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**ARTICLE INFO**

**Purpose:** Teachers are members of a profession that requires high levels of emotional labor. Committed employees tend to put more effort for their organizations. If so, organizational commitment may be a potential facilitator for teachers to act in line with schools’ expectations about emotions. The present research aims to explore the predicting role of teachers’ commitments to their schools on their displaying emotional labor during interactions with their students.

**Research Methods:** In this study, 375 teachers, working in elementary, middle, and high schools from a central Black Sea region province of Turkey participated. Data were gathered through the Scale of Emotional Labor in Teaching and the Organizational Commitment Scale. The relationships were analyzed through Pearson’s correlation coefficient and hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses.

**Findings:** The findings obtained in this study indicated that teachers’ commitments in the identification and internalization dimensions were positively correlated with their level of displaying emotional labor in the surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotions dimensions. Teachers’ commitments in the internalization dimension were determined to be the most significant predictor of each of the three emotional labor strategies.

**Implications for Research and Practice:** The results of the study add a new brick to the teacher emotional labor literature presenting that internalized teacher commitment may be an important factor to sustain teachers display their emotions in line with the school expectations.
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Introduction

Teachers establish face-to-face close relationships with students. The quality of these relationships is closely related to teachers’ emotional states and the way that they display their feelings. Students want energetic, sympathetic, cheerful, tolerant, and polite teachers. It can be claimed that academic achievement increases in such teachers’ classrooms (Barr, 1958; Mowrer-Reynolds, 2008; Thompson, Greer, & Greer, 2004). Like students, the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), parents, and school administrators expect teachers to display appropriate emotions. Truta (2014) states that teachers are constantly in close contact with students, parents and various segments of the society and that this interaction is much more intense compared to other professions. As King and Chen (2019) stated, both students and teachers experience a wide variety of emotions from negative to positive during teaching and learning interactions. It can be claimed that teaching is one of the professions where emotional labor is displayed most deeply (Brennan, 2006). Hochschild (1983), the author who first defined the term emotional labor, was inspired by flight attendants based on her observations. She concluded that to provide a satisfying service, stewardesses were expected to display positive emotions without bothering what they really feel. Research results showed us that the situation in the educational context was similar to her conclusions that displaying positive emotions enhances the quality of the service given. Some of these results tell us that displaying positive emotions boosts the satisfaction (Nalipay, Morden, Semilla, & Frondozo, 2019) and efficacy of teachers (Meier, Mastracci, & Wilson, 2006), and academic achievement increases in schools where teachers can manage their emotions appropriately (Sutton, 2005). Therefore, it can be argued that teachers’ displaying their emotions in line with organizational expectations is important for establishing and sustaining healthy teacher-student relationships, and thus achieving the objectives of the class activities and education in general.

When employees are in a good mood in the organizational environment, they may be expected to display the expected emotions by feeling them instinctively. However, when they are in a negative mood, employees may have to force themselves to display the expected emotions (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). As Humphrey, Ashforth, and Diefendorff (2015) point out, if employees are really satisfied with their work, they may not need fake smiles in their interactions with service recipients. In support of these implications, Taxer and Frenzel (2015) report that teachers who have good relations in schools naturally display positive emotions more often. The longitudinal study of Philipp and Schuppah (2010) demonstrates that dedicated teachers do not have to act as if they felt the positive emotions that they had to exhibit.

