that the framing of training may have created positive reactions, while different framings may illicit different reactions. Different framings of training need to be explored to understand if this may have an impact on reactions to the implementation of training. Furthermore, it is important to next explore what effects the two different types of reactions have on outcomes such as performance or transfer of training. In addition, the vignettes described an emotional labor training that taught deep acting. Study 2 may have been more likely to find negative reactions as predicted by Hochschild (1983) if surface acting training was manipulated. Nonetheless, emotional labor training was not found to be viewed more negatively than other training.

General Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to answer empirical questions about the occurrence and consequences of emotional labor training. Formal human resources practices, such as training, rewards, and monitoring, are used in organizations to improve employees’ emotional performance (Leidner, 1999). There is some research surrounding certain forms of management practices, such as monitoring emotional displays (Holman, Chissick, & Totterdell, 2002), however, little systematic research has been done about emotional labor training even though many authors have argued for its importance in service organizations (Grandey & Goldberg, 2007; Kim, 2007; Tan et al., 2004). Not much is known about the actual occurrence of emotional labor training and whether it is a useful human resource practice. This study set out to answer research questions about the occurrence and consequences of emotional labor training, with two studies.
Describing the Likelihood of EL Training

As stated previously, EL training may seem critical and has been called for by researchers (Grandey & Goldberg, 2007; Kim, 2007; Tan et al., 2004), but Study 1 found that respondents reported it occurring “rarely” on average, and less frequently than other forms of management control over customer service behaviors. Specifically, management controlling behaviors by monitoring employee interactions with customers, and providing social praise or recognition for those interactions, were more likely to be reported than more costly practices, including both EL training and financial rewards.

Moreover, training is more likely to occur in occupations with high frequency of customer contact. Importantly, the measure of frequency of customer contact was an objective rating and not self-report. It has previously been argued that organizations with high frequency of customer contact value their employees managing their emotions with the public (Grove & Fisk, 1989). It may be that certain occupations with a high frequency of customer contact receive training to emphasize the importance of emotional labor. In fact, EL training may be one way that management influences perceptions of job requirements, since “service with a smile” has been perceived as an in-role job requirement in jobs with frequent customer contact (Diefendorff, et al., 2006), and employees with frequent customer contact may be more likely to receive formal training. Future research is required to understand the direction of this relationship.

Emotional labor training was not related to turnover rates. I had argued that training would not be provided if it was too expensive for the organization to do so (Sieben, 2007). If an occupation has high turnover rates, the investment of training may be too costly. However, study 1 does not support this argument. There was no relationship between occupational turnover and emotional labor training, indicating that turnover may not be a contributing factor as to whether
an occupation will be likely to be provided with training. This is a finding that needs more research.

**Understanding the Consequences of EL Training**

Study 1 also suggests that emotional labor training is related to emotional performance, emphasizing the importance of providing such training to employees that perform emotional labor. Emotional labor training predicted self-report emotional performance, beyond occupational differences in customer contact. Training is considered one of the best ways to improve performance (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005; Dean, Dean & Rebalsky, 1996) often by emphasizing job requirements and teaching specific skills necessary for the job, and it seems that EL training is no exception. There is limited evidence, but in one study of teachers, participants were able to learn emotion regulation strategies and apply them post-training (Totterdell & Parkinson, 1999). However, emotional labor training was measured as the availability of the training. It is not known whether those reporting emotional labor training actually participated in it. This may explain the weakness of the relationship between emotional training and performance. Moreover, emotional performance was measured as frequency of emotional labor behaviors, not the quality of those behaviors (e.g., authenticity, intensity). This, along with the fact that it was a self-report measure, seems to provide evidence that training improves knowledge and practice of display rules but does not indicate improvement in the actual emotional behaviors. Researching whether emotions are regulated more successfully after training would be necessary in understanding the relationship between EL training and performance.

Study 2 shows no evidence that emotional labor training has negative reactions previously discussed (Hochschild, 1983) and even indicates that there may be some benefits
from providing emotional labor training in terms of participants’ perceptions of social gains.

