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Abstract

This position paper previews work from a larger study exploring the uniqueness of nonprofit workers through the lens of emotional labor by comparing research studies featuring nonprofit work settings and for-profit environments. A review of emotions featured in the preliminary research uncovered more similarities than differences between the sectors, but some disparities emerged showing strong emotions unique to each sector, raising further questions about contributing factors for these differences and similarities. The findings from this preliminary research support the value of a broader study and the need for further research and theorizing about contributing factors such as the nature of work, motivations of the worker, orientation of the researcher, and other possible factors.

Looking Across the Bridge

Throughout my years working in nonprofit human service organizations, I was convinced people attracted to nonprofit work were special individuals with a strong sense of passion and care for others. I was delighted, early in my academic career, to discover researchers who correspondingly theorized on the “uniqueness” of the nonprofit workforce, but I never found such assumptions to be sufficiently substantiated. Scholars pointed to emotions and emotional labor in nonprofit work environments as indicators of such workers’ unique characteristics, but these equally could have applied to workers in for-profit settings, as many researchers have demonstrated. Conducting this research will allow me to compile evidence to support or refute the validity of those assumptions.

---

1 The scope of the nonprofit sector is broad, but the scope of this research is more narrowly focused on public charities. For the purpose of this paper, I use the term “nonprofit” or “nonprofit organization” to maintain a consistent use of terminology.

2 Note to NCA Preconference Participants: The research featured in this position paper is still in progress, and this method of research is new to me. I welcome suggestions for the final structure of this research to make a significant contribution to our field. I also welcome opportunities for partnership on follow-up studies to conduct first-hand research that explores this topic – comparing emotional labor in nonprofit and for-profit settings.
explore the implications and possible theorizing of the results, and point the way for further refined research into this question.

The research introduced in this position paper includes an examination of similarities and differences in emotions and emotional labor practices featured in for-profit and nonprofit workplace settings. This is being achieved through a content analysis of scholarly journal articles featuring emotional labor studies that highlight worker characteristics in varied organizational contexts. Much work has been done in recent years that explored emotional labor in public sectors and health care settings (which cross sectors). The larger research study includes these sectors, but the findings featured here focus on for-profit and nonprofit sectors. Also not addressed in this paper are coping strategies used by employees to mitigate the negative effects of emotional labor, although the need to further explore this is touched upon in the closing discussion.

Due to space limitations and the complexity of the structure of this study, only a brief overview of relevant literature is provided. The full study manuscript contains an extensive literature review on emotions, feeling rules, emotional labor, and studies conducted in for-profit, nonprofit, and public sectors, and other not-easily-identified work environments. Finally, only preliminary findings are being presented here, but the full research methodology is presented, with much of the detail contained in the appendices. Before presenting details of the study, following I provide a brief introduction to emotions and emotional labor and prevailing claims about differences between for-profit and nonprofit sectors.

Sea of Emotion

I became interested in workplace emotions and emotional labor, because I could see the toll direct service work took on workers at my agency and in other social service programs. Their work

3 For research on coping strategies, see Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Bulan, Erickson, and Wharton, 1997; Fineman, 1985, 2000; Hochschild, 1983; Karabanow, 1999; Mattson, Clair, Sanger, and Kunkel, 2000; Putnam and Mumby, 1993; Rafaeli and Worline, 2001; and Shuler and Sypher, 2000.
was difficult and emotional. Such workers deal with people who are sick, abusive or abused, down on their luck, without homes, or dealing with life histories beyond most people’s imagination. Because of difficult situations being faced by these clients, they can be unpleasant to work with, overly demanding, dishonest, manipulative, and disobedient. Workers often have to restrain their own feelings in order to deal with difficult situations and to help clients as best they can. This expectation or self-imposed suppression of their feelings is called “feeling rules” (Hochschild, 1983)—governing the expression of emotions, especially in service-based occupations. Feeling rules are one important feature of emotional labor.

Emotional labor involves the production of certain feelings in the worker, the production of feelings in others, and the effort, planning and control required to express an organization’s desired emotions (Hochschild, 1983; Karabanow, 1999; Shuler & Sypher, 2000). Put another way, emotional labor involves the efforts made to understand others, have empathy with their situation, and internalize their feelings (Steinberg & Figart, 1999). It is what workers do with their feelings to comply with organizational role requirements (Yanay & Shahar, 1998).