Previous research seeking for the antecedents of teacher emotional labor has examined a wide variety of variables in the last decade and has found positive predictive relationships. These variables were personality traits (Basim, Begenirbas, & Yalcin, 2013), empathy (Wrobel, 2013), emotional intelligence (Yin, Lee, Zhang, & Jin, 2013; Pervaiz, Ali, & Asif, 2019), emotional traits (Keller, Chang, Becker, Goetz, & Frenzel, 2014), interpersonal influence (Park, O’Rourke, & O’Brien, 2014), emotional effort, positive and negative display rules, job demands, intrinsic and extrinsic
motivation, self-monitoring, trust in colleagues (Chang, 2020; Huang, Yin, & Tang, 2019; Truta, 2014; Yin, Huang, & Lee, 2017), emotion regulation (Ghanizadeh & Royaei, 2015), school climate (Yao et al., 2015), distributed leadership (Tsai, Chang, & Hsieh, 2016), teacher anger (Buric & Frenzel, 2019), psychological capital (Zhao & You, 2019), humor styles (Liao, Luo, Tsai, & Chen, 2020), work effort, teaching experience, and family interference (Zhang, Jin, Chen, Zhang, & Wu, 2020). Much of the above variables are related to teachers’ emotions and some other psychological constructs. A general overview of these research results demonstrates that positive situations (for example, high emotional intelligence) are related to high deep acting and genuine emotions while negative ones lead surface acting. Organizational commitment, as a positive organizational variable, may be a potential predictor of teacher emotional labor and is still unsearched in the literature. In an in-depth qualitative study in Turkey, teachers list some of the variables that they thought to affect their emotional status in their schools. These variables are characteristics of the institution, administrator, and teachers, administrative processes, school’s communication medium, academic events, and the school environment (Argon, 2015). The positive experiences and perceptions associated with all these variables can be argued to affect teachers’ emotions positively. Therefore, teachers who feel a commitment to their school are thought to be able to display the expected emotions while they are carrying out their job. Based on these arguments, this study examines the relationship between teachers’ emotional labor strategies and organizational commitment.

Emotional Labor Concept and Emotional Labor in Teaching

In organizations, employees sometimes emphasize some of their emotions more, while they hide others, and they have to feel or display the emotions expected from them even if these emotions are in conflict with their real feelings. Efforts spent by employees to conceal their true emotions, to feel the expected emotions or to behave as if they were feeling them are called “emotional labor” (Grandey, 2000; Mann, 1997). Emotional labor is the effort of acting emotions desired by the organization during service delivery (Morris & Feldman, 1996) and, briefly, it can be defined as the effort shown to act emotions expected by the organization (Wharton, 2009; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini, & Holz, 2001).

Emotional labor is a kind of labor like physical and mental ones performed in organizations. Hochschild (1983), a sociologist who first used the term emotional labor, states that she “means the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage, therefore, has exchange value” (p. 7). In organizations where emotions are instrumentalized in this manner, there are many rules that regulate the emotions of employees that they exhibit in their relationships with service recipients, and employees are expected to exhibit behaviors that comply with these rules. Hochschild (1979; 1983) called them “feeling rules”. The effort spent to comply with these rules is manifested as a kind of labor and is called “emotion work” (Zapf & Holz, 2006) or “emotional labor” (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).
According to Hochschild (1983), emotional labor can be displayed in two ways as “deep acting” and “surface acting” (pp. 37-42). Following studies have also shown that displaying “genuine emotions” is the third dimension (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff et al., 2005). In deep acting, employees try to change their emotions intimately to display the expected behaviors because they believe it is the case (Grandey, 2003). In the surface acting dimension, they spend efforts to pretend to feel the emotions although they do not feel that way (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Humphrey et al., 2015). Employees who display their genuine emotions act with naturally felt emotions and emotional labor is spent in this case, too (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).

Teaching is one of the professions that requires high levels of emotional labor because of its nature necessitating close and intense interactions with students. Studies in the literature report that displaying more emotional labor is necessary for professions which have intense face-to-face relationships (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Steinberg & Figart, 1999), and that teaching is one of these jobs (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2006; Leidner, 1999). Beyond that, the teaching profession is a work of emotions. Teachers should be aware of their emotions, be able to manage their emotions correctly and be able to cope with their emotions effectively so that they can carry out this job eligibly (Chang, 2009).

Yin and Lee (2012) state that teachers are emotional workers and instrumentalize their emotional experiences to meet the professional and ethical norms of teaching. Their study conducted with Chinese teachers indicated that teachers should be passionately devoted to the profession, hide negative emotions, sustain positive emotions, and instrumentalize their emotions to realize teaching objectives. Similarly, Sutton (2004) states that teachers need to manage their emotions and obey the display rules as part of both carrying out their responsibilities effectively and being an ideal teacher.

