

Emotional Labor: Why and How to Teach It

Sharon H. Mastracci
University of Illinois at Chicago

Meredith A. Newman
Florida International University

Mary E. Guy
University of Colorado Denver

ABSTRACT

Feedback from graduates often indicates that their training failed to adequately prepare them for the human processes involved in the administration and delivery of public services. Although provided with training in cognitive skills, they are left on their own to acquire an appreciation for, and to develop skill in, nuanced emotive skills. This is especially the case for graduates who work in service-delivery programs that are emotionally intense, such as disaster services, child protective services, domestic violence, emergency medical services, corrections, and law enforcement. To a lesser degree, it is the case for all programs that provide person-to-person services. This paper discusses why these skills are important, how they are referred to in the proposed National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration Standards 2009, and explains how they can be incorporated into a curriculum.

EMOTIONAL LABOR: WHY AND HOW TO TEACH IT

There have been many changes since the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) introduced its first set of standards for academic programs. E-government, for example, has made significant advancements in facilitating citizens' access to technical information, forms, notices, and policies. It provides information on office locations, hours, and services, and makes it faster for citizens to access government agencies. To accommodate this advancement, professional standards now require proficiency in information technology, just as they require proficiency in fiscal matters, analytic methods, and organizational strategies. But this is not enough. During deliberations on the 2009 revision to NASPAA's standards, Piskulich and

Mandell (2007) put it this way:

It is clear that employers are looking for more than individuals who know their way around a budget process or human resources; they are looking for people who know these things and how to work in a team, lead, manage change and diversity, think globally, speak and write clearly and act ethically (p.1).

Enhancing public engagement, promoting justice and equity, working effectively as a member of a team, and leading in a dynamic and unpredictable environment require skills that are very different from those associated with person-to-object transactions. Person-to-person interactions between citizens and the state apply both technical (cognitive) knowledge and higher-order emotion skills.

Service exchanges between workers and citizens require workers to sense the proper tone and medium for expressing a thought or feeling, and to determine whether, when, and how to act on that instantaneous analysis. To ignore this combination of analysis, affect, judgment, and communication is to ignore the “social lube” that enables rapport, elicits desired responses, and ensures that interpersonal exchanges are constructive. Cognitive skills also are required in these jobs, but cannot be exercised effectively until they are paired with emotion skills (Guy & Newman, 2004). Among these affective skills, of primary importance is the ability to sense the emotional state of the other person, to adjust one’s own response accordingly, and to react empathically. Failure to acknowledge the duality of emotive and cognitive skills has caused managers, scholars, and students to ignore an essential component of person-to-person interaction. Criticism of the proverbial Master’s of Business Administration (MBA) “bean-counter” is emblematic of what is lacking in MBA preparation. Lest preparation in Master’s of Public Administration (MPA) and Master’s of Public Policy (MPP) degrees incur the same criticism, we should strengthen what currently is a weakness in our programs.

Few professions demand more emotion work from their employees than public service. Worker-client and state-agent-citizen interactions are the center of public service work, and emotional labor is the way that much of this work is performed. Emotional labor is relational work that requires human service workers to manage their own emotions, and to elicit behaviors and feelings from clients and citizens. Although emotions and feelings often are dismissed as unprofessional and interfering, they are required if human services are to be delivered effectively (Guy, Newman & Mastracci, 2008).

NASPAA defines the MPA degree as “the professional degree for people who want a public service career in management ... [that] develop[s] the skills and techniques used by leaders and managers to implement policies, projects, and programs that resolve important societal problems, while addressing

organizational, human resource, and budgetary challenges” (NASPAA, 2008a, para.4). Graduates of MPA and MPP programs serve in the private, nonprofit, and public sectors; in federal, state, and local government; and in capacities ranging from front-line service delivery, to elected offices and executive-level positions. Are they equipped to deal with the emotional labor demands of public service work? This is the question that concerns us, and it is to this end that we suggest how a curriculum can better prepare graduates for this facet of their future careers.

Traditional training subordinates relational skills in favor of cognitive, measurable tasks. This is a disservice to students, and it exposes the gap between the discipline of public administration and the actual practice of service to the public. We examine these issues in light of accrediting standards and recommend ways that the affective component of public service can be integrated into a curriculum.

A SERVICE-ORIENTED PROFESSION

Emotion work—or emotional labor—is the “effort within” that an individual must apply to get the job done. Its performance requires workers to suppress their private feelings, in order to show “desirable” work-related emotion. From the employer’s vantage, this is about an emotional performance that is bought and sold as a commodity—it is “part of the job.” Suppressing or managing one’s own feelings requires higher levels of emotional intelligence, which is the *capacity* to exert emotional labor. Emotional labor is the process of managing one’s own emotions, sensing the emotions of others, and using that knowledge to govern actions on the job (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Kiel, Bezboruah, & Oyun, 2009). Emotional labor is the expression of one’s capacity to manage personal emotions, sense others’ emotions, and to respond appropriately, based on one’s job.