Research on emotional labor should be grounded in an understanding of workplace emotions. Related to organization communication, Putnam and Mumby (1993) define emotions as the process through which members of an organization constitute their work environment by negotiating a shared reality (p. 36). Emotions are important to help form mutual understanding “by cueing empathy, gaining insights into expectations, building shared interpretations and understanding life histories” (p. 51). Waldron (2000) describes emotion as an important tool in defining work relationships (p. 79). Similarly, Rafaeli and Worline (2001) suggest when people talk about work, they talk primarily about other people, and talking about other people at work most often involves talking about emotions at work (2001, p. 110). Emotions are what connect people to one another and to organizations, and it is the emotional bonds with collectives that comprise an organization, rather than legal, financial or geographical bonds (p. 110).
Although “emotion” is not the same as “emotional labor,” for this study, we predetermined that emotions could be critical factors for distinguishing differences among the sectors. Prior to conducting the data analysis, we conducted a systematic review of the literature on emotions (cf., Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006; Hochschild, 1983; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Scherer, 2005; Seo, Barrett, & Bartunek, 2004; Wierzbicka, 1992) to identify and define common terms, traits, and issues about which we (as researchers/coders) would need to be educated prior to conducting the analysis. Definitions and organizing concepts from these resources were blended to develop a coding sheet and corresponding code book to guide researchers when reviewing articles. For more information, refer to Appendix 1.

As previously stated, many researches have explored emotions and emotional labor in work settings, but the majority of this research features for-profit work environments. Yet several researchers have theorized that emotions and emotional labor are more prevalent and significant in workers in nonprofit environments because of personal motivations that lead them to social service work. A few of these studies are referenced in the next section.

The Workplace Divide

Several theorists have suggested characteristics unique to nonprofit workers—in particular, employees in fields such as health care, social service work, teaching, and other caring professions—that make these workers more likely to perform emotional labor (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Karabanow, 1999; Pines, 1982; Shuler & Sypher, 2000; Steinberg, 1999; Steinberg & Figart, 1999). It has been suggested those who work for nonprofit organizations are motivated by strongly held values and have chosen to work in this sector for this reason. They typically have strong professional loyalties and well-articulated opinions about the right way to serve consumers (Arsenault, 1998).

---

4 The majority of studies on emotional labor feature the “worker”—often frontline staff or volunteers who provide direct service to the customer or client. Unless specified, the focus of this research and all references similarly focus on “workers,” opposed to managers or directors.
Others suggest such behavior is more significant in the nonprofit sector, because nonprofit workers likely “self-select occupations that require particular types of emotional labor” (Shuler & Sypher, 2000, p. 75). Their career choices are motivated by concerns such as working with people, helping to meet their needs, and making the world a better place to live. Such workers often go above and beyond the call of duty, even if it means increasing their emotional labor (Eisenberg & Eschenfelder, 2009, p. 940).

As a result of performing emotional labor, these employees give something of themselves to their clients with whom they have no ongoing personal relationship (Steinberg, 1999). They work hard to understand their clients and to have empathy with their situation (Steinberg & Figart, 1999). It is their tendency toward emotional labor that makes them passionate about their work. The same characteristics, however, also make these workers more likely to experience burnout.

Several studies have explored factors of emotional labor and burnout in human service delivery work (see, for example, Fineman, 1985, 2000; Karabanow, 1999; Putnam & Mumby, 1993) and communication strategies that can mitigate the negative effects on employees and the organization as a whole (see Leiter, 1988; Miller & Considine, 2009; Miller, Stiff, & Ellis, 1988). A research study conducted by Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) demonstrated that, among various professions, human service professionals reported the highest level of interpersonal demands in their work, such as the frequency, variety, intensity, duration of emotional display and expectations for control over emotional expressions (p. 31).

