# A Blessing or a Burden? Relating Motivation for Teaching to Emotional Engagement at a Canadian University

**Céleste M. Grimard**
**ESG-UQAM**

**Raymond T. Lee**
**University of Manitoba**

**Brenda L. Lovell**
**University of Manitoba**

*This article examines how university faculty members with different teaching orientations view the emotional rules related to their occupation, how they invest in their work in an emotional sense, and how they experience their work. In our sample of 311 faculty members, we found that, relative to others, those who saw teaching as a blessing were: more likely to be aware of positive display rules than negative display rules and less likely to hide their feelings and fake expressed emotions. We also found that these faculty members were more satisfied and experienced lower levels of burnout.*

## INTRODUCTION

At its core, teaching is both "profoundly emotional work" (Winograd, 2003, p. 1667) and "extraordinarily difficult work" (Best, 1977, p. 245). Whether one views oneself as a coach or as a "sage on a stage" (Barr & Tagg, 1994, p. 24), how teachers manage and display their own emotions while interacting with students is largely prescribed by organizations and the norms of the teaching profession (Winograd, 2003). These display rules provide the framework for understanding how emotions can be harnessed effectively during teaching; that is, which should be shown and which should be withheld (Ogbonna & Harris, 2004). The enactment of emotions during teaching is challenging and requires effort (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). It entails suppressing socially undesirable feelings (hiding) and expressing unfelt emotions (faking), or attempts to actually feel the emotions that are expected to be expressed (deep acting; Zemblyas, 2005). Faking and hiding emotions, two elements of surface acting, along with deep acting constitute what Hochschild (1983) refers to as emotional labor. The emotional labor performed by faculty members not only impacts how students judge their teaching effectiveness (Harlow, 2003), but it also contributes to the daily stress and strain of teaching (Bartlett, 1994; Côté, 2005; Winograd, 2003). Among university professors, stress and strain fuel demoralization and career burnout (Bartlett, 1994), especially when they are required to carry out research and administrative duties as well (Byrne, 1991).

Despite the foregoing, surprisingly few studies have examined how emotions factor into university-level instruction. This contrasts with the research attention directed toward the regulation and impact of emotions among primary and secondary school teachers (Harlow, 2003; Winograd, 2003; Zemblyas, 2004, 2005). Even for science disciplines predicated on rational and logical reasoning, teaching such subject areas necessitates emotional involvement and engagement, such that, for example, instructors draw upon their own enthusiasm to generate excitement about the course content among their students (Zemblyas, 2004).

Similarly, for the most part, research on teaching orientations has been undertaken in a primary and secondary school setting (e.g., Curtner-Smith, 2001; Friedrichsen, Driel & Abell, 2011; Greenwood, 2003; Serow, Eaker & Ciechalski, 1992). Moreover, this research has typically considered teaching orientation from the perspective of pedagogical approach, such as whether to emphasize knowledge acquisition or skill development. For example, in contrasting two teaching orientations, information transmission and learning facilitation, Kember and Gow (1994) suggested that the latter is more consistent with a 'deep approach' to learning, which is characterized by an intrinsic interest and involvement in learning. Though teaching orientation is defined in a variety of ways in the empirical literature (Friedrichsen et al., 2011), in our study, it reflects one's conceptions and commitment to teaching as elements of one's professional role. Thus, faculty members who view teaching as a blessing are likely to value it as a vital component of their work, whereas those who view it as a burden view it as interfering with their *real* work.

In addition to these two gaps in the literature, we were unable to find research that explores the linkages between emotional engagement at work and one's teaching orientation. Given that teaching orientation informs one's experiences while teaching, it should influence emotional enactment during teaching. Whereas some faculty may experience teaching as a burden and expresses negative emotions, others may demonstrate an intrinsic interest and investment in teaching and view it as more of a blessing. These represent two fundamentally different orientations toward work as well as contrasting emotional connections to it. Given the relationship between teaching beliefs and practices (Kane, Sandretto & Heath, 2002), it is important to examine the impact of one's teaching orientation. Under ideal conditions, faculty members are able to motivate themselves to perform the teaching part of their roles in a manner that optimizes students' learning. In reality, this is not always possible. Faculty may find that adopting a positive teaching orientation is difficult when confronted by students who are instrumentally oriented toward their education. These degree purchasers tend to make little effort to prepare for classes or to study for exams; they are negative, resistant and defiant in the classroom setting, and they have low achievement levels (Brotheridge & Lee, 2005). Influenced by the student-as-customer re-branding of higher education, students may be more focused on having a satisfying experience than intellectual growth derived from the challenge of having struggled to learn new concepts or skills (Parker, 2003; Turk, 2000). However, it is possible that professors are equally instrumentally oriented toward teaching and attracted to the profession because of its occupational prestige or other external factors. Furthermore, some faculty members may feel burdened by significant pressure to publish particularly since many tenure decisions emphasize research to a greater degree than teaching (Ito & Brotheridge, 2007).

This study described in this article examines how faculty members with different teaching orientations view the emotional rules related to their occupation, how they invest in their work in an emotional sense, and how they experience the outcomes of teaching. We begin by developing the concept of teaching orientation, linking it to the conceptual underpinnings of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as developed in self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Then, we develop hypotheses regarding how individuals who view teaching as a blessing perceive emotional display rules, perform emotional regulation, and experience burnout and satisfaction at work. In particular, we expect that, in contrast with faculty who experience teaching as a burden, faculty who value teaching as a blessing will be more likely to accept the emotional display rules associated with teaching, attempt to display authentic emotions, and, consequently, experience more satisfaction and lower levels of burnout. We test the predicted relationships in a sample of faculty members at a Canadian university.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Teaching Orientation**
    In this study, we examine two types of teaching orientation: the affective valence of one's attachment to teaching and its centrality to one's work. This approach to teaching orientation overlaps with Wrzesniewski, Dutton, and Debebe's (2003) construct of work orientation, specifically the extent to which individuals view their work as a calling (i.e., consider it to be central to their identity and derive intrinsic fulfillment from it). Individuals who view their work as a calling are more likely to dedicate more hours to it, derive greater satisfaction and meaning from it, and exhibit a greater concern for their customers (Cardador, Pratt & Dane, 2006; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin & Schwartz, 1997).
    Two distinct orientations are examined presently: (a) *teaching as a blessing* in which faculty believe that teaching plays an integral and positive role in their work lives; and (b) *teaching as a burden* in which faculty consider teaching as more of an impediment in carrying out their professional role.
    *Teaching as a Blessing.* Those who view teaching as a blessing are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, seeing teaching as something that they have freely chosen and even identifying with it, potentially integrating it into their sense of self. These individuals derive positive feelings from teaching and are more likely to enjoy and be stimulated by the challenges of teaching and do it for its own sake (Vallerand et al., 1992). "People are interested in what they are doing, and they display curiosity, explore novel stimuli, and work to master optimal challenges" (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 15). As suggested by Vannini (2006), such individuals consider teaching to be self-fulfilling, almost leisure-like in nature, and they may easily blend their vocation and their home life roles (Stebbins, 2004).
    *Teaching as a Burden.* In contrast, those who view teaching as a burden may be extrinsically motivated, and they may feel external pressure to engage in teaching. They do not teach for the joy of teaching; i.e., it is not something that they would freely choose to do. Rather, teaching is a means of meeting an external goal or represents a constraint that has been imposed upon them (Hennessey & Amabile, 2005). More pointedly, it is part of their role expectation as faculty members (Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Brière, Senécal & Vallières, 1992) and "leads to some separate consequence… [either as] a tangible reward or to avoid a punishment (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 15).
    *Group Membership.* We view these orientations as independent constructs such that faculty may have high or low scores in either or both orientations. This approach to conceptualizing teaching orientation overlaps somewhat, but not completely, with the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Thus, as presented in Table 1, four groups are possible.