Emotional intelligence applies to emotional labor in the same way that physical fitness applies to physical labor. Physical fitness is an individual’s capacity to engage in physical labor, which is observable and measurable, and the effects of engaging in physical labor are easy to see on the faces of those who exert it. Therefore, if one is not physically fit, the outcome of physical labor will suffer. Similarly, emotional labor manifests itself as a desirable outcome when done well, or as an undesirable outcome when done poorly or not at all. In varying degrees, manufacturing industries generally require physical and cognitive labor, while service-providers require cognitive and emotional labor. At all levels—federal, state, and local—this is the case. For example, diplomats in the State Department finesse relationships with their international counterparts to represent American interests and convey politically charged policies. Federal Emergency Management Agency employees encounter citizens on the worst days of their lives, when their homes have been destroyed and their world is in tatters. At the state level, prison guards and law enforcement officers daily try

to “acquire voluntary compliance” (Thompson, 2006) from an uncooperative segment of the citizenry. Children and family service agencies investigate abuse and sometimes are forced to remove children from their parents. Nonprofit organizations and county human services agencies work even more closely with the public, and the nonprofit sector addresses some of the most sensitive issues in public service at this level, including substance abuse, mental health services, housing assistance, domestic violence, and suicide hotlines.

But most formal training in public administration fails to comprehend the totality of this labor. Instead it focuses on a “truncated remnant” — the part that only requires cognitive skills. The founding narratives of the field create an incomplete concept of work that endures today in job descriptions, training materials, and performance evaluations (Mastracci, Newman, & Guy, 2006). The historical origins of the concept of work in public administration underscore its inappropriateness to contemporary styles of public service. By way of background, we next provide a description of how a manufacturing-oriented tradition led to this manufacturing-oriented pedagogy.

A MANUFACTURING-ORIENTED TRADITION

Frederick Taylor, the Gilbreths, Leonard White, and others of the early 20th century focused on problems of inefficiency by prescribing a remedy in the form of systematic management, and believed that performance was a science resting on well-defined laws and principles. If Frederick Taylor and Taylorism are accepted as part of the intellectual history of public administration and management, and if Max Weber and Weberian notions of bureaucracy are similarly accepted as part of our founding narrative, then so also is “Fordism.” The term Fordism was coined in 1916 to describe the cultural and economic influence of Henry Ford’s production methods in the auto industry. As it relates specifically to the concept of work, it is characterized by

- A highly specialized division of labor where workers are trained and assigned to one specific aspect of the production process;
- A standardization of products and how they are made; and
- The arrangement of workers along assembly lines.

Fordism organizes workers according to how the end result is produced, and its approach to labor encompasses Tayloristic efficiency principles and their emphasis on measurable skills. Weber, Taylor, and Ford all were inspired by the efficiency and effectiveness of the pre-World War I, Prussian bureaucracy, and defined work according to what was measurable about a job.

WHY A MANUFACTURING-ORIENTED TRADITION DOMINATES A SERVICE-ORIENTED PROFESSION

The inappropriateness of applying the manufacturing industry's conception of work to public service is obvious, but its enduring effect on public administration theory and practice is sustained by four institutional forces (Guy, Newman, & Mastracci, 2008). First, the structural elements of organizing — as articulated by Taylor and reinforced by top-down, command-and-control structures — taught us to treat workers as interchangeable parts whose contributions reside in the performance of clearly enumerated duties. The process of job construction — where tasks are lumped together to form clearly defined jobs — is designed to depersonalize work and separate the job from the person who performs it. By doing so, any employee with *X* skills can perform any job with *X* requirements. As such, workers are like cogs in a machine, one indistinguishable from the next, whose tasks are carried out in a dispassionate manner. Luther Gulick, for example, advanced the merits of a mechanistic, dehumanized, and emotionless model of administration, by asserting that public administrators “are supposed to be smooth running machines ... transmission belts” (as cited in Kramer, 2003, p.14). The 1922 Weberian model of “man as machine” and the “dominance of a spirit of formalistic impersonality, ‘*sine ira et studio*,’ without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm” (as cited in Kramer, 2003, p.13), requires that public administrators become “souls on ice” and conduct relationships “without sympathy or enthusiasm” (as cited in Kramer, 2003, p.13). Humane-ness, therefore, is sacrificed for efficiency. It follows that recipients of government services become *cases*, students in universities become *numbers*, and workers become like *robots* (Ritzer, 2004). A rational division of labor, hierarchical control, performance standards, and scientific selection and advancement — all based on technical competence — are ingrained in the way we think about job classification. Relational work is absent from the list of knowledge, skills, and abilities, except in the obligatory requirement to establish and maintain good working relationships (Ritzer, 2004).

