Chih-Wei Hsieh
University of New Mexico
Kaifeng Yang
Kai-Jo Fu
Florida State University

Motivational Bases and Emotional Labor: Assessing the Impact of Public Service Motivation

Emotional labor has become an important topic in the study of organizational behavior, but no research has examined how it is affected in individuals' motivational bases. Public administration scholars have started to study this concept, but empirical studies are still in their infancy. Focusing on a particular type of motivational base—public service motivation (PSM), this article assesses how PSM and its three dimensions (attraction to policy making, commitment to public interest, and compassion) affect two common emotional labor activities (surface acting and deep acting). Using data from a survey of certified public management students, the results show that PSM is negatively associated with surface acting and positively associated with deep acting. Among the PSM dimensions, attraction to policy making is positively associated with surface acting; compassion is negatively associated with surface acting and positively associated with deep acting; and commitment to public interest is not associated with surface acting or deep acting.

Although emotions have been an implicit feature of the organizational sciences since Elton Mayo and the human relations movement, their critical role was not examined sufficiently for an extended period of time when the pursuit of efficiency, predictability, calculability, and impersonality dominated organizational life. Since the 1980s, many organizational scientists have turned toward a more humanist view and called for more attention to the role of emotions (Fineman 1999; Hochschild 1983; Keltner and Haidt 2001). A prominent stream of such research focuses on emotional labor—employee efforts to actively display socially and organizationally desired emotions as they engage in job-related interactions (Ashforth and Humphrey 1993; Hochschild 1983; Morris and Feldman 1997). It has become an important topic in fields such as sociology, management, occupational psychology, education, and criminology.

Public administration scholars have started to acknowledge the importance of emotional labor (Guy and Newman 2004; Hsieh and Guy 2009; Mastracci, Newman, and Guy 2006; Meier, Mastracci, and Wilson 2006; Newman, Guy, and Mastracci 2009). Like physical or cognitive labor, emotional labor is an essential component of service delivery regardless of whether it is in the public, nonprofit, or private sector. When public service delivery requires face-to-face or voice-to-voice exchanges between workers and citizens, successful performance of this work relies on how workers detect the affective state of the citizens, adjust their own affective state, and exhibit work-appropriate emotive behaviors (i.e., nicer than nice or tougher than tough; see Newman, Guy, and Mastracci 2009). Guy, Newman, and Mastracci note that "to ignore the emotion work that is required in public service is to luxuriate in the myth that mission accomplishment is merely a matter of correctly allocating resources . . . if the *service* in public service means anything, it is that the relational component of public service jobs must be acknowledged" (2008, 69).

Emotional labor research is rapidly growing inside and outside the field of public administration. Along with lingering debates about its conceptualization and dimensionality, its nomological network—including its related constructs such as antecedents, correlates, and consequences—has not been mapped fully. A few studies have examined its potential antecedents, such as personality, emotional display rules, and interaction characteristics (Brotheridge and Grandey 2002; Brotheridge and Lee 2003; Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005), but their findings need validation, and many other potential antecedents have not been investigated. One such potential antecedent is employees' motivational bases—what motivates employees to behave in a certain way. It is reasonable to expect that people with different motivational bases may have different tendencies or use different strategies to regulate their emotions. Studying the

> Studying the effects of motivational bases helps us understand how to motivate or induce employees to engage in emotional labor.

Chih-Wei Hsieh is assistant professor in the School of Public Administration, University of New Mexico. His research interests include human resource management, organizational theory, and emotional labor.
E-mail: chsieh@unm.edu

Kaifeng Yang is associate professor and PhD program director in the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University. He has published widely on citizen participation, public management, and performance measurement. He is managing editor of *Public Performance and Management Review*.
E-mail: kyang@fsu.edu

Kai-Jo Fu is a doctoral candidate in the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University. Her research interests include human resource management, leadership, and organizational theory.
E-mail: kf07d@fsu.edu

effects of motivational bases helps us understand how to motivate or induce employees to engage in emotional labor.

This article focuses on a particular type of motivational base, namely, public service motivation (PSM). In their seminal article "The Motivational Bases of Public Service," Perry and Wise define PSM as "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations" (1990, 368). Studies have found that public employees on average are motivated more strongly by the desire to help the general public compared to their private counterparts (Perry 1996). There are indications that PSM has a positive impact on public organizations and on employees regarding job performance (Frank and Lewis 2004), citizenship behavior (Christensen and Whiting 2009), public employment preference (Lewis and Frank 2002), organizational commitment (Crewson 1997), and intention to remain (Naff and Crum 1999). Still, scholars have called for more studies on the nomological framework of PSM with more comparable measures (Perry, Hondeghem, and Wise 2010). This article answers this call by assessing the impact of PSM on emotional labor.

While this article contributes to the general understanding of emotional labor and PSM across sectors, it also relates to an important concern among public administration scholars regarding the direction of public service reforms. Many scholars long have emphasized the importance of compassion and caring in serving citizens, and they propose to rebuild the administrator–citizen relationship (Frederickson 1997; Goodsell 1981; Thompson 1975). New Public Management advocates and many practitioners directing government reforms, however, are driven more by economy and efficiency concerns (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). In a recent work, Stivers (2008) concludes that the most important challenge facing public administrators is not to make their work more efficient, but to make it more humane and caring. Emotional labor and PSM relate to this caring function of public service.

Theory and Hypotheses
Emotional Labor in Administrator–Client Interactions
Although Hochschild (1983) coined the term "emotional labor" to capture a very specific meaning associated with the management of emotions, this idea has been defined in various ways (see table 1), conceptualized as an internal emotional state (Hochschild 1983),

an internal process (Guy, Newman, and Mastracci 2008; Morris and Feldman 1996), or external behaviors (Ashforth and Humphrey 1993; Grandey 2000; Kruml and Geddes 2000). Nevertheless, there is general agreement that emotional labor involves employee efforts to conform to organizational expectations of appropriate emotional displays. This is a type of labor that the worker must perform in order to get the job done. Unlike physical labor, emotional labor remains "invisible" until the work-appropriate emotion is produced and shown to the other. Grandey (2000) recognizes two themes common to most definitions: (1) individuals are able to regulate their emotions at work, and (2) surface acting (managing the expression of emotions) and deep acting (managing actual emotions) are typical activities for performing emotional labor.