**TABLE 1**
**CLASSIFICATIONS OF MOTIVATION FOR TEACHING (N=311)**

| | | Teaching is a blessing. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | LO | HI |
| Teaching is a burden. | LO | Group 1 (n=86) Neutral zone (neither hate nor love it), Disengaged consultants. | Group 3 (n=87) Teaching is truly a blessing. Experienced administrators and teachers. |
| | HI | Group 2 (n=100) Teaching is nothing but a burden. Pre-tenured and tenured researchers. | Group 4 (n=38) Complex love-hate relationship with teaching. Pre-tenured teachers. |

    Members of Group 1, the *disengaged* faculty, have low levels of both types of teaching orientation. They are similar to the professors in Vannini (2006, p. 248) who express boredom with teaching, for example: "The reinforcement that you get from teaching does not compare very well with the

reinforcement that you get from doing research, and I mean, the recognition that you get from colleagues in your field. The pleasure comes from both discovery and recognition in research. In teaching there is nothing I value. It just makes me feel like I'm wasting time (Patrick, professor, natural sciences)."

Members of Group 2, the *burdened* faculty, have high levels of viewing teaching as a burden and a low appreciation for teaching as a blessing. The instructor who expresses disdain toward teaching in the following quote is representative of this group:

I can't stand teaching, especially with the kinds of students here. [. . .] The students don't take it seriously. It's a miserable experience. They don't think they have to do any reading. It is hell of a lot of work and it's so depressing how cynical students are and how much time they spend avoiding any intellectual activity, and how much we're expected to entertain. I'm not an entertainer, I'm a scholar and I never get to talk about the research I do. They look at you and they go "who is this person?" There is no sense of who you are and what you do, there is no respect. They're rude. And I don't want tell them what to do and how to behave. I'm not a policeman, I'm not a socializer, I'm not their mother, and it's a horrible position I'm in, and I have to compromise with them and with myself and I don't want to, and I hate it (Erika, professor, social sciences; Vannini, 2006, p. 248).

In contrast, members of Group 3, the *blessed* faculty, have high levels of viewing teaching as a blessing and a low orientation toward teaching as a burden. Their attitude is similar to the instructor in the following quote who is expressing satisfaction toward teaching:

I come in, I work my hours, sometimes it's nine and sometimes it's ten. I work a lot for my classes. I re-invent a lot of courses, I spend weeks choosing textbooks, I have websites for all my courses. I am writing a lab manual this summer. Not that I get paid any more by teaching better, but I just want to do better (Steve, instructor, natural sciences; Vannini, 2006, p. 252).

Finally, members of Group 4, the *complex* faculty, have high levels of viewing teaching as both a blessing and a burden. These faculty members appear to feel pulled between what may be their true feelings and how they have been socialized into their role. Perhaps they view teaching as a burden, but they believe that they should value it since it is one of their key responsibilities. Alternatively, they may truly value teaching, but see it as being burdensome because of the other demands of their roles.

**Display Rules and Emotional Labor**

Consistent with Ashforth and Humphrey (1993), Yugo argued that individuals who view their work as intrinsically meaningful are more likely to identify with it and accept its associated emotional demands or display rules. As suggested by Zembylas (2005, p. 200), "Emotional rules, like other rules, delineate a zone within which certain emotions are permitted and others are not permitted, and these rules can be obeyed or broken, at varying costs." These display rules are learned through the socialization process within the profession, role models from one's time as a student, and/or through professional norms and expectations (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Sutton, 2004). Display rules may be "disguised as ethical codes, professional techniques, and specialized pedagogical knowledge" (Zembylas, 2005, p. 201). Faculty are expected to adopt a professional demeanor in their interactions with students: being encouraging, insightful, and positive rather than aloof, angry, or demeaning. As suggested by Hargreaves (1998, p. 835), "Good teaching is charged with positive emotions. It is not just a matter of knowing one's subject, being efficient, having the correct competences, or learning all the right techniques. Good teachers are not just well-oiled machines. Rather, they are emotional, passionate beings who connect with their students and fill their work and their classes with pleasure, creativity, challenge and joy."

When individuals take these display rules to heart and internalize them as their own, rather than viewing them as being externally imposed, these rules are more likely to form part of their goals for emotional expression while teaching (Bonnano, 2001; Sutton, 2004). They will put effort into experiencing the emotions that they are expected to show (as in deep acting) and be more authentic when interacting with students. Conversely, those who have not internalized these display rules are more likely to comply with expectations for emotional display with minimal effort (as in surface acting). Also, following Wallace, Edwards, Shull, and Finch (2009), individuals who see teaching as a burden rather

than as a calling are unlikely to possess the emotional resources needed to perform deep acting. Such individuals will lack task focus as a result of suppressing or hiding their feelings and, consequently, experience their work as being less rewarding. Similarly, in her research concerning workers in a broad range of occupational groups, Yugo (2009) found that who considered their work to be a calling were more likely to engage in deep acting than those who were not personally invested in their work. In contrast, individuals who are professionally disconnected may engage in higher levels of surface acting since it requires less effort than attempting to generate authentic feelings (Wrzesniewski et al., 2003).

**Satisfaction and Burnout**

Since emotional labor has been associated with burnout (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003), it is possible that individuals with different teaching orientations will experience varying levels of burnout. As suggested by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993), individuals who identify with their work and internalize the display rules associated with their vocation are more likely to experience well-being in performing emotional labor. Furthermore, research has linked autonomous motivation, which is parallel to intrinsic motivation, with persistence in task performance (Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand & Briere, 2001), higher levels of job satisfaction (Karatepe & Tekinkus, 2006), lower levels of burnout (Fernet, Guay & Senécal, 2004; Johnson et al., 2005; Karatepe & Tekinkus, 2006; Lee, Durden & Cadogan, 2007; Low et al., 2001; Roth, Assor, Kanat-Maymon & Kaplan, 2007), and increased overall well-being (La Guardia, Ryan, Couchman & Deci, 2000; Niemiec et al., 2006; Ryan, Rigby & King, 1993). Similarly, Ryan and Connell (1989) found that autonomous motivation was associated with positive outcomes, whereas controlled motivation such as extrinsic motivation was linked with negative outcomes. Lee et al. (2007) found that extrinsically motivated sales staff experienced high burnout levels.