Second, civil service systems are built on a foundation of formal descriptions that specify the tangible elements of each job. Though reforms have been introduced over the years, a basic understanding of what does, and does not, constitute “skill” remains mired in tradition. The nature of bureaucracy itself shapes the character of its work. According to Max Weber (1970/1946, pp.215-216), “Bureaucracy develops the more perfectly, the more it is ‘dehumanized.’” In his scathing critique of bureaucracy, Ralph Hummel decries the orthodoxy:

The psychological experience of bureaucracy is this: Bureaucrats are asked to become people without conscience. Those who submit become people without heart. Bureaucrats are asked to leave their emotions at home. Yet all that human beings do —

in relating themselves to other people, the objects of their work, the working itself — carries with it feelings. We feel for those who are our clients — compassion or disdain..., and so on... As a result, unconscious feelings silently accompany all our relations with people and things at work — at times distorting, at times supporting our ability to get work done (p.124).

As the emerging body of work on emotional labor attests, the expression and management of emotions remain for the most part invisible. The conflict between the universalism of bureaucracies and the particularism of care-giving (Abel & Nelson, 1990) is difficult to reconcile.

Third, due to the rise of urbanization and industrialization, a dichotomy emerged between home and work, with each domain evoking different behaviors. Home became a refuge from the dehumanization of the workplace. The practice of nurturing and sustaining while simultaneously performing manual labor — as had occurred on the family farm — disappeared from the definition of work. Relational work was defined in a way that was not germane to the task at hand. Instead, work and accompanying job descriptions focused on the tangible production of marketable goods and services. Efforts resulting in positive relationships, a sense of community, and resolution of conflict did not fit easily into quantifiable elements, so they were treated as extraneous, despite the suasion of Mary Parker Follett (Newman & Guy, 1998). Separating the roles of men and women, with men playing the role of primary workers in the public world, and women playing the same role in the private domain of the household, spilled over into the recognition and valuation of skills in the labor market (Baines, Evans, & Neysmith, 1998). Underlying work-ethic norms reflect an economic structure that privileges work if it is done in the marketplace, and renders it invisible if done by women in the home:

Having entered the private realm of the home, caregiving becomes invisible. It runs on a different clock than the world of employment. Both these characteristics make it difficult to see it as work when the definition of work is so firmly market-related. It is, after all, work that isn't seen and isn't valued except when it isn't done! (Baines, Evans, & Neysmith, 1998, p.239).

A corollary to this is that only observable tasks matter. This approach assures an impersonal, objective, evaluative process that protects against favoritism due to race, age, gender, or any other characteristic that differentiates one worker from another. It also assures that invisibility will continue for all labors that are relational in nature.

The fourth institutional force is that of so-called “market value.” This is

shorthand for cultural understandings of worth, the calculus of which is from the three institutional forces previously described. Market value blinds us to the influence of culturally based assumptions, and renders only quantifiable, objective tasks as those that matter.

COLLATERAL DAMAGE TO A SERVICE-ORIENTED PROFESSION

The confluence of these four factors cements general notions of what is or is not considered as real work. Trapped in the canon of Fordist production principles and scientific management standards, the widely accepted ideas of organizational effectiveness fail to account for the centrality of emotion work in public service, nor do they recognize that jobs “require workers to have emotions as well as muscle and brain” (Himmelweit, 1999, p.34). The emphasis on tangible, testable skills eclipses behavior that is inconsistent with industrial-era standards, even when that behavior is directly related to the organization’s goals. Because our curricula have been developed in this mode, our students are inadequately prepared for the work they will be performing.

Traditional administrative language — span of control, hierarchy, authority, and division of labor — is incomplete. A conception of administrative practice that is relational, rather than controlling, has a very different vocabulary. Administration is more than rule-governed procedure, it also is an inter-subjective process. But the latter idea appears only fleetingly in our theories and in our curricula. The result: Our truncated construct of work favors cognitive and measurable skills, while it excludes from the pedagogy an orientation toward service and the value of caring. Until recently, our accreditation process has reflected this mode. NASPAA’s 2009 revisions, however, move toward a fuller appreciation of the public service landscape.

NEW CONCEPTION, NEW PEDAGOGY

The proposed third generation of NASPAA accreditation standards offers a promising departure from the original standards, which were focused on program inputs such as sufficient faculty, budgets, and courses offered. The second iteration of standards in the 1990s added a layer of mission-based requirements to the inputs (Raffel, Maser, & McFarland, 2007). The proposed 2009 standards focus on a values-driven approach, which is articulated as follows: “The core of our approach is values-driven, mission-based accreditation but we are proposing a process that incorporates outcome measures, such as student competencies for public service, within it” (Raffel, Maser, & McFarland, 2007, p.2). As such, the original standards of the 1970s, current standards established in the 1990s, and the proposed 2009 standards may best be viewed as a continuum — from inputs, to inputs + mission; to values + mission + outcomes. The clarion call for public service-focused accreditation in the proposed standards is a reflection of the perceived need to brand our programs,

and to demonstrate the distinctiveness and value-added nature of public affairs programs (Raffel, Maser, & McFarland, 2007).