Following Grandey (2000), we consider emotional labor as consisting of surface acting and deep acting. First proposed by Hochschild (1983), this conceptualization has several benefits. One is that surface acting and deep acting are not intrinsically positive or negative; this allows emotional labor to have both negative and positive outcomes (Grandey 2000). A second benefit is that it provides conceptual clarity by separating emotional labor from emotional states and situational demands. Finally, most scholars, even when they use different definitions, agree on the existence of these two typical types of activities (Brotheridge and Grandey 2002; Brotheridge and Lee 2003; Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005; Grandey 2000; Groth, Thurau, and Walsh 2009; Guy, Newman, and Mastracci 2008).[1]

Emotional labor has been studied in two types of situations: interactions with organizational insiders such as coworkers and supervisors, and interactions with organizational outsiders such as clients or customers. The latter is Hochschild's (1983) original understanding. The two types of interaction have distinct characteristics, but few studies have examined the differences (Grandey, Kern, and Frone 2007). Newman, Guy, and Mastracci (2009) write that emotional labor required in worker–citizen relations involves a process of four steps: (1) *emotive sensing* or detecting citizens' affective state and using that information to array one's own alternative responses; (2) *analyzing* one's own affective state and comparing it to that of the citizens; (3) *judging* how alternative responses will affect the citizens and selecting the best one; and (4) *behaving* to suppress or express an emotion in order to elicit desired citizen responses.

Table 1 Definitions of Emotional Labor

Source	Definition
Hochschild (1983)	"The management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has exchange value" (7).
Ashforth and Humphrey (1993)	"The act of displaying the appropriate emotion (i.e., conforming with a display rule)" (90).
Morris and Feldman (1996)	"The effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions" (987).
Grandey (2000)	"May involve enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions to modify the emotional expression…in response to display rules for the organization or job" (95).
Kruml and Geddes (2000)	"What employees perform when they are required to feel or at least project the appearance of certain emotions in order to produce, for insurance, 'excellent customer service'" (177).
Chu (2002)	"The degree of manipulation of one's inner feelings or outward behavior to display the appropriate emotion in response to display rules or occupational norms" (31)
Diefendorff and Richard (2003)	"The management of emotions as part of the work role" (284).
Meier, Mastracci, and Wilson (2006)	"The projection of feelings and emotions needed to gain the cooperation of clients or coworkers, the ability to see another's side of the issue and integrate that perspective into what the organization does" (899).
Guy, Newman, and Mastracci (2008)	"That work which requires the engagement, suppression, and/or evocation of the worker's emotions in order to get the job done" (97).

Surface acting involves adjusting observable emotional expressions to mask true feelings and to pretend to feel a desired emotion. It is accomplished by faking emotional displays, so it also is termed "false face acting" (Guy, Newman, and Mastracci 2008) or "acting in bad faith" (Grandey 2003). In contrast, deep acting refers to consciously modifying one's true feelings to feel exactly a desired emotion, and so it is termed "acting in good faith" (Grandey 2003). Deep acting is accomplished by either cognitive reappraisal or attentional deployment, that is, thinking of events that elicit the emotion to be displayed (Grandey 2000).

There is no consensus about the relative effects of surface acting and deep acting, but in general, deep acting is more effortful (Morris and Feldman 1996), while surface acting is more maladaptive because it entails emotional dissonance—the tension felt when expressions and feelings diverge. Evidence generally indicates that surface acting is associated with more negative outcomes at the individual level such as stress and job dissatisfaction (Brotheridge and Grandey 2002; Morris and Feldman 1997), while deep acting is related to more positive outcomes such as role performance and affective delivery (Brotheridge and Grandey 2002). In particular, Grandey (2003) finds that service delivery ratings are positively related to deep acting but negatively related to surface acting. Although both surface acting and deep acting require emotive efforts, the former, not the latter, relates to stress or emotional exhaustion. The payoffs of deep acting—reduced emotional dissonance and positive reactions from customers—restore emotional resources for employees in a way that surface acting cannot (Grandey 2003). Grandey et al. (2005) argue that surface acting results in insincere expressions that can be recognized by customers as manipulative, while deep acting leads to displays that are perceived as more authentic. Groth, Thurau, and Walsh (2009) find that deep acting leads to benefits such as perceived customer orientation and service quality; these benefits are greater when customers can detect deep acting accurately. Similarly, surface acting has negative effects only when customers perceive it as surface acting—that is, it is not a problem if customers do not recognize it.

Surface acting and deep acting are influenced by situational factors such as the frequency of customer interactions, the duration of the interaction, job types, customer hostility, and organizational expectations (Brotheridge and Grandey 2002; Grandey, Dickter, and Sin 2004; Morris and Feldman 1996). They also are influenced by dispositional factors. For example, Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand (2005) find that extraversion and conscientiousness are negatively related to surface acting but positively related to deep acting. Neuroticism is positively associated with surface acting but negatively associated with deep acting.

Effect of PSM on Emotional Labor

Perry and Wise (1990) propose three distinct PSM categories: rational, normative, and affective. Rational motives are grounded in self-interest maximization. Normative motives relate to efforts to conform to societal norms, while affective motives trigger behaviors that are grounded in emotional responses to various social contexts. Perry (1996, 1997) further proposes a four-dimensional PSM measurement that includes attraction to policy making, commitment to public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. Perry (1996) acknowledges that the self-sacrifice dimension has only mixed sup-

port and that a three-dimension model (without self-sacrifice) fits better with the rational, normative, and affective PSM categories. Therefore, Coursey and Pandey (2007) offer a three-factor model with fewer items based on Perry's scale. Here, we employ Coursey and Pandey's (2007) abridged scale.[2] As Perry, Hondeghem, and Wise (2010) summarize, some studies have used the aggregate PSM scale, while others have used its subscales individually or in combinations. We consider both the aggregate scale and the dimensions. The literature shows that the PSM dimensions may have different antecedents (Moynihan and Pandey 2007) and consequences (Scott and Pandey 2005).

Attraction to policy making (APM). APM originally is conceptualized as a rational motive grounded in individual utility maximization in the sense that people participate in the policy process or are committed to particular public programs because they personally identify with and advocate for a special or private interest (Perry and Wise 1990). To maximize their self-interest, workers with higher APM are more likely to conform to organizational rules or expectations about emotional displays because staying in the organization is important for them to continue participating in the policy process. They are more likely to believe that they will get what they want through the political process as long as they pretend to be responsive to other participants. Thus, APM should be positively related to surface acting. In the meantime, when workers are highly identified with a special interest, whether they will step into other people's shoes and modify their inner feelings depends on whether they believe the clients will help advance their particular interest. Thus, the impact of APM on deep acting can go either direction, and it is reasonable to make a nonrelational hypothesis.