Importantly, study 2 builds on study 1, such that in addition to improved performance, emotional labor training may improve more personal aspects of the employee, such as their perceptions of their job or organization. In fact, the results showed that there were no significant differences in positive or negative reactions to emotional labor training and technical skills training but emotional labor training was viewed to have more social benefits. Training is frequently seen as a resource (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005; Goldstein & Ford, 2002) and, even though it has been argued that emotional labor training may be different than other types of training (Ryan & Ployhart, 2003), study 2 shows no evidence for this in terms of emotional reactions. Contrary to the predictions, emotional labor training may actually not be a negative human resource practice and could potentially be beneficial to participants. Since training is a way to improve emotional labor performance and does not have a negative impact on trainees, emotional labor training may be much more useful than previously thought.

Limitations and Future Research

This study took advantage of both lab and field methods of research. There are strengths in using both lab and field studies (Cook, Campbell, & Peracchio, 1990; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991) in that the field study allows for descriptions, while the lab study provides more control and opportunity to make predictions about causality. However, there were several limitations and opportunities for further research created in the studies described.

First, there were problems with the performance ratings in study 1. Self-reports of both training occurrence and emotional behavior frequency are subject to common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Common method bias is a problem because it causes measurement error that threatens validity of conclusions. Bias can be caused by social desirability or the transient
mood state of the participants. Also, the context of the survey can create bias since participants responded to these measures at the same time in one survey. Other external sources of performance ratings should be used to further explore the relationship between emotional labor training and emotional performance, such as customer ratings, as stated previously. These ratings should not only focus on the occurrence of an emotional behavior but the quality of the behaviors as well.

Also, turnover in regards to emotional labor training needs to be evaluated more strictly. This sample was too heavily centered on a single turnover job categories, which may be due to the broadness of occupational categories on the Bureau of Labor Statistics webpage. A more evenly distributed sample may provide researchers with a better idea as to whether this variable affects the occurrence of emotional labor training. It is also possible that turnover rates may have a mixed influence on emotional labor training occurrence. Some organizations may not be willing to invest in employees that have a high probability of turnover (Sieben, 2007). Investing in employees in occupations with high turnover rates may not be financially viable for organizations. On the other hand, it has been argued that providing valuable training to employees may actually help prevent turnover (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2008). These separate arguments in the literature show limited knowledge in the relationship between turnover and training. This study shows no support in either direction. In addition, there is some evidence that training is provided in high turnover jobs, such as in the food industry (Leidner, 1999) and in call centers (Townsend, 2007). This training may be less sophisticated or much quicker than training in jobs with lower turnover (Townsend, 2007) but it still does exists. In light of this evidence, the non-significant relationship between turnover and training may support the arguments that
training is provided regardless of turnover rates. However, due to the sample distribution in this study, the relationship between emotional labor training and turnover needs more research.

In addition, study 2 used a sample of college students, which may or may not generalize since they do not have much work and training experience and therefore, may not actually know how they would react to the implementation of such training. However, these were psychology students, which, arguably, may be more attuned to their emotions and reactions. Furthermore, these students will be entering the workforce in the near future, so it may be of interest to understand how they will be responding to these trainings. Training tends to be provided to incoming employees so it may be that this sample is more representative of new employees that do not have experience than one made up of actual employees. In addition, it has been argued that student and non-student samples may be equally useful sources of information about processes in underlying organizational phenomena (Greenberg, 1987). Because it is unclear whether this sample was representative, future research using different samples may be an important way to understand if these reactions are universal.