Will a focus on public service values translate into a curriculum that aligns with the actual work of those who serve the public? What would student competencies for public service look like? As noted, public and nonprofit agencies rely heavily on the effective exercise of emotion work. Public service requires workers who are skilled in relationship-building. Does our pedagogy prepare graduates to be proficient in these emotive skills? Or do our curricula adhere to the norms carried over from the industrial era, despite the fact that public service is, by definition and practice, a “people-service?” As an applied field, how can we teach our students to apply — in a practical sense — their acquired skills in the person-to-person transactions that occur at the street level? In sum, do the standards (both current and proposed) privilege cognitive, measurable skills over relational skills — a manufacturing-orientation over a service-orientation? We now turn to this overarching question.

MANUFACTURING OUR STANDARDS

The “NASPAA General Information and Standards for Professional Masters Degree Programs” (available online at www.naspaa.org) apply to master’s degree programs designed to provide professional education for leadership in public affairs, public policy, and public administration. The purpose of the curriculum is to prepare students for professional leadership in public service (Standard 4.1). Common curriculum components are intended to enhance the students’ values, knowledge, and skills for acting ethically and effectively in the management of public service organizations; in the application of quantitative and qualitative techniques of analysis; and with an understanding of the public policy and organizational environment (Standard 4.21). Components of “management” include human resources, budgeting and financial processes, information management, technology applications, and policy. Components of “techniques of analysis” include policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation, decision making, and problem solving. Attention to the context (“environment”) includes political, legal, economic, and social institutions/processes, as well as the concepts and behavior of organization and management.

We have no quarrel with our graduates becoming proficient in management, analytical skills, and policy. These are essential cognitive abilities. Our argument is that these skills are necessary, but they also are insufficient for preparing our students to be effective public servants. Missing from this skills inventory is attention to the “public” and “service” aspects of public service. Stivers (2003) illuminates this in her examination of administration and management:

Administration (from the Latin *administrare*, to minister) connotes a “ministerial act, the performance of public duty, the execution of stewardship on behalf of another or service to another” (p.214). By contrast, *management* implies “the

conduct (manipulation, control) of business affairs” (p.214). She characterizes the difference as “a contest between on the one hand, service, publicness, ministering, justice, duty, and practicality and on the other, control, results, efficiency, objectivity, and science” (p.220). Moreover, the idea of “service” connotes proficiency in (a) communicating across geographic, cultural, societal and jurisdictional boundaries; (b) developing rapport, relationship-building and connectedness; and (c) exercising emotional intelligence and emotional labor in order to practice caring and responsiveness. Emotional labor skills imbue each of these components.

The proposed “NASPAA Standards 2009” reflect the need for a “correction.” These standards “should be focused on programs improving community governance, public service and public welfare,” according to Raffel, Maser, and McFarland (2007, p.1). Their assertion is motivated by the recognition that, “as the needs of the public sector change, NASPAA must undertake an earnest discussion of how to best educate and develop public affairs leaders, ensuring that graduates of accredited programs obtain the relevant and competitive skills and competencies they need to excel in public service professions” (NASPAA, 2008b, para.5). As the public sector changes, the needs of students preparing for public service also change.

Piskulich and Mandell (2007) pose the following question:

To the extent that the MPA and MPP degrees serve to indicate preparation to work in public sector organizations or to work on problems confronting public sector organizations, shouldn't there be some “drop dead” competencies that all students achieve in our programs[?] (p.4).

Our answer is a resounding “yes” — competencies that support the inherent skills of person-to-person transactions are the essence of public service. In the “Draft of the NASPAA 2009 Standards & Self-Study Report Instructions,” proposed “2009 Universal Required Competencies” (Standard 6.1) are not dissimilar from the current “Common Curriculum Components” (Standard 4.21), namely,

- To lead and manage in public governance;
- To participate in and contribute to the policy process;
- To analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions;
- To incorporate into decisions considerations of ethics, fiscal and environmental sustainability, and social equity; and
- To communicate and interact productively with diverse and changing workforce and citizenry (Piskulich & Mandell, 2008, p.5).

Part of the differences is found in the fine print. In an (exciting) departure from the current standards, the following proposed cross-cutting skills from Piskulich & Mandell (2008) “are relevant for all the above mentioned competencies”:

- Demonstrate self-knowledge: Awareness of one’s own stylistic preferences for relating to others, communicating with others, making decisions, managing yourself in groups, and the impact that this has on relationships and your ability to influence others...
- Evidences sensitivity and responsiveness to beliefs and behaviors associated with differences among people because of their ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, physical characteristics, religion, age, etc.
- Demonstrate flexibility: Adapts behavior and work methods to differences (whether they are differences in thought, communication style, perspective, age, interests, fairness or some other variable)...
- Negotiate: Discerns the interests and values of others; surfaces assumptions; secures agreement on ground rules and tolerable outcomes; gains cooperation of others to accomplish goals...
- Facilitate: ...[B]uilds actionable consensus...
- Relates to all kinds of people and develops appropriate rapport that leads to constructive and effective relationships...
- Work productively in teams: Interacts effectively in a team, demonstrating composure, professionalism and effective working relationships (Piskulich & Mandell, 2008, p.18).

