Be Positive, Stay Calm, Appear Neutral: University Department Chairs' Emotional Labour

by

Summer Juliet Cowley

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

in

Educational Administration and Leadership

Department of Educational Policy Studies

University of Alberta

Abstract

Despite the widely acknowledged importance of university leadership, North American universities are facing a scarcity of senior faculty able or willing to take on leadership positions, including department chairships (Luna, 2012; Appadurai, 2009; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). While professors often feel motivated or obligated to act as chair, many find the position to be stressful or unpleasant, and only stay in the role for a short period due to job dissatisfaction (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Gmelch, 2016; Sarros, M. Wolverton, Gmelch, & M.L. Wolverton, 1999). Although stressors affecting chairs have been studied (Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Lees, 2016; Wilson, 1999), the body of literature on higher education lacks information regarding chairs' self-management of emotional responses to these stressors, a process herein referred to as *emotional labour* (Hochschild, 1983). In this case study, I asked: "In what ways do department chairs perform emotional labour at work?" By considering the emotional labour of department chairs as a matter of effective socialization into a university department, this project allows us to consider professional development as more than a simple nurturing of skills. Findings from this study may enable post-secondary senior administrators to improve chair training and professional development by providing further knowledge about the nature of emotional labour in chairship. This knowledge may enable institutions and administrators to give chairs the support they need to succeed in, and be satisfied with, their roles.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Summer Juliet Cowley. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, under the project names: "Sanctioned Feelings: University Department Chairs' Emotional Labour", No. Pro00065988, 2016; and "University Department Chairs' Experiences of Surprise: A Pilot Study", No. Pro00061543, 2016.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my sister, September Hope Cowley, for her unwavering commitment to truth, logic, and integrity in academic work and in life; my mother, Deanne Lau, for her insistence that education matters; and my father, Stanley Gene Cowley, for his endless curiosity about the edges of knowledge and of civil society.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the generous and ongoing guidance and support of my supervisor, Dr. Bonnie Stelmach, and my supervisory committee members, Dr. Heather Kanuka, and Dr. Cathy Adams.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

The love of teaching and education has been a part of my life since I was very young. My teachers in my K-12 education and various post-secondary experiences have all reliably shown me the power that education has to create and inspire change in the lives of students. Throughout my schooling experiences, and in my working life, I have taught, tutored, and trained students of all ages in French, ESL, biology, mathematics and, most frequently, writing. I have known for a long time that I wanted to use the strength of formal education to help others achieve their goals and to discover even larger hopes for the future than the ones they already had. However, I have experienced over and over in my work as an educator the impact that administrators have on the educators who help students to realize their goals. I have worked for excellent, visionary leaders with a passion for their work, who have inspired their staff to think, to grow, and to change, all in the name of student success. I have worked for uninspiring and bored leaders who seemed worn down by the role assigned to them, and I have worked for many administrators who fell in between. I have known for almost my entire life how significant educators are to the world, but it was not until my most recent undergraduate schooling that I began to wonder about the administrators that bind educators together. Who was responsible for the faculty meetings that often turned to unchecked monologues and barely restrained shouting matches? Who had to answer for budgets that demanded international student enrolment without providing professional development for professors in meeting the needs of ever more diverse student bodies? Who dealt with complaints about mandated curriculum changes and lecturers who were forced to instruct subjects in which they had no training? The role of administrators in universities became a very real part of my ideas about education when I returned to school as an adult, old enough to see the infighting and discord between faculty members and staff, old

enough to notice a vacuum in leadership. I began to wonder why some leaders seemed to do their job so easily, why some struggled, and why any leaders made decisions in the ways that they did. When I set out to design this study, I saw department chairs as the first kind of many educational leaders that I would eventually study. After my current work, I intend to continue my study of more levels of university administrators, to learn about the individuals who fill administrative positions in universities, and how they perform their roles.

Research Question and Objectives

In this study, I asked "In what ways do university department chairs perform emotional labour at work?" The purpose of this study was to explore what chairs self-reportedly do in order to express emotions that they believe are appropriate at work. The objective of this study was to explore chair self-management of emotions, using Hochschild's (2003) framework of emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange as a lens. Before I explain how I arrived at my research topic, it may be helpful to know the definitions of several terms that I used throughout this thesis.

Definitions of Terms

In this thesis, I use several terms that require definition. I use the terms "emotional labour", "emotional work", "feeling rules", and "social exchange" throughout. These terms are taken from Hochschild's (2003) framework of emotional labour, and I use them to focus on emotions in the workplace, rather than in private settings. "Emotional labour" is the term of these four that I use the most frequently in this study. When I use this phrase, I am referring to the effort that individuals exert to suppress or express emotions in order to act in a way that they feel is appropriate for their position and work environment. In this study, I take emotional labour to be part of the social performance of interacting with others in order to be perceived in a particular way (Goffman, 1978). The idea of emotional labour as effortful and performative is

integral to this study because it allows us to see employees' self-management of emotions as *work*, and therefore potentially as much a part of an employee's role at work as their tasks and responsibilities (Hochschild, 2003). The phrase "emotion work" appears in Hochschild (2003) to describe the self-management of emotions in broader settings than the workplace, especially in private home life. I use the phrase "emotion work" in this study to refer to the general act of self-managing emotions, whereas I use "emotional labour" to denote emotion work that takes place specifically at work. The phrase "feeling rules" denotes internal or external, implicit or explicit guidelines that define which emotions are considered appropriate or inappropriate to express in a given situation. In this study, although feeling rules are described by the participating chairs are personal and internal, I argue that these rules are in fact internalized social and external norms, developed and maintained through institutional and national cultures. Lastly in this list of terms, I use the phrase "social exchange" to describe interactions between individuals. This can include written, spoken, and non-verbal communication in both formal and informal pathways. Although these definitions align with Hochschild's (2003) usage, other commonly used variations exist.

I have used the definitions of terms that I described above because of their usage in Hochschild (2003) and because of the centrality of that framework to this study. However, some of the literature that I referenced for this study uses the phrases "emotional labour", "emotion work", "feeling rules", and "social exchange" in ways that vary slightly from the definitions I have taken from Hochschild (2003). I found these other definitions in literature from the fields of sociology, health care services, and feminist discussions of universities and other organizations. I have provided some of these definitions here for comparison to the ones I used in this study. In contrast to the definition of social exchange I used in this study, Lawler (2001), in his description of the affect theory of social exchange, defines social exchange as "a joint activity of two or

more actors in which each actor has something the other values" (p.322). This definition focuses on social exchange as driven by a series of trades, rather than as general interaction between people. In contrast to the definition I used of emotional labour, Staden (1998) and James (1992), writing in healthcare contexts, define emotional labour as part of the professional practice of providing care for others. Similar to the definition of emotional labour that I use, Mumby and Putnam (1992) provide a feminist analysis of emotions and describe emotional labour as bound up in a contrast with conceptions of individuals and workers as rational subjects. Writing about higher education contexts and gender, Luthar and Šadl (2008) describe emotional management in university settings as the control and suppression of emotions and make reference to Hochschild's definitions. As I have focused on Hochschild's (2003) framework to guide the design of this study, I have also chosen to use her definitions throughout.

In addition, I use the term "U15", which refers to a group of fifteen Canadian universities designated as focused on research (U15, 2017). These universities comprise: University of British Columbia, University of Alberta, University of Calgary, University of Saskatchewan, University of Manitoba, University of Waterloo, University of Western Ontario, Université d'Ottawa, University of Toronto, McMaster University, Queen's University, Université de Montreal, Université McGill, Université Laval, and Dalhousie University. According to the U15 website, these institutions represent the largest research production in Canadian academia and an overall student body of approximately 588,000. The U15 schools include the 10 highest ranking universities in Canada, as well as schools ranking at 12th, 13th, 15th, and 18th (QS World, 2017). For this study and for the pilot study that preceded it, I chose to focus on department chairs at a U15 institution to try to increase transferability of any findings to other major universities in Canada.

Pilot Study on Department Chair Surprise

Department chairs and their working lives are the focus of my thesis research but the journey to that research topic was slightly circuitous and began with a pilot study I conducted in 2015-2016. In my pilot study, I looked at the emotion of surprise, thinking it might connect well to contingency theory in educational leadership (Bush & Glover, 2014). I reasoned that, if leaders were surprised by goings-on at work, they might make decisions based on the immediate circumstances around them, rather than a predetermined plan. The surprise that they experienced might bring them to lead based on contingent events, ones that could not be predicted. To explore this idea, I conducted a pilot study of three chairs from the arts, social sciences, and professional faculties, and gathered data via semi-structured interviews that focused on chairs' experiences of being surprised at work. I collected data via phenomenological interviews (van Manen, 2014) of three department chairs. I contacted current Chairs from the natural sciences and social sciences in order to observe any disciplinary variation in the experience of leadership. In the pilot, I attempted to focus data collection on participants' reflective insights on surprise that challenged everyday notions of the experience (van Manen, 2014). However, as I spoke to the chairs in the pilot study, it appeared that a more foundational factor had a greater influence on the way they lead than any set of surprising events; navigating relationships with colleagues seemed to be one of the most significant components of chair decision-making. The work I completed for my pilot study helped me to focus my research on the efforts that chairs put into aspects of their work relationships. The process by which my work in the pilot study turned into my study of chair emotional labour occurred as a thin thread of loosely connected thoughts rather than at a single point in time.

It can be difficult to say where an idea comes from but for me, in my work on department chairs, my "aha!" moment arrived with little fanfare, in a story about Boxing Day, told by one of the chairs in my pilot study.

> [On December 26] I went to work, here in [the faculty]... The reason I went was because someone had given me some cookies. I was there until the 24th at four o'clock and I forgot those cookies. I forgot them on my desk. And I wasn't theoretically back till about January 2nd. And I thought, 'What if the person who gave me the cookies arrives and sees the cookies on my desk?' My office had a big window viewable from the hallway. What if they see these cookies on my desk, and think I was totally disinterested in them and their cookies? (F29)

This short set of lines, told as the introduction to a longer story, stuck with me for months after the pilot project was completed. The story about the cookies, as I have thought of it since I first heard it, nagged at me and I did not know why. There was something about the emotional aspects of the way that the chair told the story that seemed to be shouting at me to pay attention and I changed course slightly and began looking to emotions as they relate to leaders' decision-making process. I realized that it had been the emotional effort behind the chair's relationship to their colleague, symbolized by the cookies, that had been poking at my thoughts. While I had begun my pilot project thinking that the important work of being chair had to do with navigating decision-making situations, the story of the cookies had pointed out to me that navigating relationships, including self-managing emotions, was a major factor behind the work of being department chair. Although my pilot project was ostensibly on surprises experienced by department chairs, in the context of my pilot study, the things that really seemed to matter to the three chairs I interviewed, were other people. Aside from the fact that one of the pilot chairs

outright stated that what they found the most surprising was "definitely, I think, always the people thing." (M2), the chairs told me repeatedly that the real work of their job was relationships, and that it was important, above all, that they were perceived within those relationships in a particular way. Given that the three chairs from my pilot study were from departments in the arts, social sciences, and a professional faculty, I believed that subject area might not affect the importance to chairs of managing how they were perceived in relationships.

From Surprise to Emotional Labour

I looked back at the interviews from my pilot study and noted that what they appeared to have been talking about was not so much to do with decision-making as it relates to relationships, but about the *emotional work* of maintaining and creating those relationships. My reading on decision-making had led me into economics (as game theory tends to do), and I read further on how economic models of exchange could interlink with theories of emotions. Lawler's (2001) affect theory of social exchange looks at human relationships as a series of trades between groups of two in larger social settings. In short, Lawler describes a theory by which people share positive emotions, such as happiness, to achieve goals, treating the expression of emotions as currency. I liked the orderliness of the idea of people opening some internal reserve, drawing out a few pieces of positivity, and giving them to someone they need something from. The paring down of human relationships to a series of trades made me optimistic that there might be some predictability to how people behave in social interactions. I thought that maybe leaders really did offer up their emotions in exchange for others' emotions and performances at work. I thought that perhaps it was the currency of emotions that guided the decision-making of others. As I continued my search through literature on leaders, emotions, and sociological conceptualizations of the two, I stumbled upon Gonzales and Rincones (2013), a brief article on

the emotional labour of a department chair at an American university. The study was different than those I had been reading; it focused on a non-traditional methodology (participatory action research using photographic methods of data collection), and used a theoretical construct I was unfamiliar with: emotional labour (Hochschild, 2003). It was this serendipitous find that helped me look at the story of the cookies through a new lens, and steered me in the final direction that I chose for this study.