The types of traits and characteristics referenced above, however, are not unique to nonprofit work environments, nor is the practice of emotional labor—it can be found in any industry that involves providing service to others. Since Hochschild’s (1983) seminal research with flight attendants, emotional labor within caring and service professions has captured attention of researchers who have studied the impact of emotional labor on employees of The Body Shop

---

5 A review of this research will be featured in the final paper.
(Martin, Knoppoff & Beckman, 1998), technology workers, (Kunda van Maanen, 1999), personal selling representatives (Lan, 2002), nail technicians/manicurists (Kang, 2003), financial investment planners (Miller & Koesten, 2008), hairstylists (Cohen, 2010), and many other industries. Workers in the nonprofit sector also have been featured including, for example, youth shelter workers (Karabanow, 1999), human rights activists (Bosco, 2006; and Taylor, Mallinson, & Bloch, 2008), domestic violence shelter workers and volunteers (Shuler, 2007), animal shelter volunteers (Taylor, Mallinson, & Bloch, 2008), peer-providers of mental health services Mancini & Lawson, 2009), and others.

This leads to the question posed for this research study: Is there really a difference between workers who engage in emotional labor based on their work environment—nonprofit versus for-profit? For analysis in the full study we identified four hypotheses⁶ that position featured workplace emotions into various quadrants of an emotional wheel [similar to the Geneva Emotion Wheel (Schere, 2005; see Appendix 5 and 6)] based on exploratory differences among the sectors.

Constructing a Bridge (method)

To explore this research question and these hypotheses, we conducted an extensive review of scholarly journal articles featuring emotional labor studies. This involved a multi-step process of identifying an appropriate population (pool of journal articles), sampling (population and quota sampling), determining and defining key concepts for the study, developing corresponding code sheets and a codebook, meticulously reviewing and coding articles, and developing a framework for analysis.

Sampling

To identify and collect a population of scholarly journal articles for sampling, we accessed and conducted searches through several academic search databases available through our online

---

⁶ In the final study write-up, the hypotheses will be interwoven with corresponding literature review that lead into and support each.
library. This was a multi-step process that included identifying suitable databases for the search, experimenting with search criteria to determine an adequate population of articles, refining the population by cross referencing the total pool of retrieved journal articles from each database to identify common results (i.e., specific articles cited in multiple databases), and reviewing those articles to identify their appropriateness for our sample. After that extensive process, it was then determined that search parameters needed to be broadened (quota sampling), because the representation of articles featuring studies in nonprofit work environments was too low to draw adequate comparisons to for-profit workplace studies. A detailed description of these steps and a corresponding flow chart are contained in Appendices 2 and 3. A final sample of 60 articles was identified including 18 studies featuring for-profit environments, 18 on nonprofit, 15 public sector settings, 7 healthcare, and 2 unclassified work settings. A portion of these have been reviewed, coded and analyzed for this position paper.

Bridging the Divide (preliminary data analysis)

I and another researcher reviewed the final sample of articles using a grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006) to identify and code key themes emerging in the data. Reviews were conducted independently then compared to determine consistency of findings. This stage of analysis is still underway for the final study. A third researcher is being recruited to conduct another independent review and coding of the data prior to conducting the final analysis and the formulation of the findings for the final report. Presented here are preliminary findings based on a review of one-third of the for-profit and nonprofit studies, including six studies featuring emotional labor studies in for-profit settings and six featuring emotional labor studies in nonprofit settings.

Based on an analysis of this preliminary data, there are no significant findings related to the four proposed hypothesis, although some interesting trends are starting emerge. Analyzing this smaller sample, relevant data were extrapolated pertaining to specific emotions that demonstrate
similarities and differences between the sectors. At first blush, preliminary findings point more to similarities, although the differences could point to meaningful disparities between the sectors.

Out of 68 individually named and defined emotions, the majority (more than half) of the citations coded by the researchers comprised only 9 emotions, including: *compassion* (12.6% of coded citations), *love/liking* (7.5%), *pride* (6.1%), *stress* (5.4%), *anxiety* (4.6%), *contentment* (4.1%), *frustration* (3.9%), *belonging* (3.8%), and *joy* (3.6%). Out of the 68 emotions, only one emotion was featured in all studies reviewed: *compassion*. Based on the literature review, this finding made sense for nonprofit settings, but it was an unexpected finding for for-profit work environments. Other commonly featured emotions in both for-profit and nonprofit work environments included:

- *Contentment* (featured in six for-profit studies and five nonprofit studies);
- *Frustration* (six for-profit studies, four nonprofit studies);
- *Love/Liking* (six for-profit studies, four nonprofit studies);
- *Anxiety* (four for-profit studies, four nonprofit studies);
- *Joy* (four for-profit studies, four nonprofit studies); and
- *Pride* (four for-profit studies, four nonprofit studies).