Study 2 also evaluated reactions to a vignette describing the implementation of training instead of reactions to an actual training that had occurred. Even though this may be a good starting point, it is unclear whether trainees would have different reactions after having actually participated in emotional labor training. I designed the vignettes to be realistic and suitable for the sample (sales position) such that their reactions are likely to be close to what would occur if they received such a memo in their working life. Lab studies creating psychological realism are more likely to have good construct validity and be replicated (Colquitt, 2008). However the results can best be generalized to understanding how employees would respond to the idea of, or opportunity for, EL training; future research is needed to examine reactions to actual EL training.
In addition, the transfer of actual emotional labor training is important to understand since transfer of training predicts on-the-job performance (Colquitt et al., 2000). Future research also needs to examine more thoroughly whether trainees use what they learn in emotional labor training.

Moreover, emotional labor training in different contexts needs to be evaluated. Study 2 used a retail example but there may be differences in reactions to emotional labor training depending on the occupation or the organization. Reactions may also differ depending on whether the employee is new or experienced. Certain contexts may be more in line with Hochschild’s (1983) ideas. It may be that employees in managerial positions or with more experience, for example, may find emotional labor training insulting since they may believe they already have these skills due to their experience. A brief follow-up study was done, in which participants read the same vignettes but were told to imagine they were managers and not entry-level employees. The role of manager implies more experience and possibly less need for training. However, that study had the same results as the original, in which there were no differences in positive or negative reactions to the different types of training. In addition, Hochschild’s (1983) argued about the invisibility of emotional labor creating negative consequences. Training, however, makes emotional labor a more visible job requirement, which may decrease the negativity surrounding the labor. Understanding the differences of implicit versus explicit emotional labor training may explain the lack of negative reactions to an explicit implementation of training, such as found in this study. Therefore, different contexts and samples are needed to fully understand the reactions to training.

The vignettes in this study manipulated deep acting (management of feelings) and not surface acting (management of displays) training and there are probably differences between
deep acting and surface acting training that should be explored. Research has shown that deep acting is satisfying to employees while surface acting can lead to strain and dissatisfaction (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Côté & Morgan, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). This may hold true in terms of training. Employees may perceive being offered training in deep acting as a resource or opportunity to learn a skill, but training of display rules, that promotes surface acting, may be more dissatisfying. I may have found support for Hochschild’s (1983) view about EL training being controlling if I had focused on the implementation of training for displays only, rather than regulation. However, Hochschild’s (1983) did argue that deep acting training would have negative reactions and consequences since it estranges employees from their emotions and creates a sense that the organization owns these emotions. There is no evidence for these negative reactions to the idea of deep acting training in this study. Rather than being viewed as a more insidious, deeper form of management control, regulating emotions may be viewed as a helpful skill in general, contrary to Hochschild’s original arguments. Furthermore, emotional labor training in study 1 was measured using questions simply asking whether training for emotion regulation was provided. This indicates that training for deep acting is “rare” but it is still unknown how frequently training for emotion regulation (deep acting) occurs in comparison to training for knowledge of display rules (promoting surface acting). In turn, the relationship between emotional labor training and emotional performance may actually differ depending on which type of training is provided. Research has shown that performing deep acting creates more authentic displays resulting in higher customer service ratings when compared to surface acting (Gountas, Ewing, & Gountas, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Kim, 2007). Further research is necessary to see if deep acting training results in deep acting on the job (i.e. transfer of training) and higher performance.
Conclusions

In conclusion, contrary to Hochschild’s (1983) original ideas, emotional labor training may not actually have negative consequences. Not only does emotional labor training predict emotional performance, but it is not related to any negative reactions to the training. It is, however, related to perceived social benefits, indicating that this training may actually be perceived positively by employees. This study has answered some preliminary questions about emotional labor training but there is still much to be done.
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APPENDIX A

MEASURES

Management Policies Scale (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Policies</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisors monitor employees’ interactions with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisors pay careful attention to how employees interact with customers or clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Customers are encouraged to evaluate employees’ interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Customer evaluation of employees interpersonal style can influence employee performance evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my work, employees receive praise for appropriate interactions with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My workplace recognizes employees for treating customers well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In my job, having positive interactions with customers results in monetary benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There are financial rewards if you interact well with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employees receive training in how to manage emotions with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Training for how to express appropriate emotions with customers is done in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Performance</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Show a positive attitude with customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regardless of circumstances, exceptionally courteous and respectful with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Showing enthusiasm for your work during interactions with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Smiling and being friendly with all customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Covering up stress or worries when interacting with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hiding discouragement or disappointment with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Appearing genuinely concerned or sympathetic with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Masking any felt frustrations or hostility with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trainee Reactions (Tan et al., 2003)