Several studies question the operationalization of APM, arguing that the natively worded survey items do not reflect a rational motive (Kim 2009). Instead, the items more closely tap into individual distrust in politicians (Coursey and Pandey 2007) or distaste for the political process (Brewer, Selden, and Facer 2000). In other words, the APM items may measure respondents' identification with the political process in general: how they think of political negotiations, deals, and compromises. Still, people scoring higher on the items are more likely to perform surface acting. There are "exchange" norms associated with political interactions. No matter how much one disagrees with the opposing party, one must be polite and civilized. People who are attracted to politics are more likely to hold those beliefs—they need to smile at their enemies. As Rosenberg et al. write, "how a political candidate looks and speaks has a significant impact on that candidate's chances of being selected" and "these claims are political truisms of the television era" (1986, 108). In the meantime, people with high APM may not engage in deep acting because they still hold strongly to their self-interest, and political exchange norms do not necessarily require them to change their position or true feelings. Indeed, emotions are part of an expression game in negotiation dynamics (Druckman and Olekalns 2008). Negotiators' display of emotions is often strategic, not authentic (Kopelman, Rosette, and Thompson 2006).

> Hypothesis 1a: Attraction to policy making is positively associated with surface acting.

Hypothesis 1b: Attraction to policy making is not associated with deep acting.

Commitment to public interest (CPI). CPI is norm based, referring to one's desire to fulfill a societal obligation or standard, particularly the desire to serve the public interest and the loyalty to duty and the government as a whole (Perry 1997). There are no apparent mechanisms that link CPI with emotional labor. The CPI items place public interest and community preference over workers' personal interests, but they do not address how one should deal with other individuals whose actions may not represent the interests of the community and public. Unlike workers scoring high on APM, who may perform surface acting to maximize their self-interest, people with high CPI may tolerate a violation of self-interest if it is best for the community. Similarly, unless workers with high CPI believe that deep acting serves the public interest, they have no motivation to do it. Therefore, when moderating relationships are not considered, it is reasonable to make nonrelational hypotheses here.

Moreover, CPI reflects collectivist values and communitarian norms that underscore the importance of the community over the individual. Workers with high CPI may treat a client simply as someone who has a special interest. They may believe that their job is important business to the public, but how that affects their emotional display toward individual clients is unclear. When public managers are motivated to solve community problems and achieve the public interest, they make independent judgments about what is best for the community (DeSantis, Glass, and Newell 1992; Selden, Brewer, and Brudney 1999). They try to remain neutral and do not cater to any particular client. Thus, workers with high CPI are more likely to display naturally felt emotions (see Ashforth and Humphrey 1993; Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005) instead of performing surface acting or deep acting.

Hypothesis 2a: Commitment to public interest is not associated with surface acting.

Hypothesis 2b: Commitment to public interest is not associated with deep acting.

Compassion. Perry (1996) bases his definition of compassion on Frederickson and Hart's concept of "patriotism of benevolence," which represents "an extensive love of all people within our political boundaries" (1985, 549). People with higher levels of compassion are more likely to define themselves in relation to others and make moral decisions based on the impact those actions have on others (Gilligan 1982). Compassion is found to be critical for organizations that primarily address human pain and suffering, such as hospitals, social service organizations, and mental health agencies (Kanov et al. 2005), where high levels of emotional labor are required. Lilius et al. (2003) find that individuals describe compassion as the giving of emotional support, the giving of time or flexibility, and the giving of material support. Thus, it is reasonable to believe that compassionate people are more likely to display emotional labor.

A closer look shows that compassion should lead to more genuine emotional efforts but reduce insincere efforts. Compassion is a strong basis for deep acting because it demonstrates a deep sense of caring, connectedness, and "other-centeredness" (Kanov et al. 2005), which leads to the exchange of genuine and authentic relationships. The process of executing compassion involves noticing (cognitive recognition), feeling (a deeper emotional awareness), and responding (tangible and instrumental action) (Kanov et al. 2005), which relates closely to the process of deep acting. Lilius et al. assert that "compassionate interpersonal interactions at work not only prompt positive meaning making, but also cultivate positive affect at work by generating a range of outcomes that are infused with emotions about the self, coworkers, and the organization overall" (2003, 1). In short, people with compassion are likely to put themselves in other people's shoes.

Deep acting is an inside-out process. When deep acting is engaged, the organizationally desired emotions will be felt and then displayed; workers do not need to fake their behavior (or need much less faking). Therefore, compassion should positively affect deep acting but negatively affect surface acting. This is in line with Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand's (2005) argument that individuals who value positive interactions with others—as compassionate people do—are more likely to engage in deep acting and less likely to engage in surface acting. They find that agreeableness, one of the "big five" personality factors, has a positive impact on deep acting and a negative impact on surface acting. They measure agreeableness using Saucier's (1994) scale, which includes elements that reflect the concept of compassion: kindness, sympathy, consideration, warmth, generosity, and helpfulness.

Hypothesis 3a: Compassion is negatively associated with surface acting.

Hypothesis 3b: Compassion is positively associated with deep acting.

Method
Data and Sample
The data were collected using a self-reported survey of public service workers enrolled in the certified public manager program at Florida State University. The program is a comprehensive training and development program for public sector managers in state and local governments in Florida that consists of eight four-day training sessions ranging from level 1 to 8. It enrolls approximately 3,000 students per year, but the exact number of students varies from course to course and level to level. In order to sample respondents from a variety of occupations, the time frame was set from mid-November 2008 to the end of February 2009. Because we are interested in the emotional labor required in government–client service transactions, questionnaires were administered only to students in levels 1 and 2 because these students are primarily street-level bureaucrats—the target of this article.[3] There were 326 such students during the time span.[4]

We received 243 surveys, a response rate of 74.5 percent. The sample size then was reduced to 208, as 35 respondents reported that they did not talk to or help any clients or customers in their daily work. In the final sample, the average age was 44.7, with a range between 27 and 69. The average experience in the current job was 110 months (approximately nine years), ranging from 3 months to 31 years. As shown in table 2, the proportion of female respondents (54.2 percent) was slightly higher than males. About 91.2 percent

Table 2 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Gender (Missing = 7)		
Female	109	54.2
Male	92	45.8
Educational level (Missing = 4)		
Less than high school	1	.5
High school graduate or GED	12	5.9
Technical training or apprenticeship after high school	5	2.5
Some college	39	19.1
Two-year associate degree	20	9.8
Graduate from college	74	36.3
Some graduate school	15	7.4
Master's degree	32	15.7
Law degree	3	1.5
Doctoral degree	3	1.5
Annual income (Missing = 10)		
$29,999 or less	6	3.0
$30,000–$39,999	30	15.2
$40,000–$49,999	42	21.2
$50,000–$59,999	50	25.3
$60,000–$69,999	29	14.6
$70,000–$79,999	22	11.1
$80,000 or more	19	9.6