Even this preliminary data speaks volumes about the commonalities of workplace experiences, regardless of workplace sector. The differences are also telling. Two emotions were featured in for-profit settings that were not prevalent in the nonprofit work environments, and vice versa. In for-profit studies, *Stress/Tension* was featured in six studies, and *Manipulation* was featured in five studies. In the nonprofit workplace studies, *Depression* was featured in six studies, and *Anger* was featured in four. Further examination of these findings is underway to explore possible connections and contributing factors.

---

7 *Belonging* and *Manipulation* (i.e., feeling manipulated) were not identified in the originally featured studies and frameworks of emotion, but these emotions were added by the researchers prior to conducting the reviews, based on preliminary reviews of samples articles.
A Long Crossing Still To Come (limitations and discussion)

It’s unknown what the differences tell us about these workers and their environments—for example, the fact that Stress and Manipulation were commonly coded features in for-profit emotional labor studies, compared to Depression and Anger in nonprofit studies. Underlying issues of workplace controls and worker constraints may contribute to such traits. Or, perhaps, the psychological proclivity of nonprofit workers make them more prone to depression than for-profit workers, and overbearing supervisors in for-profit companies may make workers more sensitive to issues of manipulation. These are wild speculations, to be sure, and I am drawing no such conclusions. Nonetheless, the data point to the need for further research and clarification.

The data presented demonstrate the presence of complex underlying issues in for-profit and nonprofit work settings—underlying issues that may be difficult to discern, pointing to one limitation of this study. There could be many factors that contributed to similar emotions being coded in studies of both sectors. It could be due similar traits of workers, work environments, or the nature of work itself. The findings also could be due to the leanings and experience of the researchers identifying these traits; i.e., what looks like stress to one researcher may be identified as depression by another. Another related limitation of this study pertains to the nature of this type of content analysis. Conducting a content analysis of other people’s work requires some interpretation on the part of the reviewers, leaving some uncertainty in the findings. Also, in some cases, studies were excluded because only summary data was presented that did not allow for coding of specific emotions. A collection of raw data from such studies would prove tremendously useful to uncover some of the research questions being explored. Another strategy could be to conduct new research that specifically focuses on comparing for-profit and nonprofit workers and work environments.

The study of emotional labor in nonprofit sectors (and all sectors) is important, because when not recognized, understood and mitigated, the practice of emotional labor can have detrimental effects on employees’ job satisfaction and overall well-being. Although we hope the full
The analysis of emotional labor studies introduced here will provide a better understanding of the differences and similarities among sectors. It’s definite that additional research is warranted to further explore this phenomenon, develop new theories related to emotional labor and nonprofit workers, and to propose strategies to strengthen worker performance and job satisfaction.
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Appendix 1

Defining and Classifying Emotions and Emotional Labor

Although “emotion” is not the same as “emotional labor,” we predetermined that emotions could be critical factors for distinguishing differences among the sectors in this study. Prior to conducting the data analysis, we conducted a systematic review of the literature on emotional labor and emotions to identify and define common terms, traits, and issues about which we (as researchers and coders) would need to be familiar prior to conducting the analysis. In addition to an extensive review of literature on emotional labor, a thorough review was conducted of research that featured, defined, and categorized emotions (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006; Hochschild, 1983; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Scherer, 2005; Seo, Barrett, & Bartunek, 2004; Wierzbicka, 1992). Definitions and organizing concepts from these resources were blended to develop a coding sheet* and corresponding code book* to guide researchers when reviewing articles. Many of these sources defined emotion terms, looked at “affect categories” (Scherer, 2005), and explored dimensions of emotional labor (Kruml & Geddes, 2000) and emotional display rules (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006).