Hochschild (2013) describes the process of the self-management of emotions as *emotional work*, the effort people expend to match their emotional expression to contextual expectations. Set in the context of paid employment, emotional work becomes *emotional labour*. Managing emotions in routine situations, in high-stakes situations, or in moments of distress, workers' emotional expression metamorphoses from a method of social communication to a product of labour. The way that employees express desirable emotions and suppress undesirable ones becomes a measure of the workers' ability to perform the duties of their employment. Reading about emotional labour, I saw the chair's story of the cookies in a new light. Rather than a recollection of a moment of concern about a work relationship, the chair's story expanded into a description of the effort he expended to show the co-worker that he cared and an illustration of the work that is involved in maintaining relationships. The chair's rush to campus on December 26th to collect some homemade cookies from his office was not really about the cookies, but was instead about being perceived by an office member as a considerate and caring person. The way in which leaders want to be perceived at work was the link by which I connected the story of the cookies to Hochschild's (2012) framework of emotional self-management. The way I have told the story here makes it sound as though I connected the story of the cookies to emotional labour at the time; this is not the case. The connection between the story of the cookies and the desire to

present an ideal standard of being a chair only came to me towards the end of my analysis of the interviews I conducted with 10 chairs in my main study, nearly a year later. For the chair who told me the story of the cookies, his concern about how he would be perceived by the cookie baker was only a tangential example of how significant perceptions and keeping up appearances were (for him) to maintaining positive work relationships. His determination to prevent his co-worker from feeling uncared for, and the effort he expended to get to campus over the winter break, foreshadowed the stories chairs would later tell me about the efforts they made to ensure their public emotional face was seen in the 'right' way.

As I will discuss in the following chapters, I found in this study that department chairs performed emotional labour by adhering to a shared and implicit standard of leader emotional behaviour at work. In the following chapters, I will describe the details of this idealized standard and discuss some possible connections that could be made to existing literature. The standard that the chairs adhered to was that of a positive, calm, and neutral leader, able to take the goings-on of the university in stride. Going into research on department chairs without having held any administrative position in a university, or any faculty position at all, has allowed me to learn about chairs and their work environments with very few preconceived notions. I conducted literature reviews for my pilot study, and learned that the role of chair is difficult, fraught with stress (Gmelch & Burns, 1993, 1994; Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch & Gates, 1995), with challenging transitions from regular faculty appointments (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999), role conflict/ambiguity (Gmelch, Tanewski, & Sarros, 1998; Gmelch, 1995), and a lack of professional development (Morris & Laipple, 2015; Schwinghammer, Rodriguez, Weinstein, Sorofman, Bosso, Kerr & Haden, 2012). Other than that, I began my initial work on chairs as a blank slate of sorts, ready to record the world of the chairs around me. I think that it was this lack

of personal experience with working in universities that has allowed me to come to the conclusions that I did in the research upon which my thesis is based. That is, it was my position as a newcomer or outsider to university administration and the university academic work context that enabled me to notice normative aspects of chair behaviour as worthy of commentary. However, before I discuss my study of chairs in full, it is important to note the significance of studying them at all.

Significance of Studying Department Chair Emotional Labour

North American universities are facing a scarcity of senior faculty able or willing to take on leadership positions, including department chairships (Luna, 2012; Appadurai, 2009; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). While professors often feel motivated or obligated to act as chair, many find the position to be stressful or unpleasant, and only stay in the role for a brief period due to job dissatisfaction (e.g. Gmelch & Miskin, 2004, 2011; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Gmelch, 1991, 2016; Sarros, M. Wolverton, Gmelch, & M.L. Wolverton, 1999). The role of department chair is described as stressful due to role ambiguity, conflict management, and a lack of time (Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch & Gates, 1995; Gmelch, 1991; Lees, 2016; Wilson, 1999). U15 Chair job descriptions point to the importance of fostering collegial work relationships and maintaining personal and professional reputations (McMaster University, 2000; University of Toronto, 2003; University of Alberta, 2009a, 2009b) but no further indication of the effort required to achieve these tasks is given. In broader social contexts, authors have found that emotional labour is connected to emotional exhaustion (Zapf, 2002). Although stressors affecting chairs have been studied (Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch & Gates, 1995; Lees, 2016; Wilson, 1999), the body of literature on higher education lacks information regarding chairs' self-management of emotional responses to these stressors, which I have referred to as emotional

labour (Hochschild, 2003). Hochschild (2003) defined the term 'emotional labour' in her study of public service workers, as she noted the effort that they had to expend on portraying a particular affect. In the transition from regular faculty to chair, academics' roles change focus from private and individualistic concerns to public and group concerns (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999) and new chairs must learn how they are expected to act, including the feeling rules that outline which emotions are appropriate for them to express at work. Investigating the emotional labour that chairs must perform in order to maintain positive work relationships and their professional and personal reputations at work may allow us to better understand the stress that can result from that effort. In higher education research, Gonzales and Rincones (2013) applied this concept to a study of one department chair at an American university and found that the chair performed emotional labour to meet feeling rules in many different ways. This study picks up on Gonzales and Rincones (2013) and looks at the emotional labour of 10 department chairs and the normative standard to which they hold themselves.

Theoretical Framework: Emotional Labour

Hochschild (2012) describes emotional labour as efforts to self-manage emotions and as occurring as a result of *the commercialization of human feeling*. In short, workers are required by their jobs to manage their own feelings and emotional expression in order to align with the requirements of their role. Hochschild describes the process of emotional self-management as beginning in private life, where individuals learn what is and is not appropriate, and continuing in working life, where individuals perform the same self-management in exchange for money, rather than for social benefits. Emotional labour as a concept is composed of three interwoven factors: *emotion work*, *feeling rules*, and *social exchange*. In situations where emotional labour is being performed: social exchange is constrained to formal avenues whose motives are profit-

based or productivity/performance-based; feeling rules exist that define and constrain what emotional expression is appropriate, and emotional work is performed by social agents that wish to obey those rules. If 'emotion workers' (Hochschild, 2003) did not display the prescribed emotions, they would be perceived as not meeting the normative expectations of their roles; they would be seen as doing a poor job. By commodifying feeling and its expression, institutions can shape the ways in which workers express themselves and the ways in which they think about that self-expression.

In higher education institutions, such as universities, although the 'rule books' are much slimmer than the training manuals described by Hochschild (2003), workers are still held to the standard of a constructed and normative ideal—in the case of department chairs, this is the ideal of *the good leader*. The norms surrounding the good leader and their emotional expression represent a standard to which chairs must conform; if chairs do not meet these expectations, social friction and increased stress at work may result (Hochschild, 2003). In order to examine the work of chairs through the lens of emotional labour, I used the pillars of emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange to guide my interview question design. Of the set of ten questions that I asked in each initial interview, four were focused on emotional labour, four on feeling rules, and one on social exchange, with some overlap (Appendix D). The remaining questions were aimed at gathering information on length of time that chairs had served in the department. In the second set of interview questions, which were eight in total, two questions were focused on emotional labour, three on feeling rules, and four on social exchange, with some overlap (Appendix H). In the individual follow-up emails to participants (Appendix G), I asked questions to gather further information in relation to specific comments made by the chairs or to

gather information on topics that we had not discussed in full during the interviews; these topics varied in subject matter but were focused on managing emotions at work.

Methodology, Methods Used, and Research Design

As I began interviews of department chairs for this study, I was curious to hear their own stories of how they had performed emotional labour, and the feeling rules and social environments that were involved. Due to the relative lack of information in the literature on chairs' emotional labour, I wanted to allow for as many unforeseen perspectives on the subject as possible, so I designed data collection around open-ended methods. In semi-structured interviews, the researcher follows a guiding list of questions or topics loosely, changing the order and wording of the questions in response to the responses of the interview participant (Merriam, 2009). This approach allows the researcher to pursue issues raised by the participants as the interview progresses, rather than seeking answers to predetermined questions only. The bulk of my data was collected on-site in this manner. I wanted to talk to the chairs in person, to feel the emotional tone of their responses and to be able to notice the subtle shifts in their body language and voice tone when we spoke. I wanted to know the ways that they had performed emotional labour as chair but I also wanted to be able to sense how they felt about it. Since I knew from my reading that there was little published work on the emotional labour of department chairs, I wanted my work to be exploratory and particular. The case study methodology that I chose reflected this desire, and I focused my questions on one research site: a large, Canadian, research-intensive university. The research site that I chose housed a leadership development program aimed at the professional development of faculty in formal and informal leadership positions. This program included workshops on emotional intelligence and relationship development as a leader at the university. I thought that my work on chairs might benefit the

university by providing commentary on some of the school's leaders and that the presence of these programs might indicate that the school was interested in improving its leadership preparation programs in general and might be willing to participate in such a study and perhaps implement changes based on its findings. Of the ten chairs who participated in this study, four had recently completed the onsite leadership training program and were able to comment on their experiences of it. In November 2016, I reached out to 44 of the department chairs at the site. By January 2017, 10 chairs had agreed to participate in my study and by March I had finished collecting data via interviews, one participant journal, and email responses to follow-up questions after initial interviews. All data gathered in this study complied with the methods described in the original ethics application, which allowed for the collection of data via interviews, participant journals, follow-up questions via email, and focus groups. Transcribing the interviews and organizing the written information to tell the story of the chairs took patience, work, and the good sense to know when to step away and when to return. I used Saldaña's (2016) *emotion coding* and *values coding*, *in vivo* codes uttered by the chairs, and Hochschild's (2003) *a priori* codes of emotional labour, feeling rules, and social exchange. Following these coding approaches, I produced 375 codes, I printed my codes, cut them one by one from the paper they were printed on, and organized them into categories on the floor. In order to organize the codes into themes, I used a constant comparative technique (Merriam, 2009) to help me consider whether the preliminary themes I identified were related parts of a larger whole, or were separate ideas.

Assumptions, Delimitations, Limitations

In this study, I have made assumptions that connect to the study's delimitations and limitations. I have assumed that department chairs perform emotional labour in their roles and

that they are able to identify and describe their own emotional labour. I have assumed that the chairs who participated in this study would be able to reflect upon their own emotional labour and discuss it openly. I have also assumed that case studies can provide useful insights that might be transferable to a broader context. This study was a single-site qualitative case study with ten participants. As such, it is necessarily limited in its applicability to other contexts. I delimited the scope of this study by focusing on current chairs in one institution. The chairs that participated in this study were from a variety of disciplines, including the arts, natural sciences, social sciences, and professional faculties. I chose to limit the study to a single institution because I was not aiming to compare differences in participant responses between institutions. In order to avoid discipline-specific response tendencies as much as possible, I sought out participants from the full range of disciplines at the university. Since this was an exploratory study in an under-researched area, a large sample size was not necessary and I instead aimed for data saturation, the point at which I no longer observed significant differences in participants' responses. Apart from these delimitations, this study was limited by the length of engagement that was possible with participants, largely the amount of time that they had available to meet for interviews and the number of times they were willing and available to meet. The study was also limited by participants' willingness to discuss the details of their emotional labour or details of situations at work, and by their ability to accurately remember and describe events related to emotional labour performed at work. In this qualitative study, I did not aim for generalizable results but rather for information that might be transferred to other similar contexts. Despite these limitations, the findings from this study may have transferability to the emotional labour of department chairs at other large, research-intensive universities in Canada.

Chair Performances of Emotional Labour

The chairs I spoke to in this study were different from each other. I spoke to chairs from a variety of disciplinary, professional, and national backgrounds, and who also varied in terms of gender and age. The chairs told me about their own schooling, their own experiences with former chairs, their previous leadership experience in industry, informal and formal leadership roles, and previous academic administration experience, and the various goals that they had when they took on the role. These goals were: to perform an obligation, improve communication, inspire faculty and students, increase productivity, "serve their time", and to take care of colleagues. Despite differences in experiences, the chairs wanted to serve the people and the department around them in the best way they could.

Hochschild (2003) describes the drive for 'authenticity' in workers' emotional labour. It is not enough for a worker to perform and suppress appropriate emotions, *it is better if they actually feel them*. A person who really believes in what they are doing puts on a more convincing performance, because it is not a staged performance at all. No supervisors, no coaches, no prison guards are needed to monitor employee emotion when the employees want to act the way that they are acting. In tis study, each individual chair appeared to me to be acting as a guard of their own behaviour, a monitor of their own emotional expression. The chairs described an implicit standard of emotional expression at work that they appeared to share, and they performed emotional labour by following the rules that defined it: be positive, stay calm, appear neutral. Other than following those basic rules that the chairs had made for themselves, it appeared that some of the chairs felt that gender was significant to how they performed emotional labour.