In his sample of service workers, Cossette (2008) found that autonomously motivated individuals were less likely to employ surface acting in their interactions with clients compared to other employees. In contrast to surface acting, deep acting was linked with positive outcomes for employees such as job satisfaction and work engagement in Cossette's study. Barber, Grawitch, Carson and Tsouloupas (2011) found that surface acting, whether it is supportive (positively valued) or disciplinary (negatively valued) in nature, leads to increased emotional exhaustion and reduced levels of personal accomplishment. In contrast, Barber et al. found that only supportive deep acting was associated with a higher sense of personal accomplishment. Similarly, in their studies of teachers, Zhang and Zhu (2008) and Noor and Zainuddin (2011) found that surface acting increased burnout and reduced work satisfaction, but deep acting had the opposite effects. These results are supported by Hülsheger and Schewe's (2011) meta-analysis which concluded that surface acting reduces well-being and job attitudes such as satisfaction. However, Hülsheger and Schewe found that deep acting was only weakly associated with these outcomes. Zyphur, Warren, Landis, and Thoresen (2007) as well as Liu, Prati, Perrewe and Ferris (2008) argued that performing surface acting drains the emotional resources that might be used for performing work-related functions. Moreover, since the emotional displays resulting from surface acting are inherently inauthentic, it is possible that workers receive less than favourable responses from customers who may be able to detect the nature of the emotional displays (Frank, Ekman & Friesen, 1993; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2006).

Based on the foregoing discussion, we propose that, relative to other faculty members, those who value teaching as a blessing are:

H1: (a) More likely to perceive the need to display positive emotions, and (b) less likely to perceive the need to hide negative emotions as part of their teaching roles.

H2: (a) Less likely to perform surface acting (hiding their feelings and faking emotions) while teaching, and (b) more likely to perform deep acting (attempt to feel the emotions that are required to be expressed).

H3: More likely to be satisfied with teaching and with students.

H4: Less likely to experience (a) emotional exhaustion and (b) cynicism, and (c) more likely to experience personal efficacy as teachers.

**METHOD**

**Sample and Procedure**

All faculty members (n=1250) of a medium-sized Canadian university were invited via e-mail to complete an online questionnaire using Survey Monkey of their work experiences pertaining to their teaching responsibilities. They were sent two follow-up reminders by e-mail. Questionnaires completed up to five weeks after the last e-mail reminder are reported in this study. A total of 311 individuals completed the questionnaire, 53.7 percent of whom were male. On average, they have been teaching at the college or university level for 16.06 years and at this particular university for 13.34 years. Respondents included: instructor/lecturers (15.7%), assistant professors (24.7%) associate professors (35%), full professors (18.4%), and others (6.3%). A total of 47% of respondents were tenured faculty, 22.6% were pre-tenured faculty, and 30.4% occupied contract or term positions.

**Measures**

*Teaching Orientation.* A total of 14 items tapping a professor's teaching orientation were developed specifically for this study. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the statements on a five point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Based on a principal components analysis with varimax rotation and an interpretation of the Scree plot, two factors were retained: factor 1 is labelled *Teaching as a Blessing* (5 items, $\alpha = .72$) and factor 2 is labelled *Teaching as a Burden* (4 items, $\alpha = .72$). Table 2 shows the item statements, factor loadings and summary statistics. The remaining five items were excluded since they loaded on a third factor, but also cross-loaded on the first two factors.

**TABLE 2**
**PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS OF TEACHING ORIENTATION ITEMS (N=311)**

|  | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|---|---|---|
| **Factor 1: Teaching is a blessing.** | | |
| 1. Teaching is central to my career. | .70 | -.01 |
| 2. Teaching is personally rewarding for me. | .69 | -.25 |
| 3. I am grateful for the opportunity to teach. | .65 | -.30 |
| 4. I take every opportunity to teach courses of interest to me. | .65 | -.04 |
| 5. I enjoy the challenges and opportunities of teaching new courses. | .61 | -.17 |
| **Factor 2: Teaching is a burden.** | | |
| 6. I would rather spend less time and energy in course preparation | -.12 | .74 |
| 7. Teaching interferes with other aspects of my work. | -.19 | .74 |
| 8. Teaching is a major burden for me. | -.27 | .71 |
| 9. I prefer a lighter teaching load than what I have currently. | -.02 | .66 |
| Eigenvalue | 2.22 | 2.31 |
| Percentage explained variance | 24.67 | 25.66 |

*Note.* Rotation converged after three iterations. Loadings of .60 or higher are shaded.

Based on a median split, we divided the responses into high and low ranges for each of the variables: teaching as a blessing or teaching as a burden. Although the use of median split procedures have been criticized for their potential impact on loss of information and power, recent research has found that median split procedures yield results that are comparable with the use of continuous variables in the absence of multi-collinearity issues (Iacobucci, Posavac, Kardes, Schneider, & Popovich, 2015). The dichotomization of the two variables permitted us to assign the study participants into one of four groups

as illustrated in Table 1: (1) Group 1 in which respondents viewed teaching as neither a blessing nor a burden (27.6% of sample); (2) Group 2 in which respondents viewed teaching solely as a burden (33.8% of sample); (3) Group 3 in which respondents viewed teaching uniquely as a blessing (27.2% of sample); and (4) Group 4 in which respondents appeared to view teaching as both a blessing and a burden (11.4% of sample). That only 27 % of the participants considered teaching to be a blessing rather than a burden contrasts with Leslie's (2002) research findings. Leslie concluded that, as a whole, faculty valued teaching to such an extent that the personal satisfaction that it offered was more important than the significantly greater extrinsic rewards associated with success as a researcher.

*Emotion Variables.* The Emotion Work Requirements Scale (Best et al., 1997) was used to measure how frequently respondents were required to show positive emotions (4 items, $\alpha$ = .72), or hide negative emotions (3 items; $\alpha$ = .77) as part of their role as instructors. Sample items of this 5-point scale (1 = not at all, 5 = always) include: "Remaining calm even when you are astonished," and "Hiding disgust over something someone has done." Emotional labor was measured by the revised Emotional Labour Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Lee & Brotheridge, 2011). Respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale (1=not at all, 5=always) how frequently they engaged in a specified behaviour during a typical teaching week. These included: (a) hiding feelings (3 items; $\alpha$ = .82; e.g., hide your true feelings about a situation), (b) faking emotions (3 items; $\alpha$ = .86; e.g., show emotions that you don't feel), and (c) deep acting (3 items; $\alpha$ =. 88; e.g., Try to actually experience the emotions that you must show).