Several of these sources also graphed emotions on a double-axis, four-quadrant chart that placed emotions into categories based on levels of action and control, and pleasantness. The most common depiction of this is the Geneva Emotion Wheel (Scherer, 2005). Two variations of this wheel and its classification system are contained in Appendix 6. All research reviewed did not use such a grid, but most used similar classifications. For this reason, the data resulting from this content analysis also will be charted into some variation of this grid classification system. For example, hypotheses for this study have been depicted on an emotional wheel (see Appendix 5) relating each hypothesis to various emotion quadrants.

Unlike many of the research studies that lead to development of these emotion classifications, however, we were not able to portray the intensity of emotions featured in our sample studies by only a review of text results. Nonetheless, the classification system is proving helpful for discerning similarities and differences among the sectors.

Emotional labor concepts also are being reviewed, but it’s anticipated that emotions will be the more prominent place for distinguishable differences. Emotional labor concepts studied and included in the coding sheet included emotive effort (notion of feeling management), emotive dissonance (the difference between felt and feigned emotions), and emotional attachment (emotional bond or attachment) (Hochschild, 1983).

*For a copy of the code sheet and code book, contact Beth Eschenfelder at beschenfelder@ut.edu.
Appendix 2
Detailed Description of Sampling Method

Databases

The population of journal articles for this study was pulled from searches done on five databases available through our local library, including: EBSCO, ProQuest, WilsonWeb, JSTOR, and Emerald. The majority of samples were pulled from the first two databases—EBSCO and ProQuest. Gale Expanded index database was not available through our online library, which was initially a concern. However, after conducting research on the effectiveness of various library search databases, it was agreed that the databases chosen were sufficient to provide a comprehensive population from which to sample.

Research studies on the effectiveness of search databases, for example, showed that “EBSCO provided the most in-depth access with the largest number of titles, the greatest years of coverage, and the most peer-reviewed journals of the three databases” (compared to Gale and Proquest) (Blessinger & Olle, 2004, p. 346). Another study that specifically explored database resources for undergraduate sociology majors (Mellone, 2010) found that SocINDEX (EBSCO) contained more material from specialized professional disciplines (p. 155), including, for example, business, management, and marketing—disciplines of interest to organizational communication and business communication scholars. Based on this research and assurances from our library reference specialist, we determined the combination of the above five databases to be sufficient for pulling the population for sampling.

Search Criteria

Many searches were conducted across all five databases to determine a combination of search terms and criteria that would produce common results across databases as well as a suitable number of hits. Wherever possible, criteria were selected for scholarly or peer-reviewed articles. To acquire all viable articles, “full-text” was not used as a criteria, which required extensive research to track down copies of some articles chosen for the sample. We also did not limit searches to specific countries, allowing articles from England, Australia and other countries to be included in the population.

We experimented with many combinations of search terms including words such as work, organization, emotion, and emotional labor, and we experimented with field parameters such as title, citation, abstract, full text, and others. After running several searches among all five databases, it was determined a simple search of the term “emotional labor” was sufficient to meet our needs. By not limiting the search term further, we were able to keep an open mind about the definition of “work.” This resulted in retrieval of articles, for example, featuring emotional labor among sex workers, activists, domestic workers, and other personal care givers. The open nature of the search terms resulted in only a few articles not related to business or organizational communication scholarship, for example, those focused on family relationships—these were excluded from the population. The five databases used different
search fields, but wherever possible, the search was targeted to the citation and abstract. Appendix 4 shows the final search criteria used to pull the initial pool of journal articles (the population) used for this study, along with additional search terms used to add to the pool after we determined the initial search did not produce enough articles featuring nonprofit organizations to warrant an equitable comparison. This process is described in the next section.

Refining the Population (For a visual flow chart of this process, refer to Appendix 3.)

To keep the population to a manageable size, only the top 100 articles were used from each database search; this included all articles from the smaller database searches, which retrieved fewer than 100 hits. These article hits were cross referenced to eliminate duplicates; this resulted in a total population of 290 articles. This list was further narrowed down to include articles indexed by multiple databases. This became the final sub-set of the population used for sampling; this included a subpopulation of 63 articles that were indexed from two or more databases. The 63 articles included in the sub-population were reviewed by the researchers further to determine appropriateness for our sample. This involved reading through each article completely to identify several criteria: a) to determine whether the article featured an actual study, as opposed to an extended literature review or critical analysis; b) to determine whether the article featured “work,” “workers,” and/or “work places” that could be coded for analysis; and c) to identify which type(s) of work place(s) was/were featured in the article.