To Hochschild (2003), being female matters for emotional labour because of the

stereotypical characteristics ascribed to each. Men are stereotypically characterised as strong, reserved, and objective, devoid of feelings. Women are stereotypically characterised as weak, expressive, and soft-hearted, filled to the brim with love, hate, fear, and empathy. The emotional work of men is to suppress expressions of any emotion whatsoever and 'act like a man'. The emotional work of women is to gain control of their negative emotions, and to express cheer, and friendliness (Hochschild, 2012). These stereotypical women and men are only images of femininity and masculinity, not real individuals, but they stand as images that individuals are measured against. Women can and do have stereotypically 'masculine' traits, just as men can and do have stereotypically 'feminine' ones. The same stereotypical and gendered expectations tend to apply in public emotional labour at work, with women cast as emotional and men as objective. The female chairs in this study talked about the stereotypes of hysterical women, being too emotional, and coming off as shrill. The male chairs did not describe themselves in terms of gender and focused on individual traits instead. The men might have been seen as intimidating, cold, or too reserved, but as long as they were not outright negative, they still fit into the ideal standard of a positive, calm, and neutral leader (Eagly, 2007). For the women, who felt that they were already expected to project positivity, being perceived as calm and neutral was portrayed as somewhat of a challenge, given the stereotypes of femininity that suffused the university and society around them. The chairs described their conceptions of an ideal department chair as someone who was positive, calm, and neutral. The stereotypical male is objective, strong, and calm. The stereotypical woman is emotional, weak, and impassioned. The male archetype fits nicely with that of the chair, while the female archetype does not. For this study, I asked "In what ways do department chairs perform emotional labour?" The answer to that question depends on gender; for women, the performance of emotional labour is two-fold—to meet the

standard of the ideal leader and to fight the stereotype of the hysterical woman. For men, emotional labour is performed only to meet the standard of a leader; the perception of stereotypical maleness is often enough to fit the role (Eagly, 2007; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristkari, 2011).

From the chairs in this study, I learned that the private emotional work that individuals learn and practise in their homes may indeed continue in their professional lives as emotional labour, as Hochschild said. The chairs in this study showed me that they performed emotional labour through managing their emotions as they could be perceived through their words, their actions, and their navigation of professional relationships. They showed me that they were all aiming for the same idealized standard of emotional expression and that men and women had to work towards it differently. They told me that they performed emotional labour almost constantly, that there was little rest. The chairs in this study performed emotional labour with conscious effort and care, to manage their emotions so they could play their roles in the best ways that they knew how, but imperfectly, like the emotional work individuals do in the private parts of their lives.

Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the early 1990s, higher education scholars have been writing about the challenges inherent to the role of university department chair. The challenges of the role of chair include role complexity (Boyko & Jones, 2010; Boyko, 2009), role ambiguity (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017) and stress (Burns & Gmelch, 1995; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Gmelch & Burns, 1994; Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch & Gates, 1999). Being a chair seems to be reducible to a few basic facts: chairs will require training but it may be inadequate or absent (Aziz et al., 2005; Gonaim, 2016); the skills chairs exercised to gain tenure will not be useful (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999); the transition from regular faculty to chair will be confusing and marked by a lack of structural support, and chairs will feel isolated from their peers (Foster, 2006; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Gmelch, 2004; Jenkins, 2009). In addition, chairs' roles will be ambiguous and they will struggle to address an endless list of tasks (Berdrow, 2010; Boyko & Jones, 2011; Boyko, 2009; Gmelch & Tanewski, & Sarros 1998; Sarros, Wolverton, M, Gmelch, & Wolverton, M.L., 1999). The writing on chairs does not make the role sound inviting. Yet people do take on the chairship, serve their terms, and some seek second and even third terms as chair. Reading about chairs, I thought that there must be some reason that people are able to perform the role of chair and enjoy it, and do it more than once.

In this study, I have considered emotional labour as a possible factor affecting how people experience being in the role of chair. Given the social nature and significance of positive relationships to the role, an examination of the effort required to express and suppress the "right" emotions is appropriate. I have used the lens of emotional labour and its component parts (feeling rules, emotion work, social exchange) as a way to analyze the efforts that individuals exert in emotional self-management when they take on the position of department chair. In my

review of literature on university department chairs, leadership theory and emotions, emotional

labour, and female leaders, I looked for information on how chairs might perform emotional

labour in their role, including who they might perform emotion work, what feeling rules they

might follow, and how social interactions might affect their emotional labour.

Department Chair as a Social Role

Czech and Forward (2010) describe leadership at the level of department chair in

universities as vital to the successful implementation of policy, due to the chair's proximity to

academic staff. As the rank of administrators who have the most direct contact with faculty,

chairs are responsible for leading departments through new and sometimes unpopular changes

using little positional power (Berdrow, 2010). Although chairs do technically hold sway due to

their place in institutional hierarchy, their practical power is limited and they must more often

rely on personal and professional authority to achieve the ends of the university (Berdrow, 2010).

The work of department chairs has been described as multi-faceted (Aziz et al., 2005; Boyko &

Jones, 2010; Boyko, 2009; Gmelch & Burns, 1994; Sarros, Wolverton, M, Gmelch, &

Wolverton, M.L., 1999), with the various tasks/roles of the chair at times occurring in isolation

from or in conflict with each other. Among the many aspects of the chairship, the importance of

chairs' relationships with regular faculty and senior administration has been emphasized (Brown

& Moshavi, 2002; Leary, Sullivan, & Ray, 2001; Sarros, Wolverton, M, Gmelch, & Wolverton,

M.L., 1999). U15 department chair job descriptions (University of Toronto, 2016; University of

Alberta, 2009a, 2009b) point to chairs' abilities to build departmental unity, common

vision/goals, and a collegial and respectful environment as central to the chairship. This

emphasis on outcomes that require social and interpersonal skills suggests the need for chairs

who have excellent relationship-building capacities. Throughout the literature on department

chairs, there is strong agreement that the role of chair, though ambiguous and challenging, matters to the success of universities.

Literature on department chairs also addresses best practices to transition from researching academic to administrator, focusing on practical strategies to "survive" the changes that occur in tasks and relationships when an academic becomes a chair (e.g. Buller, 2012; Chu, 2012; DeLander, 2017; Taggart, 2015). The practical suggestions for new department chairs describe taking on the role as a potentially difficult adjustment (Wolverton, M., Ackerman, & Holt, 2005; DeFleur, Kurpius, Osborne, & Maxwell Hamilton, 2010). However, how to best lead in education is not agreed upon by scholars writing on educational leadership. The theoretical frameworks for leaders in higher education do not provide an obvious best model and the lack of agreement in leadership theory literature (Bush & Glover, 2014) suggests that no one theory has been demonstrated to be ideal. However, the literature does provide some indication of potential areas for further investigation. In literature from 1985-2006, Bryman (2007) identified "13 aspects of leader behaviour that were found to be associated with effectiveness at departmental level" (p. 696). These were: a) clear sense of direction/strategic vision; b) preparing department arrangements to facilitate the direction set; c) being considerate; d) treating academic staff fairly and with integrity; e) being trustworthy and having personal integrity; f) allowing the opportunity to participate in key decisions and encouraging open communication; g) communicating well about the direction the department is going; h) acting as a role model/having credibility; i) creating a positive/collegial work atmosphere in the department; j) advancing the department's cause with respect to constituencies internal and external to the university and being proactive in doing so; k) providing feedback on performance; l) providing resources for an adjusting workloads to stimulate scholarship and research; and m) making academic

appointments that enhance the department's reputation. Of these 13 aspects, at least five could be considered to be connected to the chairs' emotional expression (i.e., being considerate, acting fairly/with integrity, encouraging communication, being a role model, creating a positive environment). Given the apparent significance of social and interpersonal interactions to many aspects of the chairship, I felt it was appropriate to look at emotions, an important part of building and managing any relationship.

Leadership Theory

There are many theories of leadership in higher education (Samad et al., 2015; Bush & Glover, 2014; Bryman et al., (2007). In my own review of leadership theory that has been developed since 2001, I identified 18 separate descriptions of leadership styles, with accounts regarding problems with terminology between the styles (e.g., Bryman, 2007; Gunter, 2004; Middlehurst, 2008). Along with the wealth of described leadership theories, there is a lack of agreement on which styles or methods of leadership are the most effective. Some theories espouse a hierarchical and task-oriented style of leadership as the most effective, (Bush & Glover, 2014; Davis, Dent, & Wharff, 2015; Degn, 2015), while others describe the significance of more flexible interpersonal approaches (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2008; Hafford-Letchfield & Harper, 2014; Jones, LeFoe, Harvey, & Ryland, 2012; Jones, Harvey, LeFoe, & Ryland, 2014, Osiemo, 2011; Diehl & Dzubinski, 2016). That is, current literature on leadership theory contributes to the consensus that there is no consensus on a 'best' leadership theory in education. There are, however, indications from the literature of the importance of context to educational leadership (Bush & Glover, 2014). For this study of department chairs, I took the social nature of the role as a vital aspect of the context surrounding the chairship. The social nature of the chairship stands out as particularly significant when compared to the relatively isolated and non-

social role of a regular faculty member. In this study, because of the social nature of the role of department chair, I take emotions and emotional expression as central to departmental leadership in universities.

Emotions in leadership, and especially in leadership in higher education, are understudied. There exists literature on leaders' management of emotions at work but the foci of the inquiries are generally not within the higher education administration context. Studies focus on primary and secondary schools (Beatty, 2007; Blackmore, 2008; Hargreaves, 2004; Maxwell & Riley, 2016; Schmidt, 2010), business (Hadley, 2014; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006), industry at large (Callahan, 2004; Fineman & Sturdy, 1999; Lindgren, Packendorff, & Sergi, 2014; van Kleef, 2014), university instructors (Constanti & Gibbs, 2004), and nursing (Gunther, Evans, Mefford, & Coe, 2007; Muller-Juge et al., 2014; O'Connor, 2008; Gray & Smith, 2009). Only a small number of studies have investigated the significance of emotion in higher education leadership (e.g. Bolton & English, 2010; He, Li, Shi, Mao, Mu & Zhou, 2000; Knight, 2002; Pemberton, Mavin, Stalker, 2007; Zembylas, 2010) and fewer still focus on the emotional work of being a university department chair (Gonzales & Rincones, 2013). This lack of research on emotions suggests the topic has been theorized in higher education leadership based on findings from other contexts. By focusing specifically on the emotional labour of chairs in higher education, this study aims to highlight the uniqueness of the role of department chair in conversations about emotional self-management in the workplace. I started reading about *emotional work* and *emotional labour* as a result of my searches for literature on emotions and leaders in higher education. Gonzales and Rincones (2013) introduced me to the concept, and pointed me, luckily, towards Hochschild (2003), who began her work on emotional labour with a study of flight attendants.

Emotional Labour in Higher Education

The role of department chair is an essentially social role. That is, the regular tasks of a chair are largely performed with or for others, rather than alone and for oneself (DeFleur, Kurpius, Osborne, & Hamilton, 2010). So, individuals who work as chairs must become more aware of the way in which their emotions affect those around them at work and may have to manage their emotions accordingly. Literature on emotional labour in higher education leadership is limited, in contrast to the wealth of studies conducted on the emotional labour of teachers and course instructors (Bellas, 1999; Berry & Cassidy, 2013; Constanti & Gibbs, 2004; Ogbonna & Harris, 2004; Zhang & Zhu, 2008). Hargreaves (1998) touches upon the emotional labour of educational leaders in passing but focuses instead on the emotional labour of the teachers that leaders must manage and develop. Looking slightly further afield, Maxwell and Riley's (2016) article on school principals offers some insight into the emotional labour of these types of educational leaders, and finds that regulating emotions through suppression or forced expression both affected burnout and job satisfaction. Back in a higher education context and similar to Maxwell and Riley, Zhang and Zhu (2008) note the connections between emotional labour, burnout, and job satisfaction in the working lives of college instructors in China.

As noted above, many authors writing about emotional labour in higher education focus on instructors, including Constanti and Gibbs (2004), who find that the necessity of performances of emotional labour can lead to exploitation of workers in order to satisfy students and further the goals of management. Also writing about university instructors, Bellas (1999) points out differences in the expected emotional labour capabilities of women and men and notes that, despite the large amount of emotional labour required of professors, this type of work tends to be undervalued and unrewarded within the organizational context. Writing on the emotional

lives of five leaders in a variety of educational contexts, Beatty (2000) describes emotional self-regulation by leaders as a challenging part of a working in particular organizational cultures and describes emotional regulation as connected to job satisfaction, similar to other authors mentioned I mentioned earlier in this literature review. Throughout the works that I cited in this literature review, social and organizational context was highlighted as a significant aspect of the emotional demands of a work role and the emotional self-regulation that was thereby required.