Teaching has a nature going beyond other kinds of “people work” and hosts certain attitudes, behaviors, and emotions which differentiate the profession from other ones. Concepts, such as devotion, compassion, mercy, and love, can be argued to be closely related to teaching. O’Conner (2008) states that teaching is a profession that is very closely related to emotions. Similarly, Cuceloglu and Erdogan (2016) state that one of the basic values of teaching is love. The authors state that teachers spend a lot of time and effort to ensure that their students are the best possible.

Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

Balay (2000) defines organizational commitment as the employee's willingness to stay in the organization, to endeavor for the organization, to adopt the aims and values of the organization, identify with the aims and values of the organization without pursuing any material concerns, and to commit to the workplace psychologically. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organizational commitment shows a three-dimensional structure, such as affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment means that the employee sincerely wants to be in the organization. Continuance commitment means that the employee wants to stay in the organization to meet his/her needs. Normative commitment
means that the employee wants to stay in the organization as a result of ethical self-evaluation. O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) suggest that organizational commitment consists of compliance, identification and internalization dimensions, which are preferred to use in this study. Compliance means a commitment to instrumental rewards and it is an obligation-based commitment. Compliance is not a type of commitment desired by organizations. Identification is based on the desire to establish relationships with the organization and employees. Internalization refers to the compliance of the values of the individual and the organization and it corresponds to the strongest and the most desired type of commitment.

Schools are also organizations and in the literature, teachers’ commitment to their schools is being studied based on the theoretical framework of organizational commitment defined above. Yoruk and Sagban (2012) identify the organizational commitment of teachers as the availability of the emotions that will establish a bond between them and the school. The findings of recent research (ChambersMack, Johnson, Jones-Rincon, Tsatenawa, & Howard, 2019; Paramaarth, Mukhtar, & Akbar, 2019) show that teachers with high organizational commitment tend to do more than expected for their school. According to Meyer, Morin, Stanley, and Maltin (2019), teachers who are committed to both their work and school get more positive results both in their jobs and in their lives. Somech and Bogler (2002) report that teachers with a high level of commitment will faithfully work for the school’s purposes and put more effort than teachers who have low commitment. As researchers have pointed out, if teachers’ commitment to their school will positively affect the labor that they will spend in their work (ChambersMack et al., 2019; Paramaarth et al., 2019; Somech & Bogler, 2002), expecting a prediction relationship between organizational commitment and emotional labor may be considered as possible.

**Relationship between Emotional Labor and Organizational Commitment**

Literature reports that surface acting broadly has negative consequences on teachers (Akin, Aydin, Erdogan, & Demirkasimoglu, 2014; Lee, 2019; Yilmaz, Altinkurt, Guner, & Sen, 2016; Zhang & Zhu, 2008). A recent study (Yin, Huang, & Lee, 2017) found that surface acting in teachers reduced the perception of professional competence. Taxer and Frenzel’s (2015) study also indicated that faking emotions affects the well-being of teachers negatively. Although there is no empirical evidence for the teaching profession, acting genuine emotions has been reported to produce positive consequences in terms of both service recipients and employees (Walsh, 2019). In addition, deep acting is reported to have no negative effect on the well-being of the employee; on the contrary, it is stated to be positively associated with job satisfaction, job performance and the satisfaction of the service recipient (Humphrey, Ashforth, & Diefendorff, 2015).

It is difficult to say that there is a complete consensus on the relationships between emotional labor and organizational commitment. Humphrey et al. (2015) stated that organizational commitment was positively related to deep acting and displaying genuine emotions. The results of Schaubroeck and Jones (2000) revealed that the efforts to display positive emotions in employees who have low identification with the
organization and job involvement gave more negative results. The results of a study on nurses showed that surface acting was negatively associated with organizational commitment (Yang & Chang, 2008). The findings of the study conducted by Eroz (2014) with the participation of hotel employees showed that the employees’ organizational commitment was an important predictor of emotional labor. Conversely, the results of Hofmann and Stockburger-Sauer (2017) revealed a negative relationship between emotional labor and organizational commitment. Furthermore, Lin's (2006) study indicated that emotional labor in employees did not predict organizational commitment.