Table 3 Job Characteristics of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Level of government (Missing = 1)		
State level	122	58.9
Local level	85	41.1
Occupation (Missing = 8)		
Administrative services	33	16.5
Corrections	9	4.5
Education	3	1.5
Fire	4	2.0
Health care	7	3.5
Law enforcement	18	9.0
Legal services	2	1.0
Parks and recreation	5	2.5
Social work	33	16.5
Transportation	35	17.5
Utilities	6	3.0
Other	45	22.5
Time with clients/customers daily (Missing = 3)		
1 (Rarely)	6	2.9
2	19	9.3
3	31	15.1
4	26	12.7
5	40	19.5
6	35	17.1
7 (Always)	48	23.4

of the respondents had at least some college-level coursework, with 36.3 percent and 26 percent having a university degree and a graduate degree, respectively. The respondents were scattered over every salary category but were concentrated in the range between $30,000 and $69,999.

Table 3 reports the job characteristics of the respondents. All of them held a full-time job at the state (58.9 percent) or local level (41.1 percent).[5] They worked in a variety of occupations: transportation (17.5 percent), administrative services (16.5 percent), social work (16.5 percent), law enforcement (9 percent), corrections (4.5 percent), and other areas (such as health care, utilities, parks and recreation, legal services, code enforcement, emergency management, and animal control). Most respondents spent a significant amount of time working directly with clients or customers.

Measures

All variables were operationalized on the basis of existing scales in the literature (see appendix). The items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree/rarely" to 7 = "strongly agree/always." For emotional labor, we employed measures from Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand (2005). Because there were many duplicated items in their surface acting scale, we removed two items and slightly modified the wording of the remaining ones. Cronbach's alpha was 0.91 for surface acting and 0.89 for deep acting in our sample. For PSM, we employed the abridged version of Perry's scale from Coursey and Pandey (2007). A confirmatory factor analysis with our sample supported the scale (CFI = 0.991; RMSEA = 0.026; Chi-square = 36.4; df = 32), although one item, "I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves," did not significantly load with any of the three factors (factor loading < 0.4) and therefore was removed from further analysis. Cronbach's alpha values for all dimensions were above 0.70.

Analytical Technique and Procedure

We used ordinary least squares regression for hypothesis testing and included control variables such as gender, age, tenure, education, income, and frequency of service interactions (Erickson and Ritter 2001; Sloan 2004). It is reasonable to expect that employees in different functional areas will exhibit different degrees of emotional labor based on their responsibilities.[6] In particular, while all functional areas in our sample are in public service in general, some have more regulatory (enforcement) responsibilities, so that employees may identify themselves as regulators (enforcers) more than service providers.[7] Thus, areas such as corrections, law enforcement, fire, code enforcement, and animal control, which tend to have authoritative power and a control-oriented culture, were coded 1; areas such as education, health care, parks and recreation, social work, transportation, and utilities were coded 0.[8] We expect, in relative terms, less emotional labor in regulatory areas. This does not suggest that employees in regulatory areas do not need to engage in emotional labor; in fact, prior studies report significant emotional labor among 911 call takers and corrections workers (Newman, Guy, and Mastracci 2009).

Results
Univariate Analysis

Univariate statistics in table 4 show that, on average our sample reported higher levels of deep acting than surface acting, but the average score for both emotional activities is lower than the scale midpoint of 4. Among the three PSM dimensions, CPI has the

Table 4 Univariate Statistics of Main Latent Variables

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Surface acting	2.88	1.40	.69	–.26	1.00	7.00
Deep acting	3.67	1.44	–.04	–.60	1.00	7.00
Attraction to policy making	3.77	1.39	–.12	–.60	1.00	7.00
Commitment to public interest	5.39	.97	–.50	.31	2.25	7.00
Compassion	4.83	1.27	–.30	–.45	1.50	7.00

highest average score, followed by compassion. APM has the lowest score, lower than the scale midpoint of 4.

Correlation Matrix

Table 5 reports the correlation matrix. Most of the correlation coefficients are low, with the highest one at 0.35. Surface acting and deep acting are positively correlated, but only weakly ($r = 0.22$, $p < .01$). Although they may have different consequences, both are emotion management activities for similar purposes. Consistent with prior findings, APM is not correlated with CPI and compassion, while the latter two are positively correlated ($r = 0.35$, $p < .01$). Overall, PSM has a positive correlation with deep acting but is negatively associated with surface acting. PSM dimensions are correlated with the two emotional labor activities in different ways. Compassion is positively correlated with deep acting ($r = 0.25$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with surface acting ($r = -0.22$, $p < .01$). APM is positively correlated with surface acting ($r = .19$, $p < 0.01$) but is not correlated with deep acting. CPI is negatively associated with surface acting ($r = -0.14$, $p < .05$) but is not associated with deep acting. Finally, none of the control variables is correlated with surface acting and deep acting.

Discriminant Validity

The measure of PSM and emotional labor should reflect the fact that they are distinct but related concepts. They are distinct in that PSM is about individuals' motivational bases, while emotional labor refers to individuals' emotional efforts when interacting with clients. To assess the discriminant validity between PSM and emotional labor, we ran a confirmatory factor analysis that treated PSM dimensions, surface acting, and deep acting as distinct but correlated latent constructs. The model yielded an adequate fit (CFI = 0.928; RMSEA = 0.067; chi square = 233.2; df = 125). Discriminant validity was further demonstrated as no correlation between any pair of the latent variables was greater than 0.50.

Regression Analysis

Table 6 presents the regression results.[9] For each dependent variable, three models are tested: M1 includes only control variables, M2 includes control variables and the aggregate PSM factor, and M3 includes control variables and the three PSM dimensions.

If only control variables are included (M1s), the models are not statistically significant and R^2 is low ($F = 0.94$ and $R^2 = 0.04$ for surfacing acting; $F = 1.94$ and $R^2 = 0.07$ for deep acting). When APM, CPI, and compassion are added, the models (M3s) become statistically significant and explain significantly more data variation: for surface acting, $F = 2.31$ ($p < .05$), $R^2 = 0.12$; for deep acting, $F = 2.97$ ($p < .01$), $R^2 = 0.15$. Similarly, when the aggregate PSM factor is added, the models (M2s) become statistically significant and explain significantly more data variation, too: for surface acting, $F = 2.48$ ($p < .05$), $R^2 = 0.10$; for deep acting, $F = 3.13$ ($p < .01$), $R^2 = 0.13$.