Applying a sociological lens to the context of chairship enables us to view the experiences of chairs at work as related to contextual group processes and interactions, rather than solely individual traits and abilities. From a theoretical standpoint, the sociological lens of emotional labour lets us think of "good chairs" as enjoying successful integration into the emotional culture of their departments and "bad chairs" as less successful. Thinking of chairs as part of a social group may allow us to better understand why new chairs may find their role unduly difficult, and why chairs with successful administrative records in chairships sometimes struggle to succeed in a new department—what worked in one social context may not translate to success in another. Given the social and interpersonal nature of chairship (Gmelch, 1995), the use of a sociological lens is appropriate to the study of chairs. The effort of choosing the right emotions to show, the right ones to hide, the way the performance drains a person's energy, the way people are forced by their surroundings to manage their own emotions. Reading through articles on emotional labour, I saw that a lot of people had seen emotional labour in their lives and the lives of others (Bono & Vey, 2005; Copp, 1998). Since Hochschild first published her book on the concept, it's been cited thousands of times, with hundreds of studies conducted on various aspects of the three conceptual pillars of emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange.

Female Leaders

The observed normalcy of emotional labour on the part of women stood out in Hochschild (2003). It felt 'normal' for women to disguise their emotions, and it felt normal for a job to expect it of them. In the literature, there are many similar stories of female leaders in education. Studies published on gender and leadership in education since 2002 focus on stereotypes and bias against female leaders (Bongiorno, Bain & David, 2014; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Madden, 2011), often at the intersection of race (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). Overall, it appears that female leaders must fight against constructs of gender that mismatch with constructs of leadership (Acker, 2012; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, 2007; Embry, Padgett & Caldwell, 2008). In terms of expectations, Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie and Reichard (2008) found that strength was seen as positive in male leaders, while sensitivity was seen as positive in female leaders. Johnson et al. (2008) also found that, for leaders who did not present themselves in the ways that were expected of them, a more negative evaluation of their abilities resulted, similar to the work of Brescol, Dawson and Uhlmann (2010). The difficulties for female leaders in particular are described as being a result of socialization, culture of origin, and organizational culture (Trinidad & Normore, 2005). Mentorship for female leaders in education is suggested as a possible way to address difficulties faced by female leaders, through socializing them into their roles (Brown, 2005; Trinidad & Normore, 2005); an induction into contextual social norms. In the literature one proposed obstacle for female leaders is of role incongruity (Eagly, 2007).

The significance of matching/mismatching expectations of people's roles has been described as *role congruity theory* (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, and Ristkari (2008) point to role congruity theory and the described mismatch between stereotypes of women and stereotypes of leaders. Koenig et al. (2008) write that workers whose roles do not align with

their expected attributes "would suffer from perceived lack of fit, producing increased expectations of failure and decreased expectations of success" (p. 617). In short, female stereotypes focus on traits of *communion* (togetherness, sociability) and male and leader stereotypes focus on *agency* (power, action); since both males and leaders are thought to be agentic, and females are thought to be helpful, female leaders are considered as displaying a mismatch between their role as helpful female and as forceful leader. However, Embry, Padgett, and Caldwell (2008) found that female leaders acting in a 'masculine' way were evaluated more positively than a male leader doing so, but only by female evaluators. Similarly, in a study testing the continued predictive power of Eagly and Karau's (2002) theory of role congruity regarding the negative perception of agentic female leaders, Bongiorno, Bain, and David (2014) found that tentative or passive behaviour of female leaders was disliked more than female leader assertiveness or male leader tentativeness. The authors go on to note that "unlike traditional prejudice towards women's agentic behaviour in leadership, prejudice towards their non-agentic behaviour is likely to appear fair and legitimate, as non-agentic behaviour is inconsistent with expectations of how a leader should act" (Bongiorno, Bain, & David, 2014).

Summary of Literature Review

Much is known about the tasks and responsibilities of department chairs. Literature on the subject appeared to show a consensus that the role is complex and at times ambiguous, with generally little institutional training or support offered the chairs. Within the complex role of chair, work relationships were described as significant to success in the role, though little specific information was given on how to best foster positive relationships. The possible significance of emotion to relationship building and maintenance was largely left out of the literature that I reviewed on chairs, aside from notes that leaders could be more effective through

maintaining a positive work environment. Literature on leadership theories seemed to suggest that a variety of leadership styles could be appropriate in any given context but despite this that leaders in higher education tend to lean towards instrumental and managerialist styles that focus on productive completion of tasks. With a few exceptions, literature on leadership in higher education generally did not focus on emotions, and literature on department chairs and emotions was notably sparse.

Literature on female leaders, although it did look at emotionality as a significant factor in leadership, was more focused on the negative effects of being perceived as emotional, rather than on the experience of actually feeling emotions at work. Throughout the literature I reviewed on department chairs, educational leadership, emotional labour, and female leaders, I was only able to find one study that looked at the majority of those topics in combination (Gonzales & Rincones, 2013) and it focused on the emotional labour of a single current university department chair in the United States, who happened to be male. As there appeared to be a dearth of studies published on the emotional labour of department chairs, my research topic of how department chairs perform emotional labour can add to the existing body of literature on chairs' emotional self-management.

Since previous work on emotional labour in related areas (e.g. principalship, Maxwell & Riley, 2016; nursing, Mann & Cowburn, 2005; Gray, 2009; James, 1992; Yang & Chang, 2008, teaching Hargreaves, 2001; Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2006) did not share the significant contextual aspects of chairship (time-limited, transitional difficulties, lack of training), a study focused on department chair emotional labour can provide specific information on the emotional work of this group amidst its unique stressors. Arcing over my curiosity about department chairs that I developed during my pilot study was an interest in the emotional experiences of the

individual chairs themselves. I wanted to know what the emotional labour of their role felt like for them when they went in to work every day, what it was like for chairs to interact with others in their departments, how they fostered the collegial relationships that they were supposed to create, and what rules about emotions they followed. I sought out answers to these questions by designing interview questions that focused on the emotional labour, feeling rules, and social exchange experienced by department chairs at work.

Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

In order to conduct this study, I had to choose a suitable methodology that would, alongside my theoretical framework, aid me in choosing an appropriate research design and determine the data collection and analysis methods that I would use. In this chapter, I describe my methodology choice, my choice of research site and participants, data collection and data analysis methods, my theoretical framework, and the ways in which I aimed for credibility and consistency during the study.

Methodological Choice

The hardest part of making my methodological choices was deciding which books on methodology to read, and which voices from the texts to listen to. Merriam (2009), Yin (2003; 2014), and Stake (1995; 2013) stood out, mainly because so many other authors I had read had referred to them. All three authors had a lot to say about case study design, the type of data you should collect, and how you should define the case. However, Yin wanted to look at quantitative and qualitative information; to get an image from both sides. I knew that I did not know enough about chair emotional labour yet to know what kind of quantitative data to look for, so I chose Merriam (2009) and Stake (1995; 2013) as guiding voices. Both authors described how to use solely qualitative data, and focused on giving a detailed, interpretive report on the phenomenon under study. I found that although Stake (1995; 2013) and Merriam (2009) both provided detailed explanations and examples of case study design, each author gave a more comprehensive account of certain aspects of analysis and credibility and consistency. Stake (1995; 2013) gave a detailed explanation of four types of triangulation that Merriam (2009) did not provide. Merriam gave a step-by-step description of data analysis that Stake (1995; 2013) did not provide, along with more in-depth descriptions of credibility, consistency, and transferability

than Stake. As both approaches had complementary aspects, I chose to take Yazan's (2015) advice that "novice researchers who are planning to conduct an exclusively qualitative case study would make more use of the descriptions and guidelines provided in Merriam's text, along with Stake's rendition of Triangulation" (p. 147). Since both Merriam (2009) and Stake (1995; 2103) describe a philosophical orientation towards interpretive and constructivist paradigms, it remains philosophically appropriate to use an approach that refers to both sources' methodologies.

Research Site and Participants

My qualitative case study (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995; 2013) was conducted at a U15 institution comprised of over 70 departments. I thought that conducting the study at a large university would highlight some of the problems for chairs that scholars in this field have discussed (e.g. Boyko & Jones, 2010; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Gmelch, Tanewski, & Sarros, 1998). I thought that chairs in a large institution might be more likely to have experience with feeling isolated, bogged down by 'administrivia' in a large and complex bureaucratic structure, unprepared and untrained as managers. The research site was a Canadian university with a student population of over 30,000 undergraduate students and over 7,000 graduate students. The university also housed an onsite leadership development program for academic staff, including chairs. It was my hope that my findings might benefit the university in their leadership development efforts by providing more information about the work of being chair. As I walked around the campus, from building to building, discipline to discipline, the strength of the funding bodies supporting each area of research were obvious from the size, modernity, and character of the structures assigned to them. The sciences lived in rectangular buildings with a distinct Bauhaus influence, the Arts in strange and oddly-shaped areas, succeeding despite the lack of architectural glimmer. The professional disciplines lived in offices that spoke to the nature of

their work; social science professions in unassuming quarters, medicine and engineering in vast and growing sections of the campus. Walking between the districts, it felt like the university was a world divided on economic and social lines. The money, the funding at the school, directed squarely at the builders and the medical doctors. I wondered if the chairs thought often about the way their department, their discipline, was viewed in the broader university context and was immediately told by the chairs that they did. Each chair expressed a sense of awareness of their place in the cosmos of the institution and the place of their department. Chairs of departments with small budgets knew that their resources were limited and those of departments with larger budgets or that were responsible for institutional focus areas knew they were both significant and recognized. Despite the differences between each chair, all the chairs spoke to the importance of working with people, building strong trusting relationships and keeping promises. Each chair described their own department as a challenging and meaningful work environment.

As this study focused on the effort exerted by department chairs to express and suppress emotions at work, participants had to be department chairs who were willing and able to discuss their emotional expression. I chose to invite only current department chairs to participate in an effort to avoid the complicating effects of time on memory. Each department chair who participated in this study was serving a full term. When I emailed the chairs at the university, asking for their participation, I chose chairs from diverse disciplines, to try to hear as many different voices as I could. In order to include responses from chairs with as varied a range of demographic backgrounds as possible, I recruited participants based on variation in experience in the role, and gender. I actively sought out participants from across the Faculties of: Arts and Science, the professional faculties (Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Nursing), and the non-professional faculties. The ten chairs who accepted my invitations were from the

natural sciences and social sciences, arts, and the professional faculties. By collecting data from participants from a variety of backgrounds, I hoped to increase transferability of my findings. The chairs differed in background, and yet I would find their stories about their emotional work intersected. Among the research participants there were four women and six men; five Canadians and five foreigners; five first-time chairs and five who had chaired a department before; three from the sciences, five from the arts/social sciences, and two from professional faculties.

Data Collection Methods

After obtaining ethics approval, I sent a letter of invitation (Appendix B) to current department chairs. If chairs indicated that they were interested in participating, I then sent a letter outlining the study in detail (Appendix A) as well as a participant consent form that described their rights within the study and the details of consent to provide information (Appendix C). Chairs were invited to participate in any of the following ways: one or two in-person interviews, two focus groups, by writing a participant journal, and by responding to follow-up questions via email. As no data collection occurred that fell outside of these methods, no amendments to my original ethics approval were required. Prior to our initial meetings, chairs identified the activities in which they were willing to participate and we scheduled times during which those activities would take place.

All ten chairs participated in at least one in-person interview, with two agreeing to a follow-up interview in-person at a later date. I conducted face to face, semi-structured interviews with 10 chairs at the university in person for initial interviews. Two of the chairs agreed to a Skype/phone interview as a follow-up and three chairs sent email responses to follow-up questions after the first interview. Follow-up interviews were conducted in person, and via Skype, and phone, with additional email follow-up contact when chairs chose not to participate

in a second interview. One chair completed a participant journal, writing down notes on when he felt like his work was emotional work, and what he did to manage his feelings. This followed similar protocols as those described in Gonzales and Rincones (2013) and Jacelon and Imperio (2005). In total, counting all interviews and follow-up contact, I gathered 16 instances of data.

Keeping in mind Stake's (2013) assertion that "only a small number of observations, interviews, and documents reviews are possible" (p. 4) in a case study, I kept the total number of cases low. Since observations were not used to collect data in this study, I designed the study to include follow-up contact (via interview or email) with each chair in order to maintain a more prolonged engagement with participants. I had originally asked the chairs to take part in a focus group, talking about their emotional labour together and sharing their experiences (Cyr, 2016; Morgan, 1997; Kitzinger, 1995). Every one of them declined to participate in a focus group. The ninth chair I interviewed told me that a group setting like that would leave him too vulnerable, exposing his private, internal feelings to others. I saw his point: talking about your feelings is hard enough, talking about them with people you work with does not usually sound very inviting. Funny enough, after I spoke to the chairs for this study, I noticed that a few of them spoke fondly of meetings where chairs from the school and from different schools got together, to share their stories and see that they weren't alone, and the literature even said it was a good idea for chairs to talk amongst themselves (Hunt, Pate & Irvin, 2007). As I spoke to the chairs individually, I saw how much overlap there was between their own separate lives as chair and I wished that they had done the focus groups. Other than that, setting up the study and gathering the data was straightforward. As I was not able to collect data via focus groups, this follow-up contact proved valuable in gathering additional information after the individual interviews.