Selecting and Categorizing the Sample (For a visual flow chart of this process, refer to Appendix 3.)

Sampling was done in multiple stages: a) Population Sampling: With the population narrowed down to a manageable size, the entire population was deemed appropriate for the research sample. b) Quota Sampling: Because this study focused on comparing for-profit workers and work environments to nonprofit workers and work environments, the researchers sought balanced representation among the primary sectors (for-profit and nonprofit). To achieve this, it was necessary to do quota sampling by conducting additional searches of articles featuring emotional labor in nonprofit work environments.

To determine the need to fill out the quota of “nonprofit” articles, all articles were thoroughly reviewed and classified based on sector or work setting (whenever possible) including for-profit, nonprofit, public, healthcare, and unclassified (see the following subsection on Defining Workplace Sectors). Healthcare was listed as a separate “sector,” because most articles featuring healthcare work did not specify sector (for-profit, nonprofit, public) and because healthcare can be provided by companies in any sector. We suspected these articles may not be used in the final analysis, but they were kept in the sample for analysis. “Uncategorized” articles featured types of work and workers that were difficult to classify in a sector. Two articles fit into this category, featuring domestic workers (maids) and sex workers. Two other categories were initially included—“religious” and “unknown”—but no articles fit into those classifications in the final sample.
Among the final sample of 60 articles, the following primary categorization applied. Some articles featured workers from multiple settings, but articles received a primary classification for initial sorting.

Table A2: Representation of sectors featured in the final sample of research articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Categories by Sector</th>
<th>Final Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit (charitable)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (government)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FINAL SAMPLE: 60 articles**

*Defining Workplace Sectors*

Few studies on emotional labor specifically identify the featured work environments base on “sector.” For the purpose of categorizing research studies for further examination in this study, research sites featured in studies were categorized by sector, primarily for-profit, nonprofit, and public. There was sector overlap for some types of work places such as healthcare, some social services, and education settings. Other types of work did not fit neatly into a specific sector, such as domestic works (e.g. maids). For categorizing purposes, the following workplace types were used:

*For-profit.* These usually are considered “corporate” entities; privately-owned businesses that operate for a profit motive (Rothschild & Milofsky, 2006, p. 137).

*Nonprofit (charitable).* These organizations serve a broad public purpose and provide a public benefit in the areas of education, religion, science, the arts, human services, and other areas. They are often thought of as charitable nonprofits, charities, and social services. “Social services” many be provided by any type of sector. Unless there was reason to suspect services were being offered in/by a different sector, they were categorized as nonprofit.

*Public (government).* These include government entities, such as municipalities or federal and state agencies, but they also include quasi-governmental service-providing entities.

*Healthcare.* This could include hospitals, nursing homes, and in-home caregivers. These could be for-profit, nonprofit, or public businesses; for most studies, the sector was unknown.

*Unclassified.* This category included any “organization” that didn’t fit other category types.
Appendix 3

Sampling Method Flow Chart

1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Original Search* | Population* | Sub-Population* | Original Sample* | Additional Search #1* | Additional Search #2* |
ProQuest | ProQuest | ProQuest | 245 articles | top 100 articles | top 100 articles |
EBSCO | EBSCO | EBSCO | 216 articles | top 100 articles | top 100 articles |
WilsonWeb | WilsonWeb | WilsonWeb | 138 articles | 57 articles | 57 articles |
JSTOR | JSTOR | JSTOR | 57 articles | 57 articles | 57 articles |
Emerald | Emerald | Emerald | 8 articles | 8 articles | 8 articles |

= 664 article “hits” (included duplicates)

= 356 article “hits” (included duplicates)

Minus duplicate “hits” = 290 articles

Articles with hits in multiple databases = 63 articles

Targeted search; added from the Original Search = +14 articles

Targeted search, added from the Population = +9 articles

Articles usable for this study = 41 articles

Additional articles usable for this study = +5 articles

Additional articles usable for this study = +14 articles

Final Sample = 60 articles

*Refer to the narrative description of the sampling process outlined in Appendix 2. Also see the next page for a quick description of the sampling steps depicted here.