*Outcome Variables.* Satisfaction with teaching and students were measured with six 5-point items (1=very dissatisfied; 5=very satisfied) developed by Plax, Kearney, and Downs (1986). Personal satisfaction with teaching ($\alpha$ = .66; e.g., Everything considered, how satisfying has teaching been for you?) and one's satisfaction level with students ($\alpha$ = .73; e.g., In general, how satisfied are you with the motivation of your students?) were each assessed with three items. Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, and Jackson's (1996) Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey with minor wording changes to reflect teaching context (5-point response scale, 1=never, 5=always) was used to measure: (a) *emotional exhaustion* (5 items; $\alpha$ = .88; e.g., I feel emotionally drained from my teaching), (b) *cynicism* (5 items; $\alpha$ = . 80; e.g., I have become more cynical about whether my teaching contributes anything), and (c) *personal efficacy* (6 items; $\alpha$ = .79; e.g., In my opinion, I am good at teaching).

**RESULTS**

Table 3 shows the description statistics and zero-order correlations of the study variables. As indicated in this table, respondents engaged in deep acting somewhat more frequently than both dimensions of surface acting: hiding feelings and faking expressed emotions. This is consistent with Zhang and Zhu's (2008) findings in their study of Chinese college instructors. Teaching as a burden was positively associated with perceiving the display rule to hide negative feelings, hiding and faking feelings, exhaustion and cynicism. It was also negatively associated with teaching and student satisfaction as well as personal efficacy. In contrast, teaching as a blessing was positively associated with perceiving the display rule to show positive emotions, deep acting, satisfaction with teaching and students, and personal efficacy. It was negatively correlated with exhaustion and cynicism. Hiding feelings and faking emotions were negatively correlated with satisfaction levels and efficacy, but positively correlated with the two remaining burnout scales. In contrast, deep acting was not significantly associated with any of these outcome variables.

**TABLE 3**
**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND CORRELATIONS OF STUDY VARIABLES**

| | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Burden | 2.62 | 0.77 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Blessing | 4.07 | 0.56 | -0.39** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Show + | 3.04 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.23** | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.Hide - | 1.70 | 0.57 | 0.21** | 0.00 | 0.41** | | | | | | | | |
| 5.Hiding | 2.36 | 0.70 | 0.27** | -0.10 | 0.28** | 0.45** | | | | | | | |
| 6.Faking | 1.76 | 0.69 | 0.21** | -0.08 | 0.23** | 0.42** | 0.61** | | | | | | |
| 7.D. Acting | 2.45 | 1.09 | -0.03 | 0.12* | 0.33** | 0.29** | 0.18** | 0.35** | | | | | |
| 8.T. Sat. | 4.12 | 0.69 | -0.43** | 0.49** | 0.11* | -0.09 | -0.27** | -0.17** | 0.09 | | | | |
| 9.S. Sat. | 3.70 | 0.63 | -0.20** | 0.23** | -0.01 | -0.22** | -0.30** | -0.19** | -0.01 | 0.37** | | | |
| 10.Exhaustion | 2.63 | 0.83 | 0.51** | -0.28** | 0.12* | 0.30** | 0.47** | 0.35** | 0.04 | -0.45** | -0.39** | | |
| 11.Cynicism | 2.09 | 0.69 | 0.47** | -0.43** | -0.03 | 0.25** | 0.44** | 0.36** | 0.01 | -0.61** | -0.42** | .65** | |
| 12.Efficacy | 4.01 | 0.51 | -0.29** | 0.55** | 0.17** | -0.05 | -0.21** | -0.13* | 0.07 | 0.51** | 0.29** | -.29** | -.53** |

*Note.* *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$. (n=311)

To test the hypotheses, we first conducted a two-way ANOVA using teaching orientations (Teaching as a Blessing and Teaching as a Burden) as the independent variables and the remaining variables as dependent variables. These teaching orientations had a significant effect on showing positive emotions, $F (3, 260) = 5.14$, $p < .01$, hiding negative emotions, $F (3, 261) = 3.42$, $p < .05$, hiding feelings, $F (3, 243) = 6.17$, $p < .001$, faking expressed emotions, $F (3, 240) = 4.26$, $p < .01$, teaching satisfaction, $F (3, 251) = 30.10$, $p < .001$, satisfaction with students, $F (3, 254) = 30.10$, $p < .001$, emotional exhaustion, $F (3, 224) = 23.52$, $p < .001$, cynicism, $F (3, 228) = 21.70$, $p < .001$, and efficacy $F (3, 226) = 22.76$, $p < .001$. A significant main effect was not found for deep acting, $F (3, 238) = 2.56$, $p < .055$, ns.

Next, paired comparisons using the Tukey *t*-test were performed to test the four hypotheses for all dependent variables except for deep acting. Consistent with H1, members of Group 3 were significantly more likely to perceive the need to display positive emotions (relative to Group 1) and less likely to perceive the need to hide negative emotions as part of their teaching roles (relative to Group 4). In support of hypothesis 2, members of Group 3 were significantly less likely to perform surface acting (hiding their feelings (relative to Group 2) and faking emotions (relative to Group 4) while teaching. As predicted in hypotheses 3 and 4, members of Group 3 were more satisfied with teaching (relative to all other groups) and with students (relative to Group 2) and likely to experience lower levels of exhaustion (relative to Groups 2 and 4), lower levels of cynicism (relative to all other groups), and higher levels of personal efficacy as teachers (relative to all other groups).

Members of Group 1, those viewing teaching as neither a burden nor a blessing, can be best characterized as 'staying under the radar' in the sense that their emotional discourse is rather subdued. Of the four groups, they are the least likely to perceive a display rule to show positive emotions or to hide negative emotions, and they do not perform much emotional labor. They hide and fake emotions about as much as Group 3 (which is rather low). Moreover, members of this group are minimally influenced by the outcomes of emotional labor. In their inaction, they are demonstrating amotivation, which "results from a person not valuing a behaviour or outcome, not believing that a valued outcome is reliably linked to specific behaviours, or believing that there are behaviours instrumental to a valued outcome but not feeling competent to do those instrumental behaviours" (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 16). This may explain their relatively low mean levels of personal efficacy relative to group 3 (Table 4). They may experience a disconnection between their efforts and the resulting outcomes, in other words, a lack of control over outcomes due to forces beyond their control (Vallerand et al., 1992). These individuals may be simply getting by and seeking to avoid attention, whether negative or positive. Perhaps, they are preoccupied

with other aspects of their role as faculty and have not given any thought to teaching as either a blessing or a burden.