Individual interviews. The interviews I conducted in this study were semi-structured (Merriam, 2009) in design and each one started with the same 10 questions, addressing emotional labour, emotion work feeling rules, and social exchange, (Appendix D) as a guide, leaving me opportunities to ask follow-up questions in response to participants' statements. Merriam states that semi-structured interviews are effective ways to explore areas that are not well-defined in the literature as they allow the researcher to respond to comments and statements by the participants. In these interviews, as chairs raised new topics and highlighted certain ones as important, a semi-structured format allowed me to pursue the leads that chairs raised. Keeping the interview structure open-ended let me respond to the chairs in a conversation, instead of a script.

I left all the chairs the choice of where we would meet, and all but two of them chose to talk in their offices. One chair chose a public area that was rather noisy, with music playing and people walking by. The other chair chose another office on campus, and commented: "I've never been to this building before" (C8). He was new to the university and perhaps wanted to have a look around. I recorded each of the interviews on my laptop and transcribed the recordings. We talked for about an hour each time; some of the chairs wanted to keep talking, and we spoke for upwards of ninety minutes. Sometimes it seemed like they did not get to talk about themselves much at work, like it was a break for them to meet with me. Some of the interviews seemed to run out of steam at about the one-hour mark and other interviews left me with so many new questions that I asked more than once if I could interview them again.

Email follow-up contact. Six of the chairs chose not to participate in a second interview but encouraged me to send any follow-up questions I had via email after transcribing the interviews. After each interview, I shared the transcript of the recording with the chair I had

interviewed and asked them to make amendments to the transcripts as they saw fit. I also sent

notes on what we had talked about, posing a few more questions: "Is it okay to be angry?",

"What does it mean to be 'authentic' with your emotions at work?", "Was there anyone who

helped you learn the rules about being chair?" Three chairs sent responses to follow-up questions

after the initial interviews via email and one of these chairs also wrote preliminary responses in a

Word document before his initial interview. The chairs who responded to follow-up questions

via email answered two to four written questions. Merriam (2009) describes this kind of data as a

researcher-created document, as the researcher provides the impetus that caused participants to

produce the document. Through follow-up questions (Appendix G) sent via email, I saw a

different side of the same chairs I had interviewed. In comparison to the oral interviews, the

chairs' written email responses were more specific and more articulate; for example, they did not

use slang or say "like". Via email, the chairs described events at work with a focus on specific

contextual information and analysis, rather than describing the emotions that they experienced

during the events. I believe that this difference between face to face and digital contact was

significant because of the chairs' own assertions that they were core careful with their word

choice in email communications because of the permanence of email as a written record. Unlike

the spontaneous emotional self-regulation required by in-person communication, email contact

allowed chairs the opportunity to consider their responses and to moderate them as they saw

appropriate. I believe that this act of moderation resulted in more emotionally-regulated

responses. Conversely, by interviewing the chairs, I could see excitement behind their words, as

well as guardedness and hesitation. By speaking to them face-to-face, I could lean in when they

paused for too long and ask them if there was something else they wanted to say. Skype and

phone follow-up interviews gave me a bit of the same closeness as I got in face-to-face

interviews. Two of the chairs who agreed to follow-up interviews were ill on our scheduled dates, and suggested we meet digitally. Strangely, despite the addition of video, the Skype interview felt colder than in person, while the phone interview felt as though it had the same range of emotional expression as the chair's in-person interview.

Journal entries. I designed the study to include journal entries as a means of learning about chair emotional labour (Appendix E), in the hopes that the reflective act of journaling in relative privacy might draw out further insights about their daily work (Jacelon and Imperio, 2005). Only one chair chose to complete a participant journal; the other 9 chairs who did not complete journals did not provide a specific reason for no participating in this way but cited a lack of time as a factor in their limited participation choices in general. This chair completed a daily journal entry for two weeks, which Jacelon and Imperio (2005) describe as an "optimum length of time" (p. 996) to obtain data with enough depth and to avoid participant fatigue and boredom. The chair's journal entries were short and focused on emotional suppression, expression, social exchange and emotions that he experienced at work. The chair who completed a journal for the project wrote in short, staccato bursts of text, musing about his emotional work in a few sentences a day. I was surprised and pleased that he had chosen to participate in this way, given the additional time required. His willingness to share his thoughts with me via interview and via journaling made me consider how differently the chairs might view speaking to an individual as opposed to speaking in front of a group of their peers.

Focus groups. None of the chairs agreed to participate in focus groups. Except for one chair, none provided a reason as to why they did not wish to participate. The one chair who did provide a reason commented that a focus group would leave them potentially vulnerable in front of their fellow chairs. This perhaps aligns with Morgan's suggestion that

"The simplest test of whether focus groups are appropriate for a research project is to ask how actively and easily the participants would discuss the topic of interest... In such a case, it would be wise to build backup data collection strategies into the research design."

(Morgan, 1997, p. 17)

The backup methods for data collection that I used in this study were additional interviews of the participants, and follow-up questions sent via email. In support of focus groups, Morgan (1997) writes that "the single most important way that either individual or group interviews can contribute to a project built around the other method is in devising the interview schedule" (p. 22). In this study, the purpose of the initial focus groups was to help refine the questions and topics to be addressed in the individual interviews. Then, the individual interviews would have assisted me in devising the scripting and topics to be covered in the final focus groups. In this way, both interview-based data collection methods would assist in improving the other. However, since none of the chairs who accepted my invitation chose to participate in the focus groups, I used each individual interview to inform the next (Merriam, 2009), noting topics and comments in my researcher's journal that helped shape the questions I asked in the following interviews. In cases where I was able to conduct two interviews of the same person, I used this list of topics to construct an interview guide for the second interview (Appendix H). In cases where I was unable to interview a chair twice, I used the list of topics to design follow-up questions to solicit information via email.

Data Analysis Methods

My research question and interview questions focused on emotions, perceptions of emotions, and attitudes and beliefs about emotions, so I structured my analysis to consider those concepts. My initial analysis followed Saldaña's (2016) affective methods of first cycle coding,

specifically *emotion coding*, which labels "the emotions recalled and/or experienced by the participant" (p. 125) and *values coding*, which "assesses a participant's integrated values, attitudes, and belief systems at work" (p. 131). I also gathered *in vivo* codes based on participants' utterances and used "emotional labour", "feeling rules", and "social exchange" as *a priori* codes taken from the theoretical framework. I provide a brief overview of the theoretical framework that grounded this study below, to help explain the connection between the three *a priori* codes and the design of this study.

Theoretical Framework: Emotional Labour

Hochschild's (2003) description of emotional labour, emotion work, and feeling rules provides the lens through which this research study has been conducted. In this study, I asked: "In what ways do department chairs perform emotional labour at work?" In Hochschild's framework, *emotion work* can be defined as the work required to control one's emotions and emotional expression in order to display emotions deemed appropriate for a given context. As a general example, consider a funeral—sadness, seriousness, hysteria or similar emotions are considered appropriate; displaying other emotions (e.g. excitement) could cause offense to others in attendance. If these emotions are not part of a person's grieving process (or if the person is not in grief), then they are expected by social pressure to display one of these emotions regardless— they must obey contextual *feeling rules*. In a professional context, the term *emotional labour* is used to describe emotion work that is performed as part of one's role at work. While heeding these feeling rules, workers will find avenues for *social exchange* narrowed, and "much less room for individual navigation of the emotional waters" (Hochschild, 2003, p. 119). This type of constrained emotional self-management has been described by Hochschild for both public and private contexts, with a focus on emotional labour at work. While analyzing data in this study of

university department chairs, I looked for instances in which participants described any of the three pillars of Hochschild's (2003) framework, to help focus my analysis on the concept of emotional labour.

Coding Methods

From the many options described by Saldaña (2016), I began my initial coding by looking for statements related to emotions and values in the transcripts because emotions and beliefs about emotion were central to this study. As I had directly asked participants about emotional labour, emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange in my interview questions, I was able to identify instances where participants discussed each by looking for answers to specific questions in the interview transcripts. As well, when looking for examples of emotional labour, emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange outside of direct answers to my interview questions, I searched the transcripts for descriptions of situations that used words that described challenges, effort, expectations, attitudes, rules, and relationships. The words I searched and scanned for were ones such as "effortful", "challenging", "hard", "difficult", "expect", "have to", "should", "always", "never", "sometimes", "can't", "good", "bad", "people", and "colleagues". Searching in this way helped me to identify when excerpts of transcripts displayed codes that related to the various aspects of emotional labour.

In order to capture codes from various contexts in which emotion was described by the chairs, I looked for instances in which emotions were described as they related to individuals, social and personal relationships, and organizations. In my first cycle coding, I coded for all instances in which chairs mentioned emotions, affect, emotional labour, relationship management, or rules about emotions. I included *in vivo* codes based on the participant's utterances, and used Hochschild's (2003) framework as a guide to choose the *a priori* codes of

feeling rules, emotional labour and social exchange. I then compiled all my coded transcripts into one document for the entire project and alphabetized the document by code. I made no attempt to collapse the codes together, I just gathered them, repeating some with slight wording changes. I ended up with over 375 coded pieces - far too many to try to organize by just looking at them. In this first cycle coding, I used a data and code charting table (Saldaña, 2016). That is, I copied the transcripts from each interview and the writing from each journal and piece of email correspondence into a separate excel sheet with one statement per line and wrote the codes in a column to the right of each statement. This method allowed me to scan through the codes quickly and construct patterns as I read over the data. I then printed out the codes and cut them out into individual pieces for use in constructing "tabletop categories" (Saldaña, 2016). Throughout first cycle coding, I was struck by a few recurring concepts across the data, as well as conflicts in opinion and outliers. I made note of these recurrences, conflicts, and outliers (Saldaña, 2016) in my researcher's journal and wrote memos on the sideline of the transcripts. Faced with so many initial codes, I moved on to categorizing the information in front of me into groups of ideas.

Codes into categories. Saldaña (2016) gave me dozens of ways that I might look at the words that the chairs had given me and to try to make them make sense together, and I started by highlighting all the times the chairs mentioned emotions, or made value judgements about emotions. Hochschild's (2003) framework told me to look for emotion work, feeling rules, and narrowed or hierarchical social relationships, so I also highlighted everything the chairs said about those factors. Sometimes, the chairs told me what mattered, saying that things were big, telling me to make sure to talk about it; saying that the words that they had highlighted were the most helpful, the most pertinent to the study. I referred to Saldaña again to decide how to sort through the pile of codes and the small phrases that told me how chairs did emotional labour. I

made a coding chart, with the transcripts in one column and the codes in another, and I sorted the codes alphabetically, so I could more easily see possible connections between codes at a glance. For one of the first times in my recent life, using a computer made things harder; with it, I could write down my thoughts quickly, but I could not see the whole picture of my codes at once. To help myself see the "big picture" in the transcripts, I printed out the codes, cut them out, and laid them down on the floor. This did not quite fit the tabletop category formation that Saldaña (2016) described, but was more appropriate for someone with a small table and a large open space on the ground.

During this phase of analysis, I sorted the codes into 16 categories that related to emotions, feeling rules, expressing and suppressing emotions, and social interaction/relationships at work. I used the pillars of Hochschild's (2003) framework of emotional labour (emotion work, feeling rules, social exchange) as a guide to help me focus on information that was relevant to the approach I intended to take to analysis. The 16 categories I created were as follow: a) anger as inappropriate, b) anger as sometimes beneficial, c) the importance of objectivity, d) the importance of passion, e) being authentic, f) being manipulative, g) the identity of high-stakes situations, h) the significance of gender, i) office staff as confidants, j) the significance of culture, k) crying at work, l) professional behaviour as "about what you'd expect", m) the importance of being fair and calm, n) leadership training programs, o) emotional maturity, and p) personal psychological differences. I categorized the data by printing out the 375 initial codes that I generated along with the statements that applied to them and cutting out each statement-code. I then took each statement-code and sorted them into piles based on the similarities of the codes. As I was categorizing the codes, it became apparent that some of the categories would make more sense as a single concept with conflicting sides. For example, 'anger as

inappropriate' and 'anger as sometimes beneficial' could be discussed under the overarching concept 'the role of anger'. This process resulted in 16 categories, as listed above, which I eventually collapsed into two themes, after more discussion than I had thought I would need. In theme one sat all the ideas about the ideal chair emotional persona. In theme two sat all the ideas about maleness or femaleness. It turned out, unsurprisingly, that even though the chairs all wanted to be a good leader, trying to accomplish that was not the same for women as it was for men.