Results for M3s support all of our hypotheses. APM is positively associated with surface acting ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) but is not associated with deep acting. CPI is not statistically significant in the models predicting surface acting or deep acting. Compassion is negatively associated with surface acting ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$) but is positively associated with deep acting ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$). Results for M2s show that the aggregate PSM factor is negatively associated with surface acting ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$) but positively associated with deep acting ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$).

Most control variables are not significant, supporting past findings that every public service worker may engage in certain levels of emotional labor regardless of their gender, age, tenure, educational level, and marital status (Guy, Newman, and Mastracci 2008). It is important to observe that females were not found to engage more in emotional labor than males do, although some previous studies assumed so (Meier, Mastracci, and Wilson 2006).

> The results suggest that people with higher levels of PSM are less likely to engage in surface acting but more likely to engage in deep acting.

Discussion

Emotional labor has gained significant attention recently from public administration researchers, but empirical studies are still rare in assessing its antecedents. While PSM has a longer history of study in public administration, its consequences have not been fully examined. Bringing these two important constructs together, this article assesses how PSM influences employees' emotional labor activities. The results suggest that people with higher levels of PSM are less likely to engage in surface acting but more likely to engage in deep acting. This result is driven by the affective component of the PSM

Table 5 Correlation Matrix

	SA	DA	Gender	Age	Tenure	EDU	Income	FSI	FA	PSM	APM	CPI
Surface acting (SA)	1.00											
Deep acting (DA)	.22**	1.00										
Gender	−.05	.07	1.00									
Age	−.08	−.07	.03	1.00								
Tenure	−.06	.01	.11	.19**	1.00							
Education (EDU)	.13	−.06	−.03	−.03	−.29**	1.00						
Income	.10	.12	−.14*	.19**	.11	.26**	1.00					
Frequency of service interaction (FSI)	.08	−.02	.09	−.12	.09	.04	−.11	1.00				
Functional area (FA)	.09	−.08	−.14	−.07	.30*	−.06	.20**	.04	1.00			
Public service motivation (PSM)	−.24**	.25**	.03	.23**	.04	−.11	−.06	−.06	−.15*	1.00		
Attraction to public making (APM)	.19**	−.06	.00	−.14*	.01	−.11	−.21**	.01	−.08	.09	1.00	
Commitment to public interest (CPI)	−.14*	.03	.01	.29**	.16*	−.08	.03	−.02	.23**	−.12	1.00	
Compassion	−.22**	.25**	.05	.18*	.07	−.16*	−.09	−.04	.21**	−.02	.02	.35**

* Significant at $p < .05$; ** significant at $p < .01$.

Table 6 Regression Results of Emotional Labor on Public Service Motivation

Dependent Variable	Surface Acting			Deep Acting		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
Control Variables						
Female	−.02	−.03	−.01	.04	.04	.03
Age	−.09	−.03	−.03	−.10	−.16*	−.14
Tenure	−.02	−.01	.00	.09	.07	.08
Educational level	.09	.06	.08	−.13	−.10	−.09
Income	.06	.05	.10	.25**	.26**	.25**
Frequency of service interaction	.05	.05	.05	.01	.01	.00
Functional area (Regulatory = 1)	.10	.05	.04	−.18*	−.13	−.13
Independent Variables						
Public service motivation		−.27**			.25**	
Attraction to policy making			.21**			−.04
Commitment to public interest			−.07			−.07
Compassion			−.18*			.30**
R^2	.04	.10	.12	.07	.13	.15
Adjusted R^2	−.00	.06	.07	.04	.09	.10
ΔR^2 (compared to the model with controls only)		.07**	.08**		.06**	.08**
F	.94	2.48*	2.31*	1.94	3.13**	2.97**
N	172	171	169	172	171	169

Note: Standardized coefficients (β) are reported in the table.
* Significant at $p < .05$; ** significant at $p < .01$.

construct (the compassion dimension), as the effects of the aggregate PSM factor are similar to those of the compassion variable but not similar to those of APM and CPI.

The results support that APM is positively associated with surface acting but is not associated with deep acting. According to Perry's (1996) original conception, APM reflects a rational self-interest motive—workers are motivated to pursue a particular policy or interest. Hence, the finding here means that in order to get their self-interest satisfied, workers likely will conform to organizational rules on emotional display and perform surface acting, which will lead to greater client satisfaction if the clients cannot accurately detect that the workers are faking. However, self-interest only gets you so far: this motive will not influence whether workers engage in deep acting. This finding can be interpreted in another way. As suggested by some scholars (Coursey and Pandey 2007; Kim 2009), the APM scale may capture attitudes toward politicians, political processes, and political negotiations. In that case, the finding may mean that workers who like politics and enjoy making compromises and negotiations are more likely to fake emotions to gain support, without having to change their standpoint or true emotions.

It would be wrong to conclude that APM is not beneficial to public service delivery because it does not lead to authentic emotional display. Although surface acting may have some negative effects at the individual level, such as emotional dissonance and job dissatisfaction, it often has positive effects at the organizational level because the emotions faked are desired by the organization (Grandey 2000; Hochschild 1983). And in some situations, such as those that involve dramatic events or intense emotions, changing workers' true feelings may be inappropriate, and surface acting is the only way to go. The results suggest that emphasizing self-interest is not an effective strategy if organizations want to promote authentic emotional displays.

Organizations can tell employees: show the authentic emotions we want, we will get you what you want. But saying so may only lead to faking, not deep acting.

The results show that CPI is not associated with surface acting and deep acting. While serving the public interest and performing emotional labor are both desirable, good things do not necessarily relate to each other. As a normative motive, CPI measures the extent to which individuals are motivated by public service and serving the community at large. High levels of CPI lead to more emotional labor efforts only when workers believe the efforts are in the public interest or benefit the community. However, there is a gap between individual clients and the community as a whole because clients may only represent special interests. Therefore, one explanation for the results is that the mechanisms that might link CPI with emotional labor are not obvious, which is why we developed the nonrelational hypotheses. Another speculative explanation is that the spirit of public service influences workers' inclination to care for citizens so strongly that they have no need to regulate emotions—they just display naturally felt emotions (see Ashforth and Humphrey 1993; Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005). We wish the latter explanation were true, but this is an empirical question that deserves future research.