This is the language of emotional labor and emotive skills.

As we prepare our students to become practitioners in the professions of 21st-century public service, attention to people skills and service-orientation is key. Emotional labor skills are at the heart of service delivery, and are integral to public sector reform. The leap of faith, which assumes that all types of public service work have all the same essentials, has enabled us to ignore a simple truth: Person-to-person interactions require skills that are not used in person-to-object interactions. A shift from “engineering of things to the engineering of people” requires attention to “the human element” (Noble, as cited in Stivers, 2003, p.217). To ground ourselves in “pure” rationality is to run the risk of ignoring “essentially human and humanly measured care for our fellow humans” (Havel, as cited in Stivers, 1993, p.257).

As we move away from the “brick and mortar bureaucracy” of government (Giuliani, 2002, p.104), person-to-person transactions in the citizen-state encounter become more pronounced. Relationship, rapport, interaction, compassion, service, connectedness, and *soul work* comprise the vocabulary of this relational administrative perspective. The insight, anticipation, and tenor of the communication between persons prior to, during, and after the exchange require energy, focus, and sensing.

If a job requires its holders to project a particular feeling (e.g., politeness or toughness) or to elicit a feeling in someone else (e.g., trust or fear), then emotion work can do the job. The service person must deliberately involve his or her feelings in the situation. He or she may not particularly feel like being cordial and becoming a “one-minute” friend to the next customer or client who approaches, but that is indeed what frontline work entails (Wharton, 1993, p.208).

Connectivity and relationship-building are key leadership traits. So, too, are the skills of developing rapport and emotional engagement. The best administrators are people who are trustworthy, empathic, and connected — those who make us feel appreciated, inspired, and energized. Feeling connected refers to the concrete emotional links between leader, worker, and citizen. One powerful method for fostering such links is to build the attuned relationship between them.

A study of “what middle managers in local government actually do” (Morgan, Bacon, Bunch, Cameron, & Deis, 1996) reinforces this point and illustrates the centrality of emotional labor skills on the job. Their findings emphasize this observation by Stivers (2003):

Communication links between top executives and line personnel, interpreting and synthesizing the views of disparate constituencies, developing consensus, facilitating organizational and jurisdictional collaboration, stimulating intraorganizational cooperation, and in general creating a sense of community (p. 225).

Public servants who manage these relationship structures, and who are sensitive and skilled at the relational side of face-to-face public service, help to humanize government. If we are to emphasize and honor the *people* in public service — service providers and recipients alike — we must pay attention to how public servants work “feelingly” in the citizen-state encounter. Preparing our graduates to excel as a skilled partner in these exchanges is crucial.

While the words “emotive skills” and “emotional labor” are not found in the “NASPAA 2009 Standards & Self-Study Report Instructions” draft, the vocabulary of this language is clearly evident in the cross-cutting skills used as examples in the proposed set of “Universal Required Competencies.” The importance of relationship (and negotiation) skills was identified by a 2009 Standards discussion group as one of eight competencies that should be common across all programs. And the value of creating a quality learning environment implies the recognition of human processes. According to the “Provisional Guiding Principles” of the proposed 2009 standards, “the quality of education is determined in part by the way that students are educated and treated within the context of their program...includ[ing] quality advising, [and] the quality of

teaching,” as well as what is learned (Raffel, Maser, & McFarland, 2007, p.1). Similarly, a focus on “interpersonal skills, and cultural competencies” (p.3) are aligned with the importance of emotive skills. “Making a difference” and “changing the world” (p.2) are heady goals, and will require our graduates to be fluent in the *art* as well as the science of public administration. Now we move to where the devil resides — in the details. How can this new subject matter fit into the curriculum without having to add a course to the core?

HOW TO TEACH CONTENT AND STYLE

By now you should be asking: How do you teach and measure enthusiasm, empathy, non-verbal skills, caring, responsiveness, and so forth? Where does it fit into the curriculum? Emotion work fits comfortably into courses that focus on interpersonal relations, as well as overview courses that describe the nature of public service work. These include introductory courses such as “The Profession of Public Service,” “Introduction to Public Administration,” “Leadership in Public Service,” and similar subjects. Courses that focus on organizational dynamics include “Organization Development,” “Administrative Theory,” “Human Resource Management,” “Managing People,” “Public Management,” and so forth.