Categories into themes. Following Saldaña's (2016) note that using categories from a framework guiding the research could "enable an analysis that directly answers [the] research questions and goals" (p. 71), I considered the categories that I developed through Hochschild's (2003) lens of emotion work, social exchange, and feeling rules. By using the pillars of Hochschild's (2003) framework, I aimed to keep my analysis focused on emotional labour as described by Hochschild. Starting from the concepts of emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange, I began to develop groupings of the categories into preliminary themes. As I grouped categories together, I began to tentatively identify themes by comparing category groupings to each other in a constant comparative technique (Merriam, 2009) to determine whether these preliminary themes differed from each other or were part of a larger idea. Using this method to construct preliminary themes, I started from the categories of emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange. Under "emotion work", I ended up with the categories of "high stakes situations", "about what you'd expect", and "emotion as a tool or obstacle". Under "social exchange", I ended up with "the importance of office staff", "conceptions of being chair", and "the role of being chair". Under "feeling rules", I ended up with "DOs and DON'Ts of the chairship", "authenticity vs. intentionality", "passion vs rationality vs balance", "culture", and

"anger, bullying, crying, and regret". Although this method helped me to consider how the codes I had identified fit into Hochschild's (2003) framework of emotional labour, organizing categories around emotion work, feeling rules, and social exchange gave me an atomistic view of the data, from which it was difficult to extract a broader meaning. In order to move forward from this point, I used a constant comparative technique to help me decide which of my preliminary themes were actually smaller parts of a larger overarching concept.

Although I did not aspire to develop a grounded theory in this study, using a constant comparative technique to thematic analysis helped me to make sense of my preliminary themes and develop them into final themes. After sorting the codes into categories, and presenting my preliminary findings to others both formally and informally, I took time to consider the overarching concepts that I was seeing in the categories and themes I had been creating. I had developed preliminary themes that spoke to the emotional labour of the chairs, namely "chairs perform emotional labour to fit a norm of a 'good leader'", "chairs perform emotional labour with varying effort between individuals", and "chairs perform emotional labour with varying intensity between contexts". Although these preliminary themes seemed to describe what I was seeing in the data, I had the sense that my one major finding was that chairs in the study exerted effort to adhere to a shared and implicit standard of emotional expression. There were many nuances to this finding, including the effects of context and personality but, overall, it seemed that the shared standard of leader behaviour was the most significant thing I had noticed in the study. Comparing my various preliminary themes to the theme "chairs perform emotional labour to adhere to a shared and implicit standard of emotional expression" helped me to identify which preliminary themes needed to be collapsed under that concept and which were separate ideas.

That the female chairs described additional concerns with implicit standards for female leaders was a separate, though closely related, matter.

Credibility and Consistency

By Merriam's (2009) account, credibility and consistency of data collection and data analysis should be affirmed through: member checks, disclosure of researcher position, use of an audit trail, peer review/examination, triangulation, data saturation through adequate engagement, maximum variation in participants, and thick description of the phenomenon. I began data collection in mid-November 2016 and it ended in early March 2017. During this time, I was repeatedly in contact with chairs via email to coordinate meeting times and to ask follow-up questions after interviews. I performed member checks by sending written transcripts of the audio recordings of interviews to each participant. I encouraged participants to read the transcripts, and provide amendments, redactions, and comments as they desired. No chairs provided any changes to the transcripts. In the initial meetings with each participant, they were told the deadline for withdrawal and were told that they were free to withdraw their data or participation at any point up to that date. To ensure data saturation, after I scheduled meetings with the first seven chairs and had interviewed four of them, I continued to seek out additional participants to dispute or confirm my tentative findings until I was no longer gaining new information on the preliminary themes that I had identified.

My role in this study reflects Stake's (1995) characterization of a case researcher as someone who "has recognized a problem...and studies it, hoping to connect it better with known things" (p. 91) through new interpretations. As an interpreter for the case, my role was to connect the emotional labour of department chairs and connect it to things that were already known about leadership theory, sociology, and chair stress. By doing so, my goal as a researcher was to shed

light on a possible source of stress for department chairs: the effort expended to conform to norms of emotional expression at work. Following Stake (1995, 2013) and Merriam's (2009) description of qualitative research as an interpretive act, I do not propose that my conclusions on this subject are the only possible conclusions to which one could come. Rather, the interpretations that I give of the case under study should be considered as a plausible description that is reliable, confirmable, and transferable in its conclusions (Merriam, 2009). From the initial date of ethics approval, I kept a researcher journal for this study as part of my audit trail for the study. In this journal, I included my own observations of what was successful in data collection and the areas in which I was having difficulty. I noted my own actions and perceptions, as well as my perceptions of the behaviour of the participants. I also spoke with my supervisor in detail about my project and kept a journal to keep track of my feelings and thoughts about what I was trying to do, what I was learning. Talking to others gave me perspectives on my work that I could not have had if I had done the work alone in my head. Researchers are supposed to ask others to look at their work, to reach out and talk to others to give the work more credibility (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995, 2013). This study was an interpretive work, a subjective and particular look at ten specific individuals at one specific place in one specific range in time. Finally, I considered Stake's (1995) four methods of triangulation in this study's design to attend to concerns of reliability of the data. These methods are described in the following section.

Triangulation

Stake (1995) describes the significance of four types of triangulation: data source triangulation and methodological triangulation, which I used in this study, and investigator triangulation and theory triangulation, which I did not. Investigator triangulation was not possible in this study because I was the sole researcher. Theory triangulation was not necessary

for this study because I was using the framework of emotional labour as a lens through which to explore a topic, rather than testing the claims of the theory itself.

Stake also explains how to use the centrality of a claim to a case to decide how strong the need is for triangulation in various data situations (1995, p. 112). In brief, key interpretations, dubious, contested, and critically important claims require the most triangulation, and uncontestable claims and the author's beliefs (once declared) require little triangulation. In this study, I make two claims in my analysis of the data that are central to the image of the case I have described: a) there is an implicit and shared standard of chair emotional express, and b) being female entails additional considerations when emotional labour is performed. I triangulated these claims by comparing my findings with the literature, discussing the topics with participants and my supervisor, and using multiple data collection methods. I used multiple methods of data collection to triangulate the data, especially for claims that were contestable or central to my conclusions. I did this by soliciting written responses via email to confirm statements that chairs had made in interviews and by comparing my findings to literature on emotional labour and department chairs. During the member checking processes, many of the chairs commented that they stood by their original statements and did not intend to change any of their responses. Peer review with my supervisor and member checking helped me to ensure that my tentative findings were sensible to others involved in the study. Although there were no other researchers involved in data collection and report writing, I was able to discuss the findings and the case with my supervisor and other members of my committee. Since I first began to develop themes to explain my findings in this study, I have presented my work within my department and at an academic conference pertaining to higher education in Canada. The feedback that I have gained at those two events has been instructive in helping me to decide which parts of my analysis require more

consideration and to refine how I explain my findings. My presentation of this research at a European conference on education this past August also provided me with a similar opportunity to refine my own understanding of how this study is perceived by others and how it can be improved. The results of my thematic analysis are described in the following chapter.

Chapter 4: DATA PRESENTATION

The chairs who participated in this study wanted to fit into their roles and do a good job. It is easy to do things the right way when the rules are all laid out, when the rules are written down, and when the roles are set and feedback is instant, or at least regular. It is more difficult when a person is not sure what to say or do, or when they *are* sure but really do not want to. When I spoke to the chairs in this study, it seemed like they thought that the ideal standard they described really did come from within. They said that they made the feeling rules, and that they had their own personal standard of leader behaviour. I asked the chairs, "Who decides what's appropriate?" and one of them replied: "That's really me, that's really my own internal assessment" (C1). I asked the chairs: "Where do the feeling rules come from?" and another said the rules were "[p]robably internal. Probably internal. I've not done any kind of self-analysis in any deep way but it seems to come internally. Like, no one tells you how to be chair. They really don't" (C2). When I asked the chairs, "Who makes the rules?" yet another said: "It's me, mostly myself, I think" (C3). Overall, the chairs seemed to express a shared belief that the feeling rules governing their behaviour were personally-created.

In this study, chairs performed emotional labour to fit a shared ideal of a 'good leader'. The female chairs had an extra task of fighting stereotypes against women. The chairs described the standard as something they would expect from most professionals at work. Each individual chair described the same internal, individual, personal standard of behaviour as normal and expected. Although the chairs generally shared an ideal of leader behaviour, expressions of anger were seen as either useful in certain situations, or as consistently destructive, depending on whom I asked. In some cases, the chairs were open to differences of opinions in terms of emotional expression; in the case of anger, they were adamant that the other way of seeing things

was incorrect. One chair commented that people likely learn strategies for communication and conflict from their childhoods: "I mean everybody's experience with conflict is different. Rooted in family, your youngest experiences. And some people are better prepared for it than others" (C4). In this chapter, I discuss the two themes that I developed from my data: 1) the normative standard of leader emotional expression that chairs shared and 2) the ways that female chairs spoke differently about their performance of emotional labour.

Performances of the Ideal Standard

Sitting in my office, interviewing the ninth chair of this study, I listened as he talked about managing irritation at work. He told me that it was easy to be positive, easy to be calm, because of a natural and internal appreciation of the different ways that people are:

> Most people, and this is an assumption I make, and I'll go with this assumption for as far as I can, until I'm finally proven wrong, my assumption is that most people are trying to do a good job. If you start with that assumption, it usually will carry you a long way. And most people are trying to do a good job, right? (C8)

I could feel the truth in what the chair was telling me; people want to do a good job. Sometimes they are terrible at it, sometimes they are misguided, sometimes the 'good job' they want to do is not the job that you want them to do but people *do* try and they generally do care. The chairs in this study, in trying to do a good job in their role, believed that they had set rules for themselves and created their own guidelines for emotional expression and behaviour. The chairs held a shared and implicit belief in an ideal standard of leader behaviour. Be positive, be calm, be neutral; the feeling rules were always the same.

I asked them where the feeling rules came from: "Who makes the rules?" The chairs told me that the rules were "pretty much internal" (C1) or that they would "make a rule for myself"

(C9). They did not receive any external feedback on them and said "I've never really been given feedback about anything being inappropriate. So, I guess it is pretty much internal and I guess I base it pretty much on my own assessment of how things have gone" (C1). Over and over, the chairs talked about how normal the rules were:

> The rules are generally what you might expect. We expect people to be positive, business but don't be afraid to crack a joke once in a while, jokes at other people's expense are not cool. But in general, the rules are about what you expect (C5)

The chairs described the rules as barely interesting at all, commonplace, or expected. The chairs told me that they "tend to be an optimistic person anyways" (C8); they "don't show emotions very often and...very rarely, if ever, lose [their] temper" (C2). For the chairs, performing emotional labour to meet the ideal standard was barely a performance at all.

One of the non-Canadian chairs had noticed the norms of the Canadian context, and talked about recognizing their own differences from Canadian nationals through talking to another foreigner: "Oh man, did I learn so much about (my country) through him, about our culture, how others view it. Wow. Because you just take it for granted, thinking it's normal, right? No" (C3). Talking to that chair, the third person that I interviewed, I saw the effect that being other-than-normal had on a person. The chairs as a group started to divide into two groups in my eyes: 'I manage my emotions like any normal professional' and 'I manage my emotions like I should in this country'. The seventh chair that I interviewed, another foreigner, was even more critical of the 'normal' expectations of leaders' emotions. For this chair, the standard of the positive, calm and neutral chair was contextual, cultural and organizational. The chair still believed that this ideal was *the* ideal for chairs, but did not take the rules as a given, saying that "one way of how these rules get made is a kind of organizational culture. What a culture deems

as appropriate and who gets rewarded and so on for this" (C7). Even though the chair noticed

that the standard was something created, instead of simply 'normal', they still performed

emotional labour to adhere to it. The main difference between this chair's experience of

emotional labour at work was that they described it as uncomfortable, saying:

> You're not supposed to get angry or loud or excited. It's about a very measured way that
>
> passes then as a kind of rational and polite and professional—And I just, I have—there's
>
> something about it that makes me want to act out. It brings out my—because it's so
>
> repressive. (C7)

The shared feeling rules rubbed up against the chair in the wrong way. The rules made

her feel constrained, bound, compressed by the definition of ideal leader behaviour. This chair

did not like displaying the "neo-liberal affect" (C7) of working "cheerfully and happily and even

when bad news comes down from central" (C7) but she did it anyway. Even though the chair

could see the rules for 'normal' leader behaviour as learned norms, uncomfortable ones, she

followed them nonetheless. I wondered why the chairs would obey a set of rules that they did not

agree with, I wondered why they would pay attention to leadership development training that

they thought was "presented in a kind of very, almost mechanistic way...Almost algorithmically.