For-Profit Sector = 18 articles
Nonprofit Sector = 18 articles
Public Sector = 15 articles
Healthcare = 7 articles
Unclassified = 2 articles
Appendix 3 (continued)

Original Search

See Appendix 2 for a detailed description of selected databases, search terms, and other criteria.

Population

The top 100 articles, based on search criteria “relevance,” were selected from each resulting database search.

Sub-Population

Articles were selected for preliminary review based on duplicate indexing—those indexed in multiple databases.

Original Sample

Articles were determined appropriate for the sample, based on preliminary review. Articles that did not feature “work” or actual research studies were not included in the sample.

Additional Search #1

Additional articles were added from the Population to expand the representation nonprofit studies. These included articles from the Population (column 2) that were not indexed in multiple databases but which appeared to feature nonprofit work environments.

Additional Search #2

Still lacking an adequate supply of nonprofit research studies, additional articles featuring nonprofits were sought from the Original Search.
### Appendix 4

#### Database Search Method

Table A4. Search terms and criteria used for database searches and sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Search Criteria</th>
<th>Additional Search #2 With New Search Terms*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ProQuest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Search terms” (and fields): “emotional labor” (citation and abstract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria: scholarly journals / peer-reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hits: <strong>245</strong> articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorted by relevance; the top 100 articles were included in the population.</td>
<td>Additional search term: “nonprofit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits**: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(**not already included in the population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBSCO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Search terms” (and fields): “emotional labor” (abstract or author supplied abstract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria: scholarly journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hits: <strong>216</strong> articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorted by relevance; the top 100 articles were included in the population.</td>
<td>Additional search term: “nonprofit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WilsonWeb</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Search terms” (and fields): “emotional labor” (abstract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria: peer-reviewed; all databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hits: <strong>138</strong> articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorted by relevance; the top 100 articles were included in the population.</td>
<td>Additional search term: “nonprofit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Search terms” (and fields): “emotional labor” (abstract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria: article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hits: <strong>57</strong> articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All included in the population</td>
<td>Additional search term: “nonprofit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerald</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Search terms” (and fields): “emotional labor” (abstract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria: journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hits: <strong>8</strong> articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All included in the population</td>
<td>Additional search term: “nonprofit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional search term: “social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New unique hits: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the additional search, search fields and search criteria remained the same. Additional searches included the original search term (“emotional labor”) plus the addition of new search terms listed above (right column). These searches were intended to hone in on additional articles from the original search—beyond the narrowed down list of duplicate-hit articles selected for the final sample pool and beyond the first 100 articles selected for the population.*
Appendix 5
Hypotheses for the Larger Study

Figures A5.1-A5.4. Study hypotheses\textsuperscript{8} and application to the Geneva Emotion Wheel (Schere, 2005)

\textbf{H1:} Emotional labor studies featuring nonprofit workers and work environments will contain reference to more pleasant/positive emotions than emotional labor studies of for-profit workers—regardless of level of emotive action/control.

\textbf{H2:} Emotional labor studies featuring for-profit workers and work environments will contain reference to more unpleasant/negative emotions than emotional labor studies of nonprofit workers—regardless of level of emotive action/control.

\textbf{H3:} Emotional labor studies featuring nonprofit workers and work environments will contain reference to more unpleasant/negative emotions of passive/low control than emotional labor studies of for-profit workers.

\textbf{H4:} Emotional labor studies featuring for-profit workers and work environments will contain reference to more unpleasant/negative emotions of active/high control than emotional labor studies of nonprofit workers.

\textsuperscript{8} The study hypotheses featured here are being used in the final presentation of this study.
Appendix 6
Sample Emotion Charting Tools

Figure A6.1. Geneva Emotion Wheel

(Scherer, 2005)
Figure A6.2. Emotion Mapping Chart

(Scherer, 2005)