Although there is a limited number of studies on other professions that directly deal with the relationship between emotional labor and organizational commitment, this relationship in teachers is still an under-researched topic. The findings of Argon’s (2015) qualitative inquiry showed that when teachers’ emotions in the school environment are not considered, their commitment to school decreased. Wang, Hall, and Taxer’s (2019) meta-analytical study showed that studies conducted so far handled variables, such as personality, emotional affectivity, motivation, emotional display rules, perceived emotional expectations, and school atmosphere as the premises of the emotional labor displayed by teachers. However, as emphasized earlier, the relationship between teachers’ commitment to their schools and the emotional labor they display seems to be the missing part of the literature on emotional labor in the teaching profession. This study aimed to investigate the relationships between teachers’ emotional labor and organizational commitment levels. To do this, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between emotional labor and organizational commitment levels of teachers?
2. Do teachers’ organizational commitments predict the emotional labor that they display?

**Method**

**Research Design**

This study used a quantitative method. Studies in which the target characteristics of individuals, groups, or organizations are identified through a sample taken from the population are called survey studies (Berends, 2006; Creswell, 1994), in the same way, studies in which a variable is used to explain other variables are called predictive correlational survey ones (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012). Predictive correlational survey design was preferred because it enables to identify the antecedents of a present condition. Correlational designs involve the gathering of two sets of data, one of which will be retrospective, with an approach to determining the relationship between the variables (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 265). This study, which examined whether teachers’ organizational commitments predicted the emotional labor that they display, used a predictive relational survey design.
Research Sample

The simple random sampling method was utilized in this research. This method increases the probability of the members of the population to take place in the sample equally (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 110). The data were collected in a central Black Sea region province of Turkey, from 375 teachers, 100 from elementary, 139 from the middle, and 136 high schools, which was determined with a stratified sampling technique from the population of 7606 teachers. Data were collected from 23 different public schools. There were seven primary, nine secondary and seven high schools from both low and medium socioeconomic environments. School levels taken as the strata and the teachers to be placed in the strata were determined randomly. One hundred fifty-seven of the participants were female (41.9%) and 218 were male (58.1%). The average age of the participants was 40.87, and the mean seniority was 16.99 years.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Two previously developed scales were used to collect the data: The Scale of Emotional Labor in Teaching and Organizational Commitment Scale. Table 1 summarizes the properties of the scales.

Table 1
Information about the Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sub-dimension</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scale of Emotional Labor in Teaching</td>
<td>1. Surface acting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Akın et al., 2014)</td>
<td>2. Deep acting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Genuine emotions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment Scale (Balay, 2000)</td>
<td>1. Compliance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identification</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Internalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As summarized in Table 1, to measure emotional labor, the Scale of Emotional Labor in Teaching was used. This scale has been developed by Akın et al. (2014), adapting emotional labor literature (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 1983; Humphrey et al., 2015) to the Turkish culture and the school context. The three-dimensional scale consists of 10 items in deep acting (e.g., as a teacher, I try to be unbiased towards all students), 13 in surface acting (e.g., I pretend to seem well so as not to reflect my personal problems), and five in the genuine emotions dimension (e.g., I feel good when I see students being cheerful). Cronbach's alpha coefficients that were reported for the subscales in the original study were .87 for surface acting dimension, .81 for deep acting dimension, and .64 for genuine emotions. For this study, coefficients for the same dimensions were .87, .83, and .65, respectively.
The organizational commitment levels of the teachers were measured by the 27-item Organizational Commitment Scale. This scale has been developed by Balay (2000) using O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) theoretical framework. The scale has a three-dimensional structure, including compliance, identification and internalization. Some of the examples of the statements from the scale are "I work in this school for financial concerns primarily (compliance)", "I perceive the problems of this school as my own problems (identification)", and "I am proud to be a member of this school (internalization)". Cronbach’s internal consistency coefficients reported in the original study were 0.79 for the compliance dimension, 0.89 for the identification dimension, and 0.93 for the internalization dimension. These values, which were recalculated in the current study, were 0.79, 0.86, and 0.92, respectively.