> [P]eople with higher levels of compassion may experience less emotional distress when following organizational displaying rules.

Our results support that compassion is positively associated with deep acting but negatively associated with surface acting. As an affective motive, compassion means that workers are motivated by a sense of caring and connectedness, which naturally leads them to step into clients' shoes and perform deep acting. In this situation, workers feel no or much less need to fake emotions. Because deep acting produces less emotional dissonance than surface acting does, this finding implies that people with higher levels of compassion may experience less emotional distress when following organizational displaying rules. More importantly, some public

administration scholars long have argued that compassion and benevolence should be important administrative values (Frederickson and Hart 1985; Gawthrop 1997). Our results provide empirical evidence that people with compassion are more likely to engage in emotional efforts that help place themselves in clients' shoes and take client interests to heart.

Overall, our results confirm the importance of PSM to the practice of public management. Although PSM cannot be used as the sole criterion in selection and performance appraisal, it can be used as an important consideration. Paarlberg, Perry, and Hondeghem assert that using PSM as a selection criterion in recruiting "provides important opportunities for job seekers to learn more about the culture and values of the organization and to make the decision as to whether such values match their own preexisting values" (2008, 270). Wright and Grant (2010) suggest not only using goal-setting interventions but also placing workers in direct contact with clients in ways that highlight the impact they have on the lives of others. This can create a more facilitative environment for PSM and emotional labor. Moynihan and Pandey's (2007) conclusion, that organizations can foster employee PSM, is informative. Public organizations can create an internal environment that is conducive to PSM and deep acting. The bureaucratic structures such as red tape and hierarchical authority, for example, should be reformed because they reduce compassion and emotional efforts (Hummel 1977; Moynihan and Pandey 2007). Organizations also can design and implement programs that address how employees convey appropriate emotions and handle difficulties, such as tough clients, without losing their courtesy and temper. Training can be developed to cultivate and enhance workers' empathic concerns to the people they serve.

Functional area is only statistically significant in one of the six models. Employees in regulatory or authoritative areas are less likely to engage in deep acting (M1 for deep acting), but the effect disappears when PSM variables are included in the model (M2 and M3 for deep acting). In order to assess whether this is attributable to mediating effects—functional areas affect deep acting through PSM—we tested four additional models: functional area and other control variables were used as independent variables, while PSM, APM, CPI, and compassion were used as the dependent variable, respectively.[10] The results show that employees in regulatory areas are likely to have lower levels of PSM and compassion, which, together with the results in table 6, confirm the mediating effect. This does not mean that public employees in regulatory areas should not or do not perform emotional labor. The result must be understood in a comparative sense. For example, all else being equal, the extent to which an average corrections officer tries to feel how a criminal is feeling or thinking is less than the extent to which an average school administrator tries with parents and students. The finding that functional areas are not related to surface acting means that even public employees in areas that involve more regulatory power are likely to fake emotions to conform to organizational rules. This is probably because customer orientation and professionalism has been emphasized in almost everywhere—respect, humility, and civility are required in all types of government agencies.

As one of the early efforts to probe the relationship between PSM and emotional labor, this study has limitations. The respondents are certified public manager students who work in government full time. Government employees who choose to enter the program may be different from those who do not, so the results may not be generalizable. However, the results have strong theoretical support. Still, we fully acknowledge that future studies are necessary to verify the findings reported here. Future studies also may examine how other organizational characteristics, such as organizational culture and structure, affect emotional labor. This study was not intended to find all possible causes for emotional labor, but we do hope that it will lead to more studies in this area.

Conclusion

How can we encourage public administrators to express socially and organizationally appropriate emotions when interacting with citizens? This question arguably is at the heart of public service work. As the market model pushes government toward greater efficiency and economy, this question becomes more relevant than ever for those who envision public service as a caring and nurturing function (or calling). This article suggests that in order to achieve public service as a caring profession, PSM is an important consideration. Public employees with higher levels of PSM are more likely to engage in deep acting in serving their clients and improve the quality of their interactions. Public administration scholars long have argued that compassion should be an administrative value, but few have demonstrated empirically its performance implications. This article shows, for the first time, that compassion relates to the quality of public service delivery: it leads public employees to actively regulate their

Appendix: Main Measures

Surface acting (Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005; α = .91)
- I wear a "mask" in order to deal with clients/customers in an appropriate way.
- I put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with clients/customers.
- I pretend to feel the emotions I need to display for my job.
- I show feelings to clients/customers that are different from what I feel inside.
- I fake the emotions I show when dealing with clients/customers.

Deep acting (Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005; α = .89)
- I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to clients/customers.
- I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display toward others.
- I work hard to actually feel the emotions that I need to show to clients/customers.
- I work at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show to clients/customers.

Attraction to policy making (Coursey and Pandey 2007; α = .78)
- Politics is a dirty word. (Reversed)
- The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me. (Reversed)
- I don't care much for elected officials. (Reversed)

Commitment to public interest (Coursey and Pandey 2007; α = .76)
- I unselfishly contribute to my community.
- Meaningful public service is very important to me.
- I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
- I consider public service my civic duty.

Compassion (Coursey and Pandey 2007; α = .70)
- It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.
- I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another.

Frequency of service interaction
- On a typical day, about how much time do you spend helping or working directly with clients or customers?

emotions in serving citizens and to think from citizens' perspectives. Doing so helps create a good government image and improve citizen trust in government.

Interested in whether motives grounded in public institutions and organizations influence workers' emotional labor efforts, we find that people with higher levels of PSM are more likely to engage in deep acting and less likely to engage in surface acting. The findings contribute to the emotional labor research in general, as no prior study, inside or outside the field of public administration, has linked emotional labor with motivational bases. We hope this article will stimulate more studies that examine how emotional labor is affected by other motivational bases such as monetary incentives, value orientations, and career achievement. This article also contributes to the PSM research. As PSM scholars continue to examine its dimensionality and practical implications, this article shows that PSM influences emotional labor and its dimensions may play different roles in the relationship.

Waldo once lamented, "Why would an instrument [bureaucracy] designed to be impersonal and calculating be expected to be effective in delivering sympathy and compassion?" (1980, 45). This question has haunted us for quite some time, but we are optimistic that government and its administrators can be caring and nurturing if we create organizational attributes that foster PSM and rebuild public service ethos that emphasizes compassion and benevolence.