As though...you're like a cyborg" (C4). I wondered how they managed all their emotions to fit

into what sounded like a narrowly defined shape. I wondered why only some of the chairs

wanted to be angry.

Anger can be very powerful, wielded in a certain way and I saw the chairs in this study as

divided over the appropriateness of anger. "Can a chair be angry?" I asked. "Well, again, I think

absolutely yes, if it's warranted by something that's happened" (C1). I asked again: "Can a chair

be angry?" A different chair told me: "I'm doubtful that anger is ever helpful if it's directed at

people. All it does is threaten people's identity and sense of value and run things off the rails"

(C5). I heard two types of stories about anger from the chairs:

> I think that there's a kind of anger that some people carry all the time. I have a couple faculty members that are just angry and everything makes them angry, and I'm not talking about that. But I think in response to a specific thing, yeah. But then I suppose it then becomes—'What is an appropriate outlet for that anger?' And to kind of visit it on somebody or yell at somebody or punish somebody is not. So, you have to watch the things that anger can lead to (C1).

For the chairs, anger could lead to embarrassment, humiliation, and practical repercussions, but in some cases, to prevent those very ills, anger could be used as a tool for a greater good.

> C6: I've only gotten really mad once and it had an effect at the end of the day. I'm not sure...
>
> SC: Was it productive? Did that work?
>
> C6: Well, it was—the behaviour changed, it's not my preferred way of being. But it also was like 'I've never seen you get so mad about something!'. 'Yeah, okay, so that just is an indication of how serious this is'. But it's not—I would say that's not how I would like it to be.

There are some people who seem to enjoy being angry. The chairs mentioned this in disapproving tones: constant anger does nobody any good. Some of the chairs in this study told me how anger was unjustified:

> Doesn't matter what the situation is, anger just makes the situation worse. Everybody gets angry. So, you can't avoid it... you can't respond with anger and if you can't get hold of your anger, then you just have to remove yourself from the situation... You never win if

you're angry. (C8)

I heard their words, I asked them to explain, and I was left uncertain. I wondered, "Is it okay to be angry?" Fighting against emotions, working to perform the ideal, some chairs would wield anger to protect others against abuse, and others would refuse. "I think, sadly, in university contexts, we have a high tolerance for bad behaviour. It's incredible how much bad behaviour we think is within the normal bounds, even though it might be offensive and so on" (C9). I noted that it seems incredible how much work it can be to perform the right emotions in those circumstances in order to remain positive, calm, and neutral.

In the stories of the chairs, I saw a constant effort, a daily and routine exertion to meet a self-monitored standard of behaviour, an internalized norm. I asked, "In what ways do chairs perform emotional labour at work?" The chairs told me that:

> I think emotional labour happens every time I come into the office. Do I go and say hello to everybody in order to create a warmer environment, or do I go to my work? How do I write—what's the tone of my email? If I just want to get things done, what do I actually want to do to make the person that I'm writing to inclined to do something for me? I can't even imagine that- there's very few tasks that do not involve some kind of emotional labour. (C7)

The chairs performed emotional labour nearly constantly, in any situations involving people. For Hochschild (2013), constant emotional work, constant suppression and expression to show the 'right' emotions, has been a historically feminine burden.

Performing Femininity

The female chairs in this study told me about the ways that they managed the dual standards for leaders and for women. One chair considered how she appeared in faculty-wide

meetings, saying that "my presentation of self is a little bit, you know, my hair is blonde, I dress not crazily but I don't wear black suits" (C1). Another told me how she managed her emotions to "express...concerns in a way that isn't overly emotional but makes the case" (C6), to avoid people thinking "Uh oh, hysterical woman over in [that department], there she goes again" (C6). For the female chairs, "it's often perceived that kind of emotionality lives in the realm of women. So that if you're a woman manager or woman boss...people are going to think that you're going to be emotional" (C1).

Expecting a woman to be emotional, pleasant, and inoffensive to look at meant that the female chairs had to at least be aware of how others might perceive them or how others might respond if they slipped up. I wondered how many uncounted opinions on their role as females in the academy the female chairs had heard before they arrived in their administrative roles. How many times their perceptions of themselves had been shaped by the world around them. How many times they had gritted their teeth, kept quiet, and smiled, to avoid being seen as hysterically angry, irrational, "too emotional" (C1). Worse, how many times had they not noticed, because keeping track of the endless rules was as draining as obeying the rules themselves.

To be the positive, calm, and neutral leader, female chairs performed emotional labour twofold: once, to adhere to the standard of leader emotion, and again, to doubly ensure that any real or imagined "femininity" in the form of weakness, hysteria, or tears, would not be revealed (Scott & Brown, 2006). A chair described situations with students as times when "I am so strict with myself to be just incredibly calm and patient and to not raise my voice to not overreact to anything they say and to just let them talk and to ask questions and listen like crazy" (C1). These chairs told me about the emotional labour of women, how they performed it to adhere to the

standards for a chair, and where that performance collided with the stereotypes of female emotional expression.

Under the weight of long-blanketed expectations, where can a person turn to be understood? Hochschild (2003) describes *collective emotional labour* as a social situation in which workers have a safe space amongst peers to vent or receive guidance. For the female chairs, sharing the burden was "...a huge coping strategy. I do it a lot with my APO. That's probably the most common place" (C6). Another chair said that her office staff were:

> ...very close and very supportive of one another. So, it feels pretty okay for me to come in in the morning and say to my staff 'I'm in a really bad mood today' or 'I'm really upset about this thing going on'. Because it's almost like we have an agreement that this is okay. ... But…I don't do that with the faculty. I am much more careful with the faculty. (C1)

The circle of trust helped these female chairs to perform the emotional labour demanded of them by their role, and by their gender. Surrounded by co-workers close to them that they trusted, they could feel safe talking about things that were really bothering them. I started this study by asking: "In what ways do department chairs perform emotional labour?" For these female chairs, emotional labour was performed alone but also with others, sharing the work of navigating the dual expectations of leaders and of femininity.

Summary and Conclusions

Using a constant comparative method, I organized the data into two themes that provided me with two related answers to my research question. I found that: a) department chairs perform emotional labour by adhering to an implicit standard of a positive, calm, and neutral leader, and b) female department chairs additionally perform emotional labour in response to stereotypical

expectations of female leaders.

The shared ideal standard involved living up to an implicit ideal standard of emotional expression: be positive, stay calm, maintain an appearance of neutral affect. When the first three or four chairs all described the same kind of emotions that they thought were appropriate at work, I was underwhelmed. What kind of findings would I have if the participants did not even think there was anything of interest they could tell me in response to my questions about emotions at work? The chairs told me about their experiences, with various chairs saying: "The rules are generally what you might expect" (C5), "in any setting...I don't operate from my heart" (C6), "I don't show emotions very often and I very rarely, if ever, lose my temper" (C2), "I try to be as professional as possible" (C3), "I feel like most of [my rules] are internal and self-imposed" (C1). It felt like the chairs all had the same experiences and all had the same things to say. By the middle of the fourth interview, I had the sense that the *sameness* of the chairs' responses might actually be significant.

I did not see at first why it mattered that the chairs all said the same things but I came to believe that it was the most significant part of my interviews with them. They said that they did not see anything special about the way that they had to act as chair; they said that they were not following any externally imposed rules or feedback but were instead following individually and internally held beliefs about how leaders should behave. The sameness of the chairs' answers made me suspicious. They said that *they* monitored their own behaviour and managed their emotions in a way *they* felt was appropriate. The chairs described an individual and personal belief that they should be positive, calm, and neutral. But, I wondered, how could the belief be individual if it was the same for all of them? I realized that what I was seeing from the chairs might be a norm in disguise. The chairs had absorbed a normative expectation so completely that

it was no longer something external to their own beliefs; it was internal and self-regulating. In the sameness of the chairs' responses, I saw Bentham's panopticon (Bentham, 1791; Semple, 1993), the all-seeing eye of a central prison tower, and Foucault's (1995) subsequent discussion of the panopticon as a symbol of the social control structures of institutions. From my point of view, the chairs performed emotional labour by acting as though they were being watched. Instead of feeling like they were performing for someone's watchful eye, the chairs described their behaviour as an authentic expression of their beliefs about their role.

Overall, I found that chairs performed emotional labour nearly constantly at work, and that their efforts affected how they communicated in-person, via email or phone, and any other ways in which they conducted themselves when interacting with colleagues. The chairs described a calm, positive, and neutral emotional state as the most appropriate way for a leader to act at work, and the female chairs described situations in which stereotypical perceptions of women conflicted they way they wanted to be perceived as chair. The themes I identified in these data require discussion with connection to Hochschild's (2003) framework, as well as literature on leadership theory and the normative standard of a good leader, female leaders and femininity in university settings. This discussion is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 5: DISCUSSION

Department chairs are important to universities because they keep the smallest units of the institution clinging together (Czech & Forward, 2010). However, it can be hard to find faculty members who are good at the job, or who want it in the first place. By the time a regular faculty member gets tenure and is in a position to take on a chairship, they are already aware of the obvious disadvantages of being chair: less time for research, more work, more stress (Gmelch, 1991; Lees, 2016; Sarros, Wolverton, M., Gmelch, & Wolverton, M.L., 1999; Wilson, 1999).

When I started this study, I thought that I might be able to look at emotional labour as one way that chairs manage their feelings about the stressful things that happen around them. I expected to find that chairs had many different ways of hiding or showing their feelings. I did not expect to find that they would, by and large, do emotional labour in the same ways, towards the same basic goals. The chairs performed emotional labour by meeting a shared standard that required them to be positive, stay calm, and appear neutral. They made sure to say 'hi' to everyone in the morning and walk around to chat during the day. They chose their words carefully, in person and in emails. They took time to work through their gut reactions before responding to colleagues. They consciously attended to what they were feeling, what they expected to be feeling, and what others around them might think of them. Being chair sounded like a lot of emotional work; not unpleasant, but laborious. For the female chairs, it seemed like the work was doubled: be a chair, be a woman. The two roles played off each other, demanding different and sometimes conflicting actions; demanding a conscious choice to bend, break, or follow the rules of each. The stereotypical expectations for women and men both contained rules about showing emotions, but not the same ones. As some of the chairs commented, women were

expected to be emotional, even if they never showed it. Men were expected to never show emotion, even if they felt it. In the case of the chairs, fragile ideals of femininity and masculinity butted up against the ideal of a positive, calm and neutral leader. The chairs performed emotional labour as they tried to be the kind of leader that professional and cultural norms asked them to be.

The chairs who participated in this study described a normative and prescriptive standard of how leaders should express their emotions, while differing in beliefs as to how individuals should achieve that standard. However, some chairs described discomfort with the role they were supposed to play and expressed an urge to fight against it. In all cases, chairs performed emotional labour to present themselves as confidently meeting the implicit expectation of an ideal leader's emotional expression. The overall impression this gave me was that emotional labour was performed with varying levels of effort and intensity by different chairs who acted to appear like they were naturally calm, positive, and neutral. Goffman (2002) notes that people performing a role in social settings are concerned with being *perceived* as meeting the standards that they are being judged by in that role, regardless of whether those standards really are being met. As far as the idealized, socially normative standard of a 'good leader' is concerned, chairs expressed a great deal of concern with how they were perceived, by themselves and others, in relation to that standard.

In this chapter, I consider Hochschild's (2003) question of what the social fabric of an emotionally laborious work environment "actually consists of and what it requires of those who are supposed to keep it beautiful" (p. 9) and I identify the emotional efforts that are expended by chairs as they perform their role. Hochschild's (2003) work on flight attendants describes the explicit terms in which the rules for appearance, emotion, and behaviour are given to the

(mainly) women who serve in the skies. Explicitly detailed rules may be constricting, suffocating, and odious, but they leave little room for accidental error and little chance to misstep. For the chairs in this study, having written rules of conduct might have helped to hold their shared ideal of a leader up to brighter light. The trouble with internalized norms is that they move from a public sphere, where they are open to criticism and debate, to a private sphere, where they become a matter of opinion or a preference. When a norm is viewed by an individual as a personal preference, asking them to question the norm can feel like an attack on personal values. In this study, I saw the near inescapability of Bourdieu's (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) cultural replication in the expected, professional, 'normal' standard of the chairs' idea of the 'good leader'. Looking at the chairs and the rules they described and willingly followed, I saw the strength of repetition in upholding context-bound social norms that govern what is considered appropriate or inappropriate for individuals playing a certain role.