Talking the Talk

In terms of content, lectures should delineate the nature of emotion work as contrasted with cognitive work; the relationship of and the difference between emotional intelligence and emotional labor; the skill requirements of emotion work as compared to knowledge work; the antecedents to and consequences of its performance — including the feeling of making a difference through one’s work, and affecting another person’s life, as well as the risk of burnout. Suggested readings and resource material are listed in the Appendix. Following is a sketch of how four main points can be covered.

Point 1: Explain emotional labor — including the relationship of and the contrast between emotional intelligence and the performance of emotion work.

While *emotional intelligence* refers to a person’s innate ability to be aware of personal emotions and to sense the emotive state of another person, *emotional labor* involves *managing* the emotional state of the self, as well as that of the other person. *Artful affect* is a useful term to explain the performance of emotional labor. This term captures the artful sensing of another’s emotional state, while crafting one’s own affective expressions so as to elicit a desired response. Practicing artful affect is both proactive and reactive. *Proactive* means the worker is required to anticipate the emotional state of the other person, and act to mitigate it. *Reactive* means the worker is required to respond to whatever emotional state the other person is in at the start of the interaction.

Point 2: Explain how and why emotional labor is exercised in public service jobs.

For this, a list of jobs that require person-to-person exchanges can be generated, and the nature of their transactions can be explored. In most classes, there will be students who have experience in a variety of jobs, and their involvement in class discussion will enrich a greater understanding of the dynamics. This discussion can be used as a platform for delineating required skills, such as sensing the emotive state of the citizen, determining the best affective response to achieve the goal of the transaction, controlling one's own emotional state while responding, and resolving the uncomfortable feelings one may have after an exchange.

Point 3: Although the outcome is usually positive, there can be a negative result.

Until recently, focus on the outcomes of emotional labor targeted only the negative of employee burnout (e.g., Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1988; Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Stevenson, 1986). Current research confirms that burnout can result from the performance of emotion work, but it occurs less often than one might think. More importantly, the successful performance of emotion work results in extraordinarily high levels of job satisfaction, and provides workers with a sense that their work (a) has made a difference in someone's life, (b) has meaning beyond bringing home a paycheck, (c) enhances job satisfaction, and (d) sustains their commitment to public service (Guy, Newman, & Mastracci, 2008). Most recently, performance data indicate that those who receive public services give higher satisfaction ratings to workers who are skilled in emotion work (Hsieh & Guy, 2009).

Point 4: Relate the service component of the state-citizen exchange to the customer-service component of retail sales.

This will drive home the point that an emphasis on service is expected in many settings, and that while cognitive skills are important, affective skills, in essence, "seal the deal." A citizen who is satisfied with services received is a citizen who is more likely to appreciate and support the work of the state. Workers who gain personal satisfaction from the job, and feel as if they are improving the lives of those served, are more likely to stay with the organization and to provide superior performance.

Walking the Walk

Drama workshop: Engaging in emotional labor is akin to method acting (Hochschild, 1983), so experiential learning in this area is an entirely appropriate way to develop students' skills. McGill University management professor Henry Mintzberg (2009) incorporates drama workshops into the first module of his "International Masters Program in Practicing Management" (accessible online at www.impm.org). Developing a relationship with a faculty member from your

university's theater department in order to facilitate at least one session with students goes a long way toward internalizing the principles of emotional labor in public service. Moreover, a drama workshop can spur enlightening discussions on the tension between the need to engage in deep acting, and the ethics of doing so.

Self-assessment: A range of assessment tools exists to help students discover their own communication styles. None of us communicate or exert emotional labor in the same way. Similar patterns exist, but discovering one's personal style of communication helps students to better understand how they "do" emotional labor.

Available assessment methods can be as simple as self-administered paper and Web-based quizzes, or as complex as off-site, multi-day retreats facilitated by professionals. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is perhaps the most well-known, oft-used, and oft-imitated assessment instrument for a range of career- and psychological-based applications, and it includes styles of communication and interpersonal relations (Myers & Myers, 2009). *How to Become a Better Negotiator*, by Luecke and Patterson (2008), is published by AMACOM, a division of the American Management Association. It includes a communication assessment tool that has been used by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the U.S. Army Military Intelligence School, among other institutions. *What's My Communication Style?* (Teambuilders Plus, 2009) is a multi-media training and assessment program intended for use in a facilitated group context. The Forte Institute for Interpersonal Communication offers a series of interactive team-building seminars, executive communication preparation for meetings, coaching to improve communication performance for individuals and groups, and customized off-site retreats facilitated by certified professionals.

Class assignment: In conjunction with lectures on emotional labor, an assignment that helps students comprehend how it is exercised and experienced on the job reinforces the subject and aids learning. This can be achieved by asking students to interview a public service worker who regularly has person-to-person contact with citizens. This could include those who staff phone lines or who meet face-to-face with the public, but would exclude e-mail-only interactions, because they do not require emotional spontaneity. Eligible employees include public school teachers, social service workers, crisis line call-takers, police officers, firefighters, intake workers, probation counselors, courtroom staff, university admissions staff, employment training staff, and city hall receptionists, among many others.