Notes

1. For some researchers (e.g., Ashforth and Humphrey 1993; Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand 2005), there is another emotional labor activity or strategy—the expression of naturally felt emotions. But this activity requires much less effort and has not been widely considered by other scholars. Morris and Feldman (1996) prefer a scale of four dimensions—attentiveness to display rules, frequency to emotional display, variety of emotions to be expressed, and emotional dissonance—but this scale seems inconsistent with Hochschild's (1983) paradigm. There are still other conceptualizations, but in general, researchers agree that surface acting and deep acting are the most commonly used emotional labor activities (Groth, Thurau, and Walsh 2009).

2. As Coursey and Pandey (2007) acknowledge, the self-sacrifice dimension has been included in PSM research by many scholars (e.g., Brewer, Selden, and Facer 2000). There is reasonable theoretical and empirical support for studying self-sacrifice in future studies.

3. Street-level bureaucrats in general have more direct contacts with citizens or clients. Public administration research on emotional labor mostly has studied street-level bureaucrats (Hsieh and Guy 2009; Meier, Mastracci, and Wilson 2006; Newman, Guy, and Mastracci 2009). Newman, Guy, and Mastracci write that studying emotional labor and affective leadership is important because "when citizens meet friendly street-level bureaucrats, they are more likely to have a positive assessment of services rendered and of public services in general" (2009, 17).

4. The focus for level 1 students is management of individual performance, and for level 2, management of group performance. PSM and its dimensions were not mentioned in the classes, nor was emotional labor.

5. Level of government will not be treated as a control variable because it lacks the relevance to emotional labor in theory, as the respondents are all street-level bureaucrats. We tried to test the effect of the level of government using ANOVA and regression analysis, and we found that it was not statistically significant.

6. In organizational behavior studies, Gutek et al. (1999) distinguish between service relationships (people have a shared interaction history and expect to interact again in future) and service encounters (people do not expect to see each other

again), but it is difficult to apply this categorization to broad functional areas. For example, some law enforcement positions involve more service relationships, while others involve more service encounters. Groth, Thurau, and Walsh (2009) differentiate between high-contact services and moderate-contact services, but again, the categorization is difficult to be applied to broad government functional areas and the study does not find it a significant moderator for the impact of emotional labor any way.

7. A close example is Yang's (2005, 2006) study on public employees' trust in citizens, a construct with affective components such as security, hopefulness, and optimism. Yang (2005) finds that employees in law enforcement may be different from those in health, education, financial services, and human and social services.

8. We coded fire along with law enforcement because they often are discussed together in terms of public safety. This procedure is open to question because fire departments have both regulatory and service responsibilities. Nevertheless, when we excluded fire department respondents from our analysis, the results remained essentially the same. When we coded fire department respondents as 0, the results remained the same as well. One likely reason is that fire could be coded either way, as it has both types of responsibilities. Another possible reason is that we had only four fire department respondents, or 2 percent of our sample.

9. The variance inflation factor (VIF) test shows that there is no multicollinearity problem in our models. All VIF values are less than 2. Other regression assumptions are met as well.

10. Details of the results are not reported in table 6 for the sake of simplicity. Interested readers may contact the authors for the details. The mediation effect can be assessed with three steps of regression analysis (Baron and Kenny 1986): (1) regressing the mediator (PSM) on the independent variable (functional areas), (2) regressing the dependent variable (deep acting) on the independent variable (functional areas, M1 in table 6), and (3) regressing the dependent variable on both the independent and the mediator (M2 and M3 in table 6).

References

Ashforth, Blake E., and Ronald H. Humphrey. 1993. Emotional Labor in Service Roles: The Influence of Identity. *Academy of Management Review* 18(1): 88–115.

Baron, Reuben M., and David A. Kenny. 1986. The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51(6): 1173–82.

Brewer, Gene A., Sally Coleman Selden, and Rex L. Facer II. 2000. Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review* 60(3): 254–64.

Brotheridge, Céleste M., and Alicia A. Grandey. 2002. Emotional Labor and Burnout: Comparing Two Perspectives of "People Work." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 60(1): 17–39.

Brotheridge, Céleste M., and Raymond T. Lee. 2003. Development and Validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 76(3): 365–79.

Christensen, Robert K., and Steven W. Whiting. 2009. Employee Evaluations in the Public Sector: Public Service Motivation, Task, and Citizenship Behaviors. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies* 24(2): 41–56.

Chu, Kay. 2002. The Effects of Emotional Labor on Employee Work Outcome. PhD diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Coursey, David H., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007. Public Service Motivation Measurement: Testing an Abridged Version of Perry's Proposed Scale. *Administration & Society* 39(5): 547–68.

Crewson, Philip E. 1997. Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499–518.

DeSantis, Victor S., James J. Glass, and Charldean Newell. 1992. City Managers, Job Satisfaction, and Community Problem Perceptions. *Public Administration Review* 52(5): 447–53.

Diefendorff, James M., Meredith H. Croyle, and Robin H. Gosserand. 2005. The Dimensionality and Antecedents of Emotional Labor Strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 66(2): 339–57.

Diefendorff, James M., and Erin M. Richard. 2003. Antecedents and Consequences of Emotional Display Rule Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88(2): 284–94.

Druckman, Daniel, and Mara Olekalns. 2008. Emotions in Negotiation. *Group Decision and Negotiation* 17(1): 1–11.

Erickson, Rebecca J., and Christian Ritter. 2001. Emotional Labor, Burnout, and Inauthenticity: Does Gender Matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly* 64(2): 146–63.

Fineman, Stephen. 1999. Emotion and Organizing. In *Studying Organization: Theory and Method,* edited by Stewart R. Clegg and Cynthia Hardy, 289–310. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Frank, Sue A., and Gregory B. Lewis. 2004. Government Employees: Working Hard or Hardly Working? *American Review of Public Administration* 34(1): 36–51.

Frederickson, H. George. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Frederickson, H. George, and David Hart. 1985. The Public Service and the Patriotism of Benevolence. *Public Administration Review* 45(3): 547–53.

Gawthrop, Louis C. 1997. Democracy, Bureaucracy, and Hypocrisy Redux: A Search for Sympathy and Compassion. *Public Administration Review* 57(3): 205–10.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodsell, Charles T. 1981. *The Public Encounter: Where State and Citizen Meet.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Grandey, Alicia A. 2000. Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: A New Way to Conceptualize Emotional Labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5(1): 95–110.

———. 2003. When "The Show Must Go On": Surface Acting and Deep Acting as Determinants of Emotional Exhaustion and Peer-Rated Service Delivery. *Academy of Management Journal* 46(1): 86–96.