The approval of the Provincial Directorate of National Education was obtained before launching the data collection process. The data collection tool was administered to teachers who volunteered to participate in this study. For ethical consideration, the participants were informed that the data would be evaluated anonymously and personal data would be kept confidential.

Data Analysis

The scales were in 5-point Likert-type and the participants responded to the items with options ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). The means and standard deviations were calculated for descriptive analyses. The Pearson correlation was used to determine the correlations. The predicting relationship between organizational commitment and emotional labor scores was analyzed through hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis. Gender and age were added to the analysis to control the potential contribution of these variables on the explained variance. Dummy variables were created for gender scores. Before conducting the multiple linear regression analysis, the data were analyzed to determine whether they were suitable for this analysis, and then multiple normal distribution status was analyzed. In addition, the data were examined to find out whether there was multicollinearity. To do this, tolerance values, variance inflation factors, and status indexes (Buyukozturk, 2006) were examined, and the data were observed to meet the assumptions of multiple linear regression analysis.

Results

The first question of this study was whether there was a significant relationship between teachers’ emotional labor and their organizational commitment levels. To answer this question, Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated. The results are shown in Table 2.
Table 2

The Relationship between the Teachers’ Emotional Labor and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Surface acting (SA)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deep acting (DA)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Genuine emotions (GE)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compliance (C)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identification (I)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Internalization (In)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .01

As can be seen from Table 2, there were low and medium positive correlations between the teachers’ identification scores and all three dimensions of the emotional labor scale. There was a medium positive correlation between internalization scores and all three dimensions of emotional labor. In addition, there were low negative and significant correlations among the compliance, the deep acting and the genuine emotions scores (p< .01). No significant correlation was found between the teachers’ compliance and the surface acting scores.

The second question of this study was whether the teachers’ organizational commitment predicted their emotional labor. To answer this question, hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were employed to test the status of the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment to predict the three dimensions of emotional labor as independent variables. Gender and age were added to the first model to control the potential contribution of these variables on the relationship between organizational commitment and emotional labor. In the second model, the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment were added to each analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5.

Table 3

Organizational Commitment as the Predictor of Surface Acting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1: R= .19, R²= .04, Adj.R²= .03, F= 7.13,* p< .05
Model 2: R= .40, R²= .16, Adj.R²= .15, F= 14.17,* p< .05
Table 3 shows that, when controlled for gender and age, the model testing organizational commitment as a predictor of surface acting was significant ($F= 14.17$, $p<.05$). The sub-dimensions of organizational commitment predicted 16% of emotional labor in the surface acting dimension ($R^2= .16$). The examination of T values indicated that the compliance and internalization dimensions were significant predictors of emotional labor ($p<.05$). When the $\beta$ coefficients were examined, relatively the most important predictor of the surface acting was perceived commitment in the internalization dimension ($\beta= .40$).

Table 4
**Organizational Commitment as the Predictor of Deep Acting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>31.51</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1: $R= .20$, $R^2= .04$, Adj.$R^2= .04$, $F= 7.90$, $p<.05$
Model 2: $R= .47$, $R^2= .22$, Adj.$R^2= .21$, $F= 20.47$, $p<.05$

As seen in Table 4, controlling for gender and age, the model testing organizational commitment as a predictor of deep acting was significant too ($F= 20.47$, $p<.05$). The sub-dimensions of organizational commitment predicted 22% of emotional labor in the deep acting ($R^2= .22$). The T values revealed that the compliance and internalization dimensions were significant predictors of deep acting ($p<.05$). The examination of $\beta$ coefficients indicated that perceived commitment in the internalization dimension was relatively the most important predictor of deep acting ($\beta= .37$).

Table 5
**Organizational Commitment as the Predictor of Genuine Emotions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1: $R= .21$, $R^2= .04$, Adj.$R^2= .04$, $F= 8.23$, $p<.05$
Model 2: $R= .50$, $R^2= .25$, Adj.$R^2= .24$, $F= 25.12$, $p<.05$
According to the results in Table 5, the model testing the status of organizational commitment as the predictor of genuine emotions was also significant \((F= 25.12, p < .05)\). The dimensions of organizational commitment predicted 25% of displayed emotional labor in the genuine emotions dimension \((R^2 = .25)\). The examination of T values revealed that only the internalization dimension of the organizational commitment was the significant predictor of genuine emotions \((p < .05)\). The \(\beta\) coefficient was calculated as .45 for this dimension.

**Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations**

This predictive relational survey aimed to analyze the relationship between teachers’ emotional labor and their organizational commitment scores. Further, this study explored whether teachers’ organizational commitment explains their emotional labor strategies they used in the relationships with students. If so, we could assert that organizationally committed teachers would meet organizational expectations about emotions.

Correlational results revealed that there was a negative relationship between the compliance commitment and the deep acting and the genuine emotions scores. In addition, positive and meaningful relationships were determined between teachers’ identification and internalization commitment scores and all three emotional labor strategies. Compliance commitment means loyalty to instrumental rewards, such as financial concerns (Balay, 2000; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986); therefore, this kind of teacher commitment may not result internally felt emotions. Identification and internalization commitment refers teachers’ internal desires to have good relationships in the school and internalizing the values of the school. Thus, increased identification and internalization scores may result in teachers to make more effort for their relationships, values, and schools.

The existence of a positive correlation between identification and internalization scores and teachers’ levels of using a surface acting strategy is not an expected result. Because surface acting is considered as “the dark side of the emotional labor” (see Ward & Mc Murray, 2016) and known as a negative organizational variable (Lee, 2019; Zhang & Zhu, 2008). This finding shows that both teachers’ desire to have good relations in their school and the consistency of the values of teachers with the values of the school, that higher identification and internalization scores tell us, do not prevent teachers from pretending their emotions in their relations with students. Based on the same finding, teachers’ pretending their emotions can be said to not affect their organizational commitment adversely.

Results indicate that teachers’ commitment scores predict their emotional labor scores in all three dimensions. The variance explained by the organizational commitment shows an increase from surface acting to genuine emotions. The most important predictor of all three emotional labor strategies is the commitment experienced in the internalization dimension. In other words, the commitment of teachers experienced particularly in the internalization dimension explains the
emotional labor they display to a great extent, which is the lowest in the surface acting dimension and the highest in the genuine emotions dimension.

Surface acting means the inconsistency between the felt and displayed emotions. Research results show that emotional dissonance makes up the most stressful dimension of emotional labor (Zapf & Holz, 2006). Kruml and Geddes (2000) pointed out that the emotional dissonance decreases as the commitment of employees to the service recipients increases. Both correlation and regression analyses showed a positive relationship between surface acting and organizational commitment. As Humphrey et al. (2015, p. 750) argued, deep acting and genuine emotions may be defined as the “bright sides” of emotional labor. Surface acting is generally known as representing the “dark side”. Results of the present study suggest that the antecedents and the consequences of surface acting in the teaching profession may be different from other professions.

Argon (2015) reported that teachers avoid reflecting their genuine emotions because they do not want to be in disagreement with their colleagues, be excluded from their circles, be in disagreement with management, break up their relations with the administrator, and affect the school environment and student success negatively. According to Balay (2000), internally committed teachers will make all kinds of sacrifices for their schools. Trying to conceal their inner feelings for the benefit of the school can also be seen as an important sacrifice. Therefore, the fact that the commitment to the internalization dimension predicts teachers’ surface acting behaviors can be interpreted as hiding their true feelings for the benefit of their schools.

Truta (2014) found that teachers display more genuine emotions as their internal motivations increase. The high level of internal motivations of teachers mean that the power that drives them is related to internally induced variables (internalization of organizational values) rather than instrumental rewards (compliance commitment) or relationships with others (identification). With this regard, the fact that the commitment experienced in the internalization dimension is the most important predictor of the level of teachers’ use of genuine emotions in their relations with students seems to be consistent with Truta’s (2014) findings.