**Positive Evaluation**
1. _____ I would recommend this program to other employees who have the opportunity.
2. _____ I have an overall good feeling about how the training program will be carried out.
3. _____ I would recommend that every employee take part in this training program.
4. _____ I would participate in this training program.

**Negative Evaluation**
5. _____ This training program would teach me nothing I will use on the job.
6. _____ This training program is a useless waste of my and/or others’ time.

Perceived Benefits

"I think the main benefits from this training would be..."

**Financial Benefits**
1. _____ The financial gain from being a better service employee.
2. _____ The commission I can make by providing better service.
3. _____ The organization’s increased profits.
4. _____ The organization’s improved customer service.

**Social Benefits**
1. _____ The social relationships I could develop.
2. _____ The networking opportunities.
Emotional Intelligence (Wong & Law, 2002)

1. _____ I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time.
2. _____ I have good understanding of my own emotions.
3. _____ I really understand what I feel.
4. _____ I always know whether or not I am happy.
5. _____ I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior.
6. _____ I am a good observer of others’ emotions.
7. _____ I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
8. _____ I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me.
9. _____ I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them.
10. _____ I always tell myself I am a competent person.
11. _____ I am a self-motivated person.
12. _____ I would always encourage myself to try my best.
13. _____ I am able to control my temper and handle difficulties rationally.
14. _____ I am quite capable of controlling my emotions.
15. _____ I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry.
16. _____ I have good control of my own emotions.
APPENDIX B

VIGNETTES

*Emotional Labor Training – Voluntary*

You work in a designer shoe store as a full-time sales employee. You earn 5% commission on every shoe sale. In order to enhance sales and customer satisfaction, the employees in your department are expected to be genuinely friendly with all customers and provide efficient shoe retrieval for customers.

You receive the following memo from the store:

“Due to recent customer service issues, we have decided to implement a new training workshop focused on employee service behaviors to help improve customer satisfaction.

“The 2-hour training workshop, provided by an outside consulting company, will be during store hours. Employees who choose to attend the training will be paid their normal hourly wage, however, since they will be off the sales floor, sales and commission may be lost.

“This training is VOLUNTARY. We are providing this voluntary training because we want to enhance customer satisfaction in our store. One of the factors that is linked to customer satisfaction is your positive displays: your friendly smile towards customers throughout all interactions. If you choose to participate, this training will help you to perform these desired behaviors, which are critical for customer satisfaction and linked to increased sales and profits.

“Thus, the goal of this training is to provide strategies to improve your service with a smile. It will teach you how to regulate your own emotions, a skill that will help you in your job and in your personal life.

“You will learn methods of emotional regulation by
- Refocusing your attention on positive ideas
- Learning strategies for improving personal control over your emotions
- Identifying strategies for improving positive mood
- Identifying your common cues for negative reactions
- And other strategies for improving your service with a smile

“Learning and practicing these emotional strategies will enhance store level service delivery and your future commissions.

Thus, we think this voluntary training is critical for all our employees to receive and encourage you to choose to participate at this time.”

*Emotional Labor Training – Mandatory*

You work in a designer shoe store as a full-time sales employee. You earn 5% commission on every shoe sale. In order to enhance sales and customer satisfaction, the employees in your department are expected to be genuinely friendly with all customers and provide efficient shoe retrieval for customers.

You receive the following memo from the store:

“Due to recent customer service issues, we have recently to implement a new training workshop focused on employee service behaviors to help improve customer satisfaction.