Grandey, Alicia A., David N. Dickter, and Hock-Peng Sin. 2004. The Customer Is Not Always Right: Customer Aggression and Emotion Regulation of Service Employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25(3): 397–418.

Grandey, Alicia A., Glenda M. Fisk, Anna S. Mattila, Karen J. Jansen, and Lori A. Sideman. 2005. Is "Service with a Smile" Enough? Authenticity of Positive Displays during Service Encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 96(1): 38–55.

Grandey, Alicia A., Julie H. Kern, and Michael R. Frone. 2007. Verbal Abuse from Outsiders versus Insiders: Comparing Frequency, Impact on Emotional Exhaustion, and the Role of Emotional Labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 12(1): 63–79.

Groth, Markus, Thorsten Hennig Thurau, and Gianfranco Walsh. 2009. Customer Reactions to Emotional Labor: The Roles of Employee Acting Strategies and Customer Detection Accuracy. *Academy of Management Journal* 52(5): 958–74.

Gutek, Barbara A., Anita D. Bhappu, Matthew A. Liao-Troth, and Bennett Cherry. 1999. Distinguishing between Service Relationships and Encounters. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(2): 218–33.

Guy, Mary Ellen, and Meredith A. Newman. 2004. Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor. *Public Administration Review* 64(3): 289–98.

Guy, Mary Ellen, Meredith A. Newman, and Sharon H. Mastracci. 2008. *Emotional Labor: Putting the Service in Public Service.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hsieh, Chih-Wei, and Mary Ellen Guy. 2009. Performance Outcomes: The Relationship between Managing the Heart and Managing Client Satisfaction. *Review of Public Personal Administration* 29(1): 41–57.

Hummel, Ralph P. 1977. *The Bureaucratic Experience.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kanov, Jason M., Sally Maitlis, Monica C. Worline, Jane E. Dutton, Peter J. Frost, and Jacoba M. Lilius. 2005. Compassion in Organizational Life. *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(6): 808–27.

Keltner, Dacher, and Jonathan Haidt. 2001. Social Functions of Emotion. In *Emotions: Current Issues and Future Direction,* edited by Tracy J. Mayne and George A. Bonanno, 192–213. New York: Guilford Press.

Kim, Sangmook. 2009. Revising Perry's Measurement Scale of Public Service Motivation. *American Review of Public Administration* 39(2): 149–63.

Kopelman, Shirli, Ashleigh Shelby Rosette, and Leigh Thompson. 2006. The Three Faces of Eve: Strategic Displays of Positive, Negative, and Neutral Emotions in Negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 99(1): 81–101.

Kruml, Susan M., and Deanna Geddes. 2000. Catching Fire without Burning Out: Is There an Ideal Way to Perform Emotional Labor? In *Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice,* edited by Neil M. Ashkanasy, Charmine E. J. Hartel, and Wilfred J. Zerbe, 177–88. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Lewis, Gregory B., and Sue A. Frank. 2002. Who Wants to Work for Government? *Public Administration Review* 62(4): 395–404.

Lilius, Jacoba M., Monica C. Worline, Jane E. Dutton, Jason Kanov, Peter J. Frost, and Sally Maitlis. 2003. What Good Is Compassion at Work? Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, August 1–6, Seattle, WA.

Mastracci, Sharon H., Meredith A. Newman, and Mary Ellen Guy. 2006. Appraising Emotional Work: Determining Whether Emotional Labor Is Valued in Government Jobs. *American Review of Public Administration* 36(2): 123–38.

Meier, Kenneth J., Sharon H. Mastracci, and Kristin Wilson. 2006. Gender and Emotional Labor in Public Organization: An Empirical Examination of the Link to Performance. *Public Administration Review* 66(6): 899–909.

Morris, J. Andrew, and Daniel C. Feldman. 1996. The Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Emotional Labor. *Academy of Management* 21(4): 989–1009.

———. 1997. Managing Emotions in the Workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues* 9(3): 257–74.

Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007. The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 40–53.

Naff, Katherine C., and John Crum. 1999. Working for America: Does Public Service Motivation Make a Difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 19(3): 5–16.

Newman, Meredith A., Mary Ellen Guy, and Sharon H. Mastracci. 2009. Beyond Cognition: Affective Leadership and Emotional Labor. *Public Administration Review* 69(1): 6–20.

Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Paarlberg, Laurie E., James L. Perry, and Annie Hondeghem. 2008. From Theory to Practice: Strategies for Applying Public Service Motivation. In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service,* edited by James L. Perry and Annie Hondeghem, 268–93. New York: Oxford University Press.

Perry, James L. 1996. Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1): 5–22.

———. 1997. Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(2): 181–97.

Perry, James L., Annie Hondeghem, and Lois R. Wise. 2010. Revisiting the Motivational Bases for Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 681–90.

Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367–73.

Rosenberg, Shawn W., Lisa Bohan, Patrick McCafferty, and Kevin Harris. 1986. The Image and the Vote: The Effect of Candidate Presentation on Voter Preference. *American Journal of Political Science* 30(1): 108–27.

Saucier, Gerard. 1994. Mini-Markers: A Brief Version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five Markers. *Journal of Personality and Assessment* 63(3): 506–16.

Scott, Patrick G., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2005. Red Tape and Public Service Motivation: Findings from a National Survey of Managers in State Health and Human Services Agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 25(2): 155–80.

Selden, Sally Coleman, Gene A. Brewer, and Jeffrey L. Brudney. 1999. The Role of City Managers: Are They Principals, Agents, or Both? *American Review of Public Administration* 29(2): 124–48.

Sloan, Melissa M. 2004. The Effects of Occupational Characteristics on the Experience and Expression of Anger in the Workplace. *Work and Occupations* 31(1): 38–72.

Stivers, Camilla. 2008. A Civil Machinery for Democratic Expression: Jane Addams on Public Administration. In *Jane Addams and the Practice of Democracy,* edited by Marilyn Fischer, Carol Nackenoff, and Wendy Chmielewski, 87–97. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Thompson, Victor. 1975. *Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion.* University: University of Alabama Press.

Waldo, Dwight. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration: A Summary View.* Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp.

Wright, Bradley E., and Adam M. Grant. 2010. Advancing Knowledge of Public Service Motivation: Research Designs for Key Questions about Emergency and Effects. *Public Administration Review.* 70(5): 691–700.

Yang, Kaifeng. 2005. Public Administrators' Trust in Citizen: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review* 65(3): 273–85.

———. 2006. Trust and Citizen Involvement Decisions: Trust in Citizens, Trust in Institutions, and Propensity to Trust? *Administration & Society* 38(5): 573–95.