**TABLE 4**
**MEANS (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) AND PAIRED COMPARISONS (N=311)**

| Variable | Group 1 Disengaged | Group 2 Burdened | Group 3 Blessed | Group 4 Complex |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Show Positive | $2.87^{ab}$ | $2.97^{c}$ | $3.15^{a}$ | $3.31^{bc}$ |
|  | (.60) | (.62) | (.66) | (.74) |
| Hide Negative | $1.60^{d}$ | 1.76 | $1.63^{e}$ | $1.91^{de}$ |
|  | (.47) | (.54) | (.55) | (.76) |
| Hiding | $2.22^{g}$ | $2.56^{gh}$ | $2.22^{h}$ | 2.46 |
|  | (.68) | (.69) | (.61) | (.85) |
| Faking | 1.65 | 1.89 | $1.64^{i}$ | $1.97^{i}$ |
|  | (.59) | (.74) | (.57) | (.93) |
| Teaching Sat. | $4.11^{lmn}$ | $3.70^{lop}$ | $4.58^{moq}$ | $4.11^{npq}$ |
|  | (.58) | (.66) | (.50) | (.68) |
| Student Sat. | $3.77^{r}$ | $3.49^{rs}$ | $3.85^{s}$ | 3.69 |
|  | (.52) | (.63) | (.57) | (.79) |
| Exhaustion | $2.36^{tu}$ | $3.22^{tv}$ | $2.20^{vw}$ | $2.91^{uw}$ |
|  | (.68) | (.83) | (.65) | (.79) |
| Cynicism | $2.03^{xy}$ | $2.48^{xz}$ | $1.66^{yzâ}$ | $2.19^{â}$ |
|  | (.62) | (.62) | (.56) | (.73) |
| Efficacy | $3.96^{bç}$ | $3.73^{bd}$ | $4.20^{cdé}$ | $4.14^{é}$ |
|  | (.45) | (.52) | (.41) | (.45) |

*Note.* The Tukey *t*-test was used in all paired comparisons. Matching superscripts indicate a mean difference that is significant at the .05 level.

In contrast to Group 1, members of Group 2, who view teaching exclusively as a burden, appear to be significantly troubled by multiple facets of their profession. Of all the respondents in the survey, they have the highest level of hiding feelings and the second highest level of faking emotions. They are the least satisfied with teaching and students. Finally, members of this group report the highest levels of all three burnout dimensions.

In contrast to the preceding groups, members of Group 3 view teaching as an inherent blessing and calling. They perceive the display rule as requiring instructors to show positive emotions and report engaging low levels of hiding and faking of emotions. Of all the respondents, they experience the highest level of satisfaction with teaching and students. Finally, they have the lowest levels on all three burnout dimensions.

Finally, members of Group 4, who view teaching as both a burden and a blessing, appear to have an ambivalent or complex relationship with teaching. They report perceiving the display rules as requiring instructors to show positive emotions as well as to hide negative emotions. They engage in moderate level of hiding their feelings, high levels of faking their displayed emotions. Of the four groups, they have the second highest levels of emotional exhaustion, cynicism and low personal efficacy. So, they *toe the party line*, work overtime at managing their emotions, and, as a result, feel burned out. Moreover, despite their efforts, they are not getting the results (satisfaction) obtained by those who see teaching as a true blessing. It is possible that they are confused as a result of receiving mixed signals: they are expected to value teaching, but it takes time away from their research, which is what will give them tenure and promotions.

**Demographic Differences in Groups**

To compare the demographic profiles of the four groups, we conducted follow-up analyses. Members of Group 1, who we labeled as disengaged consulting-oriented faculty, taught the lowest number of

courses (3.12) and the lowest number of students (126.27) in the past 12 months, spent the least amount of time teaching (31.78%), and spent the most time on consulting (28.97%). They tended to be contract or term faculty (37.1%) or tenured faculty (27.8%).

Members of Group 2, new researchers trying to establish themselves, had the fewest years of experience (12.93 years) and spent the most time conducting research (33.38%). They tended to be pre-tenured faculty (48.1%) or tenured faculty (28.78%). Nothing else differentiated them from the remaining groups.

Members of Group 3, experienced administration and teaching-focused faculty, taught more courses in the past 12 months than others (3.95), spent the least amount of time doing research (23.80%), the most time on administration (25.29%), and had the highest number of years of experience (19.71 years). They tended to be contract or term faculty (31.4%) or tenured faculty (33.3%).

Finally, members of Group 4, teaching-focused pre-tenured faculty, taught more students in the past 12 months than others (285.61), spent the most time teaching (43.94%) and spent the least amount of time on administration (10.85%) and consulting (5.14%). They tended to be pre-tenured faculty (26.9%). Although Group 1 had the highest percentage of males (53.1%) and Group 2 had the lowest percentage of males (42.9%), there were no overall differences in gender proportions across groups.

## DISCUSSION

This study considered how university faculty with different teaching orientations view the emotional rules related to their occupation, how they invest in their work in an emotional sense, and how they experience their work. It differentiated among four groups of faculty on indicators of wellbeing. In the strongest position are the members of Group 3 (teaching is a blessing) and then Group 1 who are emotionally detached. Next is Group 4 for whom the negative effects of viewing teaching as a burden may be attenuated by also seeing teaching as a blessing. The members of the group that are the worst off in terms of outcomes, Group 2, are those who view teaching entirely as a burden. As indicated in post-hoc analyses, these tend to be pre-tenured or tenured faculty.

**Implications for Interactions with Students**

In terms of teaching performance, does it matter whether faculty are simply complying with emotional norms by surface acting? It is likely that students are able to detect the nature of the emotional labor being performed by faculty (Cacioppo Bernston, Larsen, Poehlmann & Ito, 2000; Groth, Hennig-Thurau & Walsh, 2009; Tomas & Montgomery, 1998). Groth et al. found that the manner in which service workers regulated their emotions influence customers' service evaluations. In particular, deep acting communicates that the service is more customer oriented and shows an effort to meet customer needs in a more authentic and sincere fashion (Hennig-Thurau Groth, Paul & Gremler, 2006). Deep acting is likely to yield positive responses from interaction partners (Côté, 2005). In contrast, when service providers engage in surface acting, they are perceived to lack sincere interest in meeting client needs, and they are more likely to receive negative evaluations and reactions such as anger or disrespect. If faculty members show disinterest in their subject matter and are aloof toward students, students may react in a hostile manner (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). Research indicates that faculty members' emotions influence students' ability to learn (Pekrun, Goetz, Titz & Perry, 2002; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). As well, there is a potential for emotional contagion such that the students become influenced by the emotions displayed by faculty members (Cacioppo Bernston et al., 2000). Incivility will be returned with incivility from students as they assume that this is acceptable behaviour (Kuhlenschmidt & Layne, 1999). Moreover, as argued by Czikszentmihalyi (1982, p. 21), "The teacher who does not find his or her subject matter worthwhile in and of itself, but teaches it only for extrinsic reasons - pay or prestige - wastes his own time and conveys the message to students that learning is only a means to other ends and lacks intrinsic value."

**Contextual Influences**

Contextual factors may also influence faculty's teaching orientation and, hence, group membership. A number of researchers have pointed to the increasing organizational challenges that faculty are facing as an important influence on their teaching. They argue that the growing culture of managerialism (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004) results in faculty having less academic freedom overall and, more specifically, less influence over curriculum development and classroom policies. Similarly, it has been argued that educational institutions are adopting a corporate structure and market values to the detriment of traditional academic values (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, 2001; Stormer & Devine, 2008). As argued by Poovey (2001, p. 419), in a market system, "research should be governed by the profit motive; teaching is a marketable commodity...and universities are like corporations in their investments, their global pretensions, and their incessant drive to generate a more efficient value-chain."