Interview questions could include the following: (a) Tell me about your work, (b) Tell me about a case/interaction that sticks in your mind where the citizen/client was emotional, (c) How did you handle the situation?, (d) How did you feel about what happened after it was over?, (e) Does this sort of exchange happen often?, (f) What does it take for you to put something like this behind you and face the next case/incident? In most cases, these questions will trigger sufficient discussion for the interviewer to probe more deeply and, in the process,

gain an understanding of the job and how one performs its required emotion work. Students also gain an understanding of how cognitive and emotive skills combine to produce what we call public service.

SUMMARY

In order to amplify students' preparation for the human processes involved in public service leadership and service delivery, we have argued the importance of incorporating the "invisible" aspect of public service work into the canon. In terms of producing positive exchanges between citizen and state, emotional labor skills are as important — if not more important — than cognitive skills. These skills require workers to manage their own emotions, as well as those of the citizen. The better we equip our MPA and MPP graduates to do this, the better public service they can provide. Think of emotion work as the art of public service, while the exercise of cognitive skills represents the science of public service. To put art and science together is to advance the practice of public service.

REFERENCES

- Abel, E.K., & Nelson, M.K. (Eds.). (1990). *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Baines, C., Evans, P., & Neysmith, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Women's caring: Feminist perspectives on social welfare* (2nd ed). Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Cherniss, G., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Forte Institute for Interpersonal Communications. Retrieved June 17, 2009, from www.theforteinstitute.com
- Giuliani, R.W. (2002). From in line to on-line: The e-government revolution in New York City. In P.J. Andrisani, S. Hakim, & E.S. Savas (Eds.), *The new public management: Lessons from innovating governors and mayors* (pp. 99-106). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Golembiewski, R.T., & Munzenrider, R.F. (1988). *Phases of burnout: Developments in concepts and applications*. New York: Praeger.
- Golembiewski, R.T., Munzenrider, R.F., & Stevenson, J.G. (1986). *Stress in organizations: Toward a phase model of burnout*. New York: Praeger.
- Guy, M.E., & Newman, M.A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 289-98.
- Guy, M.E., Newman, M.A., & Mastracci, S.H. (2008). *Emotional labor: Putting the service in public service*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Guy, M.E., Newman, M.A., & Mastracci, S.H. (2008, September). *Are we there yet? From Taylor's triangle to Follett's web; From knowledge work to emotion work*. Paper presented at the Minnowbrook III conference, Lake Placid, NY.

Emotional Labor: Why and How to Teach It

- Himmelweit, S. (1999, January). Caring labor. *Annals, AAPSS*, 561(1), 27-38.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hsieh, C., & Guy, M.E. (2009). Performance outcomes: The relationship between managing the “heart” and managing client satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 29(1), 41-57.
- Hummel, R.P. (1987). *The bureaucratic experience* (3rd ed). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kiel, L.D., Bezboruah, K., & Oyun, G. (2009). Developing leaders in public affairs and administration: Incorporating emotional intelligence training into the core doctoral leadership course. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15(1), 87-105.
- Kramer, R. (2003). Beyond Max Weber: Leading with emotional intelligence in post-communist governments. *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference of Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe*, Cracow, Poland.
- Luecke, R.A., & Patterson, J.G. (2008). *How to become a better negotiator*. New York, NY: AMACOM Publications.
- Mastracci, S.H., Newman, M.A., & Guy, M.E. (2006). Appraising emotion work: Determining whether emotional labor is valued in government jobs. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 123-38.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). IMPM: The international masters program in practicing management. Retrieved April 20, 2009, from www.impm.org
- Morgan, D., Bacon, K.G., Bunch, R., Cameron, C.D., & Deis, R. (1996). What middle managers do in local government: Stewardship of the public trust and the limits of reinventing government. *Public Administration Review*, 56(3), 359-365.
- Myers, P.B., & Myers, K.D. (2009) Myers-Briggs type indicator. Retrieved June 17, 2009, from www.mbti.com
- National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). (2008a). FAQ. Retrieved September 13, 2008, from http://www.naspaa.org/students/faq/faq.asp#question_1
- NASPAA. (2008b). *NASPAA standards 2009: Defining quality in public affairs education*. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from <http://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/standard2009/main.asp>
- Newman, M.A., & Guy, M.E. (1998) Taylor's triangle, Follett's web. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 20(3): 287-297.
- Piskulich, M., & Mandell, M. (2008, March). NASPAA Standards 2009 (working draft). *Curricular competencies: NASPAA white paper*. Retrieved from <http://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/document/WhitePaperCompetencies.pdf>
- Raffel, J., Maser, S., & McFarland, L. (2007, September). *NASPAA standards 2009: Public service values, mission-based accreditation* (working draft). Retrieved from <http://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/standard2009/docs/NS2009Standards03.26.08.pdf>

- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The McDonaldization of society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stivers, C. (2003). Administration versus management: A reading from beyond the boundaries. *Administration & Society*, 35(2), 210-230.
- Stivers, C. (1993). Rationality and romanticism in constitutional argument. *Public Administration Review*, 53(3), 254-257.
- Teambuilders Plus. (1997-2009). *What's my communication style?* (3rd ed.). Retrieved June 17, 2009, from www.teambuildinginc.com
- Thompson, G. J. (2006). *Verbal judo: The gentle art of persuasion*. NY: Harper Collins Reprints. Retrieved September 13, 2008, from www.verbaljudo.com
- Weber, M. (1970/1946). *Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. Translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wharton, A.S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, 20(2), 205-32.

Sharon Mastracci is an associate professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago. She studies public personnel policies, the changing labor force, policies affecting low-wage workers, and gender and diversity dynamics in the workplace. She is the 2010 recipient of the Rita Mae Kelley award for outstanding research in gender-related issues. E-mail: mastracc@uic.edu

Meredith A. Newman is Professor and Chair of the Department of Public Administration at Florida International University. Prior to her career in academia, Newman served with the Australian Foreign Service, the U.S. Department of State, and the World Bank. She is widely published in the areas of public management, human resources and gender, and the emotive aspects of work. Newman is an Associate Editor of Review for *Public Personnel Administration*; past Chair of the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation of NASPAA; incoming President of the American Society for Public Administration; and a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. E-mail: newmanm@fiu.edu

Mary E. Guy is Professor and MPA Director in the School of Public Affairs at the University of Colorado Denver. Her work focuses on the changing workforce, the difference that “differentness” makes, and the role of emotional labor in the delivery of public services. She is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and past-president of the American Society for Public Administration. E-mail: mary.guy@ucdenver.edu

Emotional Labor: Why and How to Teach It

APPENDIX

Suggested Literature

Here are two lists of readings that will help faculty to understand the topic and prepare lectures. The first set of readings pertains to emotional labor in public service settings. The second set of readings pertains to scholarship on the subject in the literature of other disciplines.

READINGS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SCHOLARSHIP

- Burnier, D. (2003). Other voices/other rooms: Towards a care-centered public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 25(4), 529-44.
- Guy, M.E., Newman, M.A., & Mastracci, S.H. (2008). *Emotional labor: Putting the service in public service*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Guy, M.E., & Newman, M.A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 289-98.
- Hsieh, C. & Guy, M.E. (2009). Performance outcomes: The relationship between managing the "heart" and managing client satisfaction. Manuscript submitted for publication in *Review of Public Personnel Administration*.
- Mastracci, S.H., Newman, M.A., & Guy, M.E. (2006). Appraising emotion work: Determining whether emotional labor is valued in government jobs. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 123-38.
- Meier, K.J., Mastracci, S.H., & Wilson, K. (2006). Gender and emotional labor in public organization: An empirical examination of the link to performance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 899-909.
- Stivers, C. (2005). A place like home: Care and action in public administration. *American Review of Public Administration*, 35(1), 26-41.

READINGS FROM OTHER DISCIPLINES

- Adelmann, P.K. (1995). Emotional labor as a potential source of job stress. In S.L. Sauter & L.R. Murphy (Eds.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress* (pp. 371-81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ashkanasy, N.M., Härtel, C.E.J., & Zerbe, W.J. (Eds.). (2000). *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Barger, P.B., & Grandey, A.A. (2006). Service with a smile and encounter satisfaction: Emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1229-1238.
- Brotheridge, C.M., & Grandey, A.A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of people work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 17-39.
- Diefendorff, J.M., & Gosserand, R.H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 945-959.

- Domagalski, T.A. (1999). Emotion in organizations: Main currents. *Human Relations*, 52(6), 833-852.
- Erickson, R.J. (1997). Putting emotions to work. In D.D. Franks, R.J. Erickson & B. Cuthbertson-Johnson (Eds.), *Social perspectives on emotion* (pp. 3-18). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fineman, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Emotions in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Grandey, A.A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95-110.
- Härtel, C.E.J., Zerbe, W.J., & Ashkanasy, N.M. (Eds.). (2005). *Emotions in organizational behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heuven, E., Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., & Huisman, N. (2006). The role of self-efficacy in performing emotional work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 222-235.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3), 551-75.
- Liu, Y., Perrewé, P.L., Hochwarter, W.A., & Kacmar, C.J. (2004). Dispositional antecedents and consequences of emotional labor at work. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 12-25.
- Lord, R.G., Klimoski, R.J., & Kanfer, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the structure and role of emotions in organizational behavior*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pugh, S.D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1018-1027.
- Zerbe, W.J. (2000). Emotional dissonance and employee well-being. In N.M. Ashkanasy et al. (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice* (pp.189-214). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.