“The 2-hour training workshop, provided by an outside consulting company, will be during store hours. Employees who attend the training will be paid their normal hourly wage, however, since they will be off the sales floor, sales and commission may be lost.
“This training is MANDATORY. We are providing this mandatory training because we want to enhance customer satisfaction in our store. One of the factors that is linked to customer satisfaction is your positive displays: your friendly smile towards customers throughout all interactions. This training will help you to perform these desired behaviors, which are critical for customer satisfaction and linked to increased sales and profits.

“Thus, the goal of this training is to provide strategies to improve your service with a smile. It will teach you how to regulate your own emotions, a skill that will help you in your job and in your personal life.

“You will learn methods of emotional regulation by
• Refocusing your attention on positive ideas
• Learning strategies for improving personal control over your emotions
• Identifying strategies for improving positive mood
• Identifying your common cues for negative reactions
• And other strategies for improving your service with a smile

“Learning and practicing these emotional strategies will enhance store level service delivery and your future commissions.

Thus, we think this mandatory training is critical for all our employees to receive at this time.”

*Cognitive Regulation Training – Voluntary*

You work in a designer shoe store as a full-time sales employee. You earn 5% commission on every shoe sale. In order to enhance sales and customer satisfaction, the employees in your department are expected to be genuinely friendly with all customers and provide efficient shoe retrieval for customers

You receive the following memo from the store:

“Due to recent customer service issues, we have recently to implement a new training workshop focused on employee service behaviors to help improve customer satisfaction.

“The 2-hour training workshop, provided by an outside consulting company, will be during store hours. Employees who choose to attend the training will be paid their normal hourly wage, however, since they will be off the sales floor, sales and commission may be lost.

“This training is VOLUNTARY. We are providing this voluntary training because we want to enhance customer satisfaction in our store. One of the factors that is linked to customer satisfaction is your shoe retrieval efficiency: your speed and accuracy in finding shoes for customers. If you choose to participate, this training will help you to perform these desired behaviors, which are critical for customer satisfaction and linked to increased sales and profits.

“Thus, the goal of this training is to provide strategies to improve your service with speed. It will teach you how to regulate your attention, a skill that will help you in your job and potentially in your personal life.

“You will learn methods of shoe retrieval efficiency by
• Refocusing your attention to the customer request
• Learning strategies for improving personal control over your attention
• Identifying strategies for improving memory recall
• Identifying your common points of distraction
• And other strategies for improving your service with speed

“Learning and practicing these cognitive strategies will enhance store level service delivery and your future commissions.

Thus, we think this voluntary training is critical for all our employees to receive and encourage you to choose to participate at this time.”
You work in a designer shoe store as a full-time sales employee. You earn 5% commission on every shoe sale. In order to enhance sales and customer satisfaction, the employees in your department are expected to be genuinely friendly with all customers and provide efficient shoe retrieval for customers.

You receive the following memo from the store:

“Due to recent customer service issues, we have recently implemented a new training workshop focused on employee service behaviors to help improve customer satisfaction.

“The 2-hour training workshop, provided by an outside consulting company, will be during store hours. Employees who attend the training will be paid their normal hourly wage, however, since they will be off the sales floor, sales and commission may be lost.

“This training is MANDATORY. We are providing this mandatory training because we want to enhance customer satisfaction in our store. One of the factors that is linked to customer satisfaction is your shoe retrieval efficiency: your speed and accuracy in finding shoes for customers without distraction. This training will help you to perform these desired behaviors, which are critical for customer satisfaction and linked to increased sales and profits.

“Thus, the goal of this training is to provide strategies to improve your service with speed. It will teach you how to regulate your attention, a skill that will help you in your job and potentially in your personal life.

“You will learn methods of shoe retrieval efficiency by
  • Refocusing your attention to the customer request
  • Learning strategies for improving personal control over your attention
  • Identifying strategies for improving memory recall
  • Identifying your common points of distraction
  • And other strategies for improving your service with speed

“Learning and practicing these cognitive strategies will enhance store level service delivery and your future commissions.

Thus, we think this mandatory training is critical for all our employees to receive at this time.”