These cultural and structural changes in academia may lead to the perception that students function more as customers than as learners, and that faculty are service providers aiming to please as measured by teaching evaluations (Willmott, 1995). The resulting dynamic may well be that students become degree purchasers who are more interested in the market value of their diplomas than the learning that they represent (Vannini, 2006; Willmott, 1995) and who want to be entertained (Bellas, 1999).

> Some students may see themselves as customers, their instructors as service providers, and good grades as something they deserve as a matter of course and as part of the exchange, not something to be earned through diligent and insightful work subjected to careful faculty review.... Students now see professors less as intellectual leaders who are to be respected and more as simply gatekeepers (even impediments) on the students' path to educational completion and the desired better job. Hence, they are more likely to attend class late and leave early, call professors by their first names, skip class, entertain themselves by texting and using laptops, and fail to respond to the intellectual climate proffered by their professors (Lippmann, Bulanda & Wagenaar, 2009, p. 199).

Student disengagement from learning has significant negative impacts on instructor affect, self-efficacy, and motivation (Kitching, Morgan & O'Leary, 2009). These contextual factors place dual pressure on faculty members: pressure from above (e.g., an imposed curriculum or performance standards) and pressure from below (e.g., students expecting to be entertained) (Pelletier, Seguin-Levesque & Legault, 2002). The end result is reduced autonomous motivation for teaching on the part of faculty (Pelletier et al.).

**A Choice between Teaching and Research?**

The 'publish or perish' culture of universities drives faculty to direct their attention and efforts towards research (Vannini, 2006). If academic rewards emphasize research and grants, then faculty members will focus their energy in this direction. In this research, Miller, Taylor and Bedeian (2011) found that tenured and, especially, non-tenured faculty experienced this pressure and, consequently, marginalized teaching and increased stress levels. In particular, 53% of their respondents considered teaching to be a distraction from research, and 39% believed that the pressure to publish took their attention away from teaching. Similarly, Bergeron and Liang (2007) found a negative correlation between time invested in teaching and research such that the more time faculty invested in teaching, the lower their publication levels.

**Practical Implications**

When hiring faculty members, it may be worthwhile to consider the nature of individuals' motivation for entering the profession: are they truly interested in teaching, or do they have an instrumental orientation toward teaching? The latter more closely resembles the motives of the nurses referenced in Horeczy (2013, p. 1): "There's plenty of non-caring people that thrive in nursing....They make good money, they have flexibility in their work, they get to move around. They might not really give a fiddler's fart about somebody."

Faculty should be encouraged to develop the teaching orientation of teaching as a blessing. Research points to several alternatives for doing so. First, greater emphasis should be placed on providing constructive feedback on faculty teaching. Since negative feedback weakens intrinsic motivation and creates a sense of amotivation, it should be avoided or, at the very least, presented in a constructive manner (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2008) proposes that, rather than offering rewards such as bonuses for work well done, receiving positive feedback for effective teaching may be an effective way to enhance levels of intrinsic motivation since it communicates information about one's competence levels.

In contrast, others argue that extrinsic rewards should be offered to motivate faculty members to invest effort in their teaching (Mowday & Nam, 1997). Van Fleet and Peterson (2005) propose that the marketplace value of teaching be given the same importance as that of research. "It may be that for some faculty research and teaching are complementary and enhance one another, but for most, good teaching takes time away from research, and if it is only research that is financially rewarded, the incentives to spend any more than the minimally required time on teaching and student advising are absent" (Melguizo & Strober, 2007, p. 664).

Second, faculty members should be provided with more autonomy and choice in the relative weighting of the three elements of professorial work and in how they carry out their work (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This is especially important since individuals experience negative affect when the organization of their work is imposed on them rather than freely chosen (Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1986). "When administrators and colleagues are more autonomy-oriented, when teachers have opportunities to try new things, to teach in idiosyncratic ways, to choose optimal challenges, they seem to be more intrinsically motivated....[and] motivating teachers is unlikely to be a problem" (Deci & Ryan, 1982, p. 30).

Third, senior management should cultivate a culture that encourages an intrinsic interest in teaching through "frequent interaction, collaboration, and community among faculty about issues pertaining to teaching" (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995, p. 32). This teaching culture would increase the frequency of formal and informal dialogues about effective teaching and reduce faculty's sense of isolation (Frost & Teodorescu, 2001). It might also deter faculty from adopting facades of conformity in which they give the impression that they share the institution's core values (even when they do not) since doing so may be necessary to succeed (Stormer & Devine, 2008). For example, in their study, Stormer and Devine found that a number of respondents hid their interest in teaching from others, while others simply pretended to enjoy teaching because it was the politically correct thing to do.

> I work teaching at a major university. That university espouses teaching as a primary goal—the reality is that teaching really matters little in my annual review process. As a result, I "talk the talk" about respecting students, having concerns about pedagogy, and doing course development. The reality? I spend as little time as possible on teaching as it has little payback to me during tenure and review. (Stormer & Devine, 2008, p. 119).

A supportive teaching culture signals the value of learning for its own sake among academics and students alike. It and the other recommendations presented may encourage faculty to see teaching is a blessing and, consequently, to emotionally engage in their teaching.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Given that this study employed a cross sectional self-report design, it is possible that common methods variance (CMV) influenced study results. We used the Harman single-factor test (Malhotra, Kim, & Patil, 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff, 2003) to assess the extent to which CMV was present. According to this test, if one factor emerges or if the first factor accounts for most of the variance in the variables, then CMV is likely present. Our analyses indicate that this was not the case. Based on a principal components analysis with varimax rotation, 12 factors emerged with eigenvalues great than 1, accounting for 69.75% of the total variance. No general factor was apparent. Furthermore, given the intrapsychic nature of the variables, which were the respondents' emotional regulations, motivational states, and teaching experiences, our use of a retrospective self-report design was both appropriate and revealing.

This research took place at a medium-sized comprehensive university (i.e., one that offers a broad range of professional programs including medicine and law) that places relatively equal emphasis on teaching and research. The generalizability of the study's results could be examined by undertaking future research in different types of universities, for example, small teaching schools vs. large research-focused schools. It is possible that faculty in large research-focused schools would feel even more pressure to publish and, consequently, find teaching to be more of an impediment than a calling. Conversely, faculty attracted to working in teaching oriented schools are likely to place teaching at the core of their responsibilities and source of satisfaction.

Additionally, diary-based research that examines the nature of faculty members' emotional engagement and outcomes in various teaching-related situations (planning for classes, lecturing, grading, dealing with disciplinary issues, etc.) may help to pinpoint specific aspects of teaching that faculty find particularly burdensome. It is possible that student incivility is driving faculty's experience of teaching as burdensome and resulting in a sense of strain (Jiang, Tripp, & Hong, 2017).