One of the most important results of this study is that the teachers’ internal commitments to their schools are an important predictor of their use of emotional labor, especially deep acting and genuine emotions. This result means that school leaders can facilitate their teachers’ use of emotional labor by providing and supporting their internal commitments to their school. Thus, this may help reduce teacher stress and burnout (Akin et al., 2014; Zhang & Zhu, 2008) caused by emotional labor. As recent studies proposed (Tsui, Lee, Zhang, & Wong, 2019; Zheng, Shi, & Liu, 2020), effective leadership which incorporates the values of the school into the values of teachers and ensures teachers’ internalized commitment can be suggested as the most functional way to achieve the stated benefits.
Limitations and Implications for Future Research

This research adds a new brick to teacher emotional labor literature by bringing forth teacher organizational commitment as a predictor, which was a missing part of the previous research. However, some important limitations can be argued for this research. First of all, there may be some potential mediators that may affect the relationship between emotional labor and organizational commitment. To go a step further about implications of these results, further researchers should infer these potential mediators from both emotional labor and organizational commitment literature. Other remarkable limitations may be related to the method followed in this research. The first limitation of our method is related to our population and sample. To make more generalizable implications, a sample can be defined representing Turkey. The second limitation concerning the method can be identified as using pure quantitative tools that may not produce a clear and holistic understanding of the relationship between teachers’ commitment and emotional labor. Knowing how and why internalized commitment facilitates teachers’ displaying emotional labor, qualitative and mixed method research may be more illustrative.

Another limitation may be some unanswered questions still after this research. Although surface acting is known as the “dark side” of emotional labor (while deep acting and genuine emotions are called as the “bright side”), results show that surface acting functions in a different way in teaching when compared to other professions (e.g., Yang & Chang, 2008). It is still unclear that what is the real case for the teaching profession, and if still deep acting and genuine emotions are beneficial, then what about surface acting? How teachers really perceive surface acting and this process really works in the context of the teaching profession? It is taught that further research is needed to answer these questions.
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Öğretmenlerin Duygusal Emek ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Atıf:

Özet

Yaşantı ve algıların öğretmenlerin duygu durumlarını olumlu etkileyeceği ileri sürülebilir. Dolayısıyla, görev yaptığı okula ilişkin olumlu bir algısı olan, okulundan memnun olan ve okuluna bağlılık hisseden öğretmenlerin işlerini yaparken duygularını kendilerinden beklenen biçimde sergileyebileceğisi düşünülmektedir. Bu düşünden harekete, araştırmanın amacı, öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri duygusal emek ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkileri incelemektir. Bu amaçla ulaşmak üzere aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmıştır:

i) Öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri duygusal emek ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındadır mı?

ii) Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları sergiledikleri duygusal emeği yardım etmektedir?

Bulgular: Öğretmenlerin uyum boyutunda örgütsel bağlılık puanları ile yüzeysel sergileme arasında anlamlı bir ilişki yoktur. Bunun yanında, uyum puanları ile içten sergileme ve gerçek duyguların sergilenmesine ilişkin puanlar arasında düşük düzeyde negatif ve anlamlı ilişkiler tespit edilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin özdeşleşme boyutunda örgütsel bağlılık puanları ile duygusal emeğin boyutları arasında düşük ve orta düzeyde pozitif yönlü ilişki bulunmaktadır. Diğer taraftan, içselleştirme boyutunda örgütsel bağlılık ile duygusal emeğin her üç boyutunda pozitif yönde orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki olduğu arastırılmıştır. Tespit edilen tüm ilişkiler .01 düzeyinde anlamlıdır. Örgütsel bağlılığın hem yüzeysel sergilemeye ($F= 14.17, p< .05$) hem içten sergilemeye ($F= 20.47, p< .05$) hem de gerçek duyguların sergilenmesine ($F= 25.12, p< .05$) yoruma duyarlarını test eden modeller anlamlıdır. Örgütsel bağlılık alt boyutları ile duygusal sergileme ve gerçek duyguların sergilenmesi boyutunda %25 ve %22'ini yoruma duyarlıklarını test eden modeller anlamlıdır. Bu katayları incelendiğinde, her üç duygusal emek boyuttanın görünen örgütsel bağlılığın önemli bir yordayıcısı olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. 


Anahtar Kelimeler: Duygusal emek, örgütsel bağlılık, öğretmenlerin uyum, içselleştirme, duygusal emek, öğretmenlerin bağlılığı.