Finally, future research should consider faculty's motivation in a longitudinal manner as way of determining how it may ebb and flow over the course of their career. Such research may also help faculty find the means of dealing with pressures to publish and other factors that may dampen their enthusiasm for teaching (Crooks & Castleden, 2012; Özbilgin, 2009; Prasad, 2013). This research may also inspire and reassure future faculty that they are "doing work that matters" (Bell, 2009) when they are teaching.

## REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E. and Humphrey, R. H. (1993), "Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity", *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 18, pp. 88-115.

Barber, L. K., Grawitch, M. J., Carson, R. L. and Tsouloupas, C. N. (2011), "Costs and benefits of supportive versus disciplinary emotion regulation strategies in teachers", *Stress and Health*, Vol. 27, pp. 173-187.

Barr, R. and Tagg, J. (1995), "From teaching to learning–a new paradigm for undergraduate education", *Change*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 12-25.

Bartlett, S. J. (1994), "The psychology of faculty demoralization in the liberal arts: Burnout, *acedia*, and the disintegration of idealism", *New Ideas in Psychology*, Vol.12, pp. 277-289.

Bell M. P. (2009), "Introduction: Special section, doing work that matters", Academy of Management Learning and Education, Vol. 8, pp. 96–98.

Bellas, M. L. (1999), "Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 561, pp. 96-110.

Bergeron, D.M. and Liang, X.F. (2007), "Thriving in the academy: A model of faculty career success", In Solomon, G.T. (Ed.), "*Proceedings of the 2007 Academy of Management Annual Meeting* (pp. 1-6), "Philadelphia, PA.

Best, R. G., Downey, R. G. and Jones, R. G. (1997, April), "*Incumbents' perceptions of emotional work requirements",* Paper presented at the 12th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.

Brotheridge, C. M. and Lee, R. T. (2003), "Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 365-379.

Brotheridge, C. M. and Lee, R. T. (2005), "Correlates and consequences of degree purchasing among Canadian university students", *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 35, pp. 71-97.

Byrne, B. M. (1991), "Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary and university educators", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 197-209.

Cardador, M. T. and Pratt, M.G. (2006), "Occupational identity and the meaning of work: toward an expanded understanding of work orientation", Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Cacioppo, J. T., Bernston, G. G., Larsen, J. T., Poehlmann, K. M. and Ito, T. A. (2000), "The psychophysiology of emotion", In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), "*Handbook of emotions* (2ⁿᵈ ed., pp. 173-191), Guilford Press, New York.

Constanti, P. and Gibbs, P. (2004), "Higher education teachers and emotional labour", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 243–249.

Cossette, M. (2008), "*Styles de régulation émotionnelle des employés de service: Antécédents organisationnels, motivation et conséquences sur santé psychologique*", Dissertation presented as a partial requirement for a doctorat in psychology, December 2008, Université du Québec à Montréal.

Côté, S. (2005), "A social interaction model of the effects of emotion regulation on work strain", *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 30, pp. 509–530.

Crooks, V. and Castleden, H. (2012), "All we really needed to know about tenure-track faculty positions we did not learn in graduate school", *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, Vol. 56, pp.393-397.

Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2001), "The occupational socialization of a first-year physical education teacher with a teaching orientation", *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 6, pp. 81-105.

Czikszentmihalyi, M. (1982), "Intrinsic motivation and effective teaching: A flow analysis", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 10, pp. 15-26.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (1982), "Intrinsic motivation to teach: Possibilities and obstacles in our colleges and universities", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 10, pp. 27-35.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (1985), "*Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2008), "Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains", *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, Vol. 49, pp. 14-23.

Emmons, R. A., Diener, E. D. and Larsen, R. J. (1986), "Choice and avoidance of everyday situations and affect congruence: Two models of reciprocal interactionism", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, pp. 815-826.

Fernet, C., Guay, F. and Senécal, C. (2004), "Adjusting to job demands: The role of work self-determination and job control in predicting burnout", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 65, pp. 39-56.

Friedrichsen, P., Driel, J. H. V. and Abell, S. K. (2011), "Taking a closer look at science teaching orientations", *Science Education*, Vol. 95, pp. 358-376.

Frost, S. H. and Teodorescu, D. (2001), "Teaching excellence: How faculty guided change at a research university", *Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 24, pp. 397-415.

Greenwood, A. M. (2003), "Factors influencing the development of career-change teachers' science teaching orientation", *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, Vol. 14, pp. 217-234.

Groth, M., Hennig-Thurau, T. and Walsh, G. (2009), "Customer reactions to emotional labor: The roles of employee acting strategies and customer detection accuracy", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52, pp. 958–974.

Hargreaves, A. (1998), "The emotional practice of teaching", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 14, pp. 835–854.

Harlow, R. (2003), "'Race doesn't matter, but...': The effect of race on professors' experiences and emotion management in the undergraduate college classroom", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 66, pp. 348-363.

Hennessey, B. A. and Amabile, T. M. (2005), "Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation", *Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, 1-1.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Groth, M., Paul, M. and Gremler, D. D. (2006), "Are all smiles created equal? How emotional contagion and emotional labor affect service relationships", *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 70, pp 58–73.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983), *The managed heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Horeczy, B. (2013), "Nurses make a difference: Caring is key to halt burnout, veterans say", *Saskatoon Star Phoenix* (February 16, Jobs section, 1-2),

Hülsheger, U. R. and Schewe, A. F. (2011), "On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 16, pp. 361-389.

Iacobucci, D., Posavac, S. S., Kardes, F. R., Schneider, M., and Popovich, D. (2015), "The median split: Robust, refined, and revived", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 690–704.

Ito, J. K. and Brotheridge, C. M. (2007), "Predicting individual research productivity: More than a question of time", *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 37, pp. 1-25.

Jiang, L., Tripp, T. M., and Hong, P. Y. (2017), "College instruction is not so stress free after all: A qualitative and quantitative study of academic entitlement, uncivil behaviors, and instructor strain and burnout", *Stress and Health*, Vol.33, pp. 1-12.

Kane, R., Sandretto, S. and Heath, C. (2002), "Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 72, pp. 177–228.

Karatepe, O. M. and Tekinkus, M. (2006), "The effects of work-family conflict, emotional exhaustion, and intrinsic motivation on job outcomes of front-line employees", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 24, pp. 173-193.

Kember, D. and Gow, L. (1994), "Orientations to teaching and their effect on the quality of student learning", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 65, pp. 58-74.

Kitching, K., Morgan, M. and O'Leary, M. (2009), "It's the little things: Exploring the importance of commonplace events for early-career teachers' motivation", *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, Vol. 15, pp. 43-58.

Kuhlenschmidt, S. L. and Layne, L. E., (1999), "Strategies for dealing with difficult behavior", In S.M. Richardson (Ed.), *Promoting civility: A teaching challenge* (pp. 45-58), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

La Guardia, J. G., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E. and Deci, E. L. (2000), "Within-person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well-being", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 79, pp. 367–384.

Lee, N., Durden, G. R. and Cadogan, J. W. (2007), "Work-related stressors and psychological strain in the sales force: the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation", *Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 8, pp. 371-400.

Lee, R. T. and Brotheridge, C. M. (2011), "Words from the heart speak to the heart: A study of deep acting, faking, and hiding among child care workers", *Career Development International*, Vol. 16, pp. 401-420.

Leslie, D. W. (2002), "Resolving the dispute: Teaching is academe's core value", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 73, pp. 49-73.

Lippmann, S., Bulanda, R. E. and Wagenaar, T. C. (2009), "Student entitlement: Issues and strategies for confronting entitlement in the classroom and beyond", *College Teaching*, Vol. 57, pp. 197-204.

Liu, Y., Prati, L. M., Perrewe, P. L. and Ferris, G. R. (2008), "The relationship between emotional resources and emotional labor: an exploratory study", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* Vol. 38, pp. 2410-2439.

Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S. and Patil, A. (2006), "Common method variance in IS research: A comparison of alternative approaches and a reanalysis of past research", *Management Science*, Vol. 52, pp. 1865-1883.

Melguizo, T. and Strober, M. H. (2007), "Faculty salaries and the maximization of prestige", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 48, pp. 633-68.

Miller, A. N., Taylor, S. G. and Bedeian, A. G. (2011), "Publish or perish: Academic life as management faculty live it", *Career Development International*, Vol. 16, pp. 422-445.

Mowday, R. T. and Nam, S. H. (1997), "Expectancy theory approaches to faculty motivation", In J. L. Bess (Ed.), "*Teaching well and liking it: Motivating faculty to teaching effectively* (pp. 110-124), "Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Niemiec, C. P., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., Bernstein, J., Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2006), "The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A self-determination theory perspective on socialization", *Journal of Adolescence,* Vol. 29, pp. 761–775.

Noor, N. M. and Zainuddin, M. (2011), "Emotional labor and burnout among female teachers: Work–family conflict as mediator", *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 283-293.

Ogbonna, E. and Harris, L. C. (2004), "Work intensification and emotional labour among UK university lecturers: An exploratory study", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 25, pp. 1185-1203.

Özbilgin, M. F. (2009), "From journal rankings to making sense of the world", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 8, pp. 113-121.

Parker, J. (2003), "Reconceptualising the curriculum: From commodification to transformation", *Teaching in Higher Education,* Vol. 8, pp. 529-543.

Paulsen, M. B. and Feldman, K. A. (1995), "*Taking teaching seriously: Meeting the challenge of instructional improvement",* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J. and Briere, N. M. (2001), "Associations among perceived autonomy support, forms of self-regulation, and persistence: A prospective study", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 25, pp. 279-306.

Pelletier, G. L., Seguin-Levesque, C. and Legault, L. (2002), "Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors", *Journal of Educational Psychology,* Vol. 94, pp. 186–196.

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W. and Perry, R. (2002), "Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research", *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 37, pp. 67–68.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P. and Downs, T. M. (1986), "Communicating control in the classroom and satisfaction with teaching and students", *Communication Education*, Vol. 35, pp. 379-388.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *88, pp.* 879-903.

Poovey, M. (2001), "For everything else, there's . . .", *Social Research,* Vol. 68, pp. 397-427.

Prasad, A. (2013), "Playing the game and trying not to lose myself: a doctoral student's perspective on the institutional pressures for research output", *Organization*, Vol. 20, pp. 936-948.

Richmond, V. P. and McCroskey, J. C. (Eds.) (1992), *Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Roth, G., Assor, A., Kanat-Maymon, Y. and Kaplan, H. (2007), "Autonomous motivation for teaching: How self-determined teaching may lead to self-determined learning", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 99, pp. 761-774.

Ryan, R. M. and Connell, J. P. (1989), "Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 57, pp. 749–761.

Ryan, R. M., Rigby, S. and King, K. (1993), "Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientations and mental health", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 65, pp. 586-596.

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C. and Jackson, S. E. (1996), "The MBI-General Survey", In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson and M. P. Leiter (Eds.), "*Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual* (3rd ed., pp. 19-26), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.

Serow, R. C., Eaker, D. and Ciechalski, J. (1992), "Calling, service, and legitimacy: Professional orientations and career commitment among prospective teachers", *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. Vol. 25, pp. 136-141.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. L. (1997), *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. L. (2001), "Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism", *Organization,* Vol. 8, pp. 154-161.

Stebbins, R. A. (2004), *Between work and leisure: The common ground of two separate worlds.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Stormer, F. and Devine, K. (2008), "Acting at work: Façades of conformity in academia", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 17, pp. 112-134.

Sutton, R. E. (2004), "Emotional regulation goals and strategies of teachers", *Social Psychology of Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 379-398.

Sutton, R. E. and Wheatley, K. F. (2003), "Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research", *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 327–358.

Turk, J. L. (2000), "What commercialization means for education", In J. L. Turk (Ed.), *The corporate campus: Commercialization and the dangers to Canada's colleges and universities* (pp. 3-14), Toronto: Canadian Association of University Teachers/James Lorimer and Company.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C. and Vallières, E. F. (1992), "The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 52, pp. 1003–1017.

Van Fleet, D. D. and Peterson, T. O. (2005), "Increasing the value of teaching in the academic marketplace: The creation of a peer-review infrastructure for teaching", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 4, pp. 506-514.

Vannini, P. (2006), "Dead Poets' Society: Teaching, publish-or-perish, and professors' experiences of authenticity", *Symbolic Interaction*, Vol. 29, pp. 235-257.

Wallace, J. C., Edwards, B. D., Shull, A. and Finch, D. M. (2009), "Examining the consequences in the tendency to suppress and reappraise emotions on task-related job performance", *Human Performance*, Vol. 22, pp. 23-43.

Willmott, H. (1995), "Managing the academics: Commodification and control in the development of university education in the UK", *Human Relations,* Vol. 48, pp. 993-1114.

Winograd, K. (2003), "The functions of teacher emotions: The good, the bad and the ugly", *Teachers Colleges Record*, Vol. 105, pp. 1641-1673.

Wrzesniewski, A., Dutton, J. E. and Debebe, G. (2003), "Interpersonal sense-making and the meaning of work", *Research in Organizational Behavior,* Vol. 25, pp. 93-135.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley C. R., Rozin, P. and Schwartz B. (1997), "Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work", *Journal of Research in Personality,* Vol. 31, pp. 21-33.

Yugo, J. E. (2009), *The role of calling in emotional labor*. A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Zembylas, M. (2005), "'Structures of feeling' in curriculum and teaching: Theorizing the emotional rules", *Educational Theory*, Vol. 52, pp. 187-208.

Zhang, Q. and Zhu, W. (2008), "Exploring emotion in teaching: Emotional labor, burnout, and satisfaction in Chinese higher education", *Communication Education*, Vol. 57, pp. 105-122.

Zyphur, M. J. Warren, C. R., Landis, R. S. and Thoresen, C. J. (2007), "Self-regulation and performance in high fidelity simulations: An extension of ego-depletion research. *Human Performance,* Vol. 20, pp. 103–118.