Meeting the Shared Standard of Chair Behaviour

Hochschild (2003) describes the ways in which customer service workers self-manage emotional expression to fit a company standard of affect. Despite a lack of direct daily supervision, university department chairs are similarly held to a standard of emotionality, although the origins of the standard are less explicit than in Hochschild's (2003) examples of flight attendants and bill collectors. Chairs in this study described an implicit, shared, and normative standard of ideal leader emotional expression that they achieved by performing emotional labour. Unlike the situations described in Hochschild (2003), expectations of emotional expression were not made explicit to chairs. The standard of leader emotional expression was described by chairs as originating within their own beliefs about how a leader should behave. As each chair described similar expectations of leader emotional expression, it

became clear that the standard originated from contextual and normative expectations of leaders in university and ideal leadership styles. The 'administrative affect', as one chair described it, appeared to be considered ideal by all the chairs.

The concept of an 'administrative affect' as desirable in a neoliberal university setting reflects Hochschild's (2003) description of commodification of feeling in the workplace and the way in which emotional labour is performed to meet a market demand. Hochschild (2003) describes how companies commodify the emotions of customer service workers and compares that commodification to Marx's (2007) description of individuals in a capitalist society as becoming *instruments of labour*. The conversion of human labour to a resalable commodity was described by Marx (2007) as an alienation of humans from the enjoyment and meaning of their physical work. Hochschild (2003) describes an alienation of humans from their *emotional* work. In Hochschild's (2003) conceptual framework, the person is transformed into an instrument of *emotional* labour, using their emotions to achieve the ends of an institution, rather than for their own purposes. By treating emotional expression and suppression as a saleable good, the signal function of emotion is lost, changing emotional exchange from a communicative act between individuals to a commercial act between worker and customer (Hochschild, 2003). In this framework, service providers (chairs, in this case) must project a particular emotional stance (affect). This emotional stance in staff is achieved in four ways: a) selection of suitable recruits, b) supervision and correction, c) training programs and materials that guide recruits to the desired affective stance, and d) self-regulation of recruits to hold themselves to that standard. For the chairs in this study, some of these methods were in place in their tenure as chair. University documents in Canada regarding the selection of chairs refer to the need for collegiality, respectful relationships and persons who can build positive departmental climates (e.g., McGill

University, 2017; University of Alberta, 2009a, 2009b; University of British Columbia, 2016, n.d.). Chairs in this study stated that there was very little supervision in the role, and very little correction from others, which made learning the role difficult. This aligns with literature on chairs that points to a lack of training and feedback as causes of chairs' stress (Gmelch & Burns, 1993, Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch, 1991). About half of the chairs in this study had participated in an onsite leadership development program that was designed and organized by university human resources personnel, During the time frame of the study, the leadership program was run by a learning and development consultant who was also a graduate student studying education at the university. The program comprised 90 hours of instructional time over 13 days over 12 months, and was focused on helping leaders learn how to manage themselves, their teams, and university systems. The chairs pointed to this leadership program as containing materials that promoted the validity of diverse leadership styles and affective stances. However, the chairs stated that the training program appeared, nonetheless, to be heavily value-laden with regards to the best ways to lead and to be as a leader. With meeting times occurring approximately once per month, the leadership development program was limited in the volume and depth of information that could be discussed with participants. Despite the infrequency of meetings, the four chairs who had participated in this program described the program's preferred feeling rules for university leaders as easily discernable.

Hochschild (2003) describes the ways in which customer service workers perform emotional labour in response to explicit company-developed feeling rules. The chairs in this study performed emotional labour in response to implicit feeling rules that possibly originate from cultural and institutional norms of leader behaviour. Norms within a culture or social setting are informally developed by members of a group and are perpetuated through their

continued acceptance and adoption by new group members (Gerber & Macionis, 2010; Scott & Marshall, 2009). In this study, the setting in question is the large research-intensive university where I conducted the study, and the chairs were individual members in the larger group of university faculty, as well as within the smaller group of university administrators. The norms within the university were identified and maintained by the chairs based on their experiences as faculty members and, upon taking on a chairship, as university administrators. So, the norms of the dominant discourse in the institution were perpetuated by chairs through their continued adherence to them, even when they were not to their personal benefit. Most chairs took the normative standards of professional conduct as a given: be optimistic, be calm in the face of financial challenges, be neutral. However, many of the chairs pushed back against these standards in their interviews, stating their discomfort with the normative expectation of presenting as calm, positive, and neutral. Despite their discomfort with the institutional standard, these chairs nonetheless performed emotional labour to meet its normative expectations.

Despite the standard of leader behaviour shared by chairs in this study, there is currently no broadly-held belief in the literature that there is one best way for leaders to lead. Literature on leadership theory in education has not reached a consensus on which style of leadership is considered to be the most effective (Samad, 2015; Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989; Bush & Glover, 2014; Bryman, 2007). The disagreement between proponents of the various leadership styles appear to have agreed to disagree, explaining the lack of agreement as reflecting ideological, contextual, or practical differences between leaders and their institutions (Bush & Glover, 2014). With the large number of described styles in the literature, an acceptance of widely varying leadership styles might be expected. However, although the chairs in this study varied in their modes of leadership, they shared *one* standard of emotional expression for leaders.

Despite the disagreement in the literature on an ideal mode of leadership, chairs in this study shared a conception of a 'good leader' as positive, calm, and neutral, even when the chairs did not describe themselves as generally positive, calm, or neutral people. The leadership theories at play in the chairs' shared conception of leadership reflects concerns with the business aspects of educational leadership and its corresponding concerns with professionalism and productivity (Bush & Glover, 2014, Degn, 2015, Diehl & Dzubinski, 2016). That is, despite the sometimes-unpopular administrative decisions that chairs are meant to communicate and uphold, there is an expectation that they will find a way to cheerfully convince department members that the decision is for the best. This efficiency-, productivity-, and profit-minded theoretical stance is characteristic of new managerialism (Deem, 1998; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Hoyle & Wallace, 2005; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999), which has been noted in educational leadership literature as being as significant as the more emotionally expressive transformational and charismatic leadership in the last 20 years (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bush & Glover, 2014; Brown & Moshavi, 2002). Despite the lack of consensus about a 'best' theory amongst writers in educational leadership literature, the *practice* of leadership in higher education has leaned heavily towards the neoliberal concerns of new managerialism since at least the mid-1990s (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Deem, 1998; Deem, 2001; Ferlie, 1996). The presence of a common managerialist practice of leadership may relate to the shared expected standard of leader behaviour in this study. This expected standard points to a dominant conception (or hegemonic norm) of leadership in higher education.

Chairs in this study performed emotional labour by expending energy in order to appear to be a naturally positive, calm, and neutral leader. The perception of the need to seem natural or authentic in the emotional role of chair appeared to cause some friction with chairs who did not

see themselves as a true natural fit into the shared standard. Passionate individuals and female chairs described an awareness of having to perform emotional labour to play a part or to live up to normative expectations, and an awareness of the gap between themselves and the ideal standard. This gap required intentional performance and management of emotions, which some chairs referred to as 'inauthentic' behaviour. Hochschild (2003) talks about the "search for authenticity" (p. 185) in workers' emotional expression; for companies, it is not enough for an emotion worker to project appropriate feelings, it is preferable that they actually *experience* them. The concept of an authentic match to desired affective norms means that individuals who naturally fit into the role are preferable to those who do not. For chairs in this study, this meant that good chairs make fitting into the standard look effortless. Displays of vulnerability, inability to fit the idealized standard of the 'good leader', and cracks in the emotional veneer of normative professionalism were described as unhelpful, unproductive, inappropriate, and out of control. Chairs repeatedly mentioned their efforts to remain in control of their emotional expression and opinions in public venues, with some chairs stating that some feelings were never revealed to others, due to confidentiality and an ever-present need to be careful of who might hear and spread their words. In a drive to *appear* to be acting natural, chairs sometimes took great pains to control their emotional expression. There were moments in which some chairs did feel that they were able to drop all pretense and express their thoughts and feelings openly but these were the exception, rather than the rule.

Addressing Stereotypical Expectations of Female Leaders

Three of the female chairs in this study pointed to assumptions about men and women's emotions, such as assumptions about how men and women might feel or behave. They said that "it's okay for men to get angry" because anger from men indicates strength of opinion (Luthar &

Šadl, 2008, p. 244) whereas women are perceived as having lost control. Hochschild's (2003) framework describes emotional labour as inherently gendered, noting that "women are more likely to be presented with the task of mastering anger and aggression in the service of 'being nice' [and men are given] the socially assigned task of aggressing against those that break rules" (p. 163). Hochschild (2003) explains this division of emotional labour as a reflection of social norms guiding the emotional expression of women and men. Emotional labour performed by chairs in this study also seemed to show a gendered difference in exertion. Many of the chairs talked about negative examples of when they saw a person losing their temper and the negative impressions that made. There was some division between men and women, with most of the female chairs pointing to the pre-existing negative stereotype of a 'hysterical woman' or of being perceived as being 'shrill', 'shrieking', 'over emotional', or 'flaky'. Although all members in institutional life are officially considered as rational subjects,

> the behavior of women is frequently defined as emotional and in contradiction to organizational instrumentality. As a rule, women are accused of being too emotional, even when the same sort of behavior from a male colleague would be interpreted...as someone 'arguing his position with conviction'. (Luthar & Šadl, 2008, p. 244)

The difference between the male leader with conviction and the over-emotional female leader was shown by Scott and Brown (2006) who found that observers of leadership behaviour were slower to categorize agentic behaviour traits as agentic when a female leader performed the behaviour. Similarly, anger displayed by female leaders was found by Lewis (2000) to result in lower leadership evaluations, possibly due to expected role incongruity. Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard (2008) discuss how expectations of leader behaviour, or "leadership prototypes" (p. 40) can cause problems for female leaders, due to stereotyping. That is, beliefs

and expectations about how women behave can misalign with beliefs and expectations about how leaders behave (Acker, 2012; Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Luthar and Šadl (2008) describe a related normative pressure towards conservative stereotypes of a rational masculinity in Slovenian higher education, casting stereotypes of an emotional femininity in academia as "other". They point to "a special form of unequal treatment of women...based in the division between the rational-instrumental, and to emotional-professional culture" (p. 244). In their study of Slovenian academics, Luthar and Šadl found that most of their female participants thought that their marginalization at work was partly self-imposed, "effected through self-discipline and consent" (p. 243) and that an escape from marginalization was possible through speaking and behaving how the men around them spoke and behaved. A side effect of this is the perpetuation of discriminatory norms through a self-regulation system "where authority gives way to self-discipline as a means of control" (Luthar & Šadl, 2008, p. 239). By earning a place in the dominant discourse through adopting its ways of being, the marginalized become demarginalized by giving up the parts of their identity that the hegemonic system considered inferior, thus creating space for a new "other" to be made peripheral and subjugated (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Deleuze, 1994). By being pushed to act the part of the normative "good leader", chairs are made to perpetuate the characteristics of that standard: "a rational self...unexpressive at work, especially at the front stage, presenting a neutral demeanor" (Luthar & Šadl, p. 245), rather than to expand the identity of a leader in higher education to other possible expressions, with a broader range of acceptable affects. One context in which some of the female chairs in this study *could* express a wider range of emotions was in the collective emotional labour that took place within confidant-like relationships with co-workers.

Department Chair Emotional Labour

The chairs in this study told me about their goals: to be a good leader, be fair, be seen as positive, calm, and neutral, protect the department, and to do a good job. To achieve these goals, the chairs said they had to work in ways that they were never really formally prepared for. Often, little more preparation was given than that of living among other women and men, of seeing and experiencing examples of good and bad leaders. When the chairs began their roles, and began the emotional labour of being a chair, they did that work in all their interactions with others, while pursuing an ideal. Be positive, stay calm, appear neutral: three simple rules that describe a simple shared standard, remarkable only for the assumed 'normalcy' of it, for the expectedness of it. I began this study to learn about the draining work of managing emotions. How did the chairs in this study perform emotional labour at work? The chairs who participated in this study performed emotional labour constantly, consciously, willingly, as they tried to be the ideal chair and to fit the implicit and shared standard of a good leader.

Chapter 6: CONCLUSION

I prefaced this study with a brief discussion of department chair stress and its various

causes. I mentioned the way that stress relates to the high turnover and burnout at the chair level

(and beyond) that has created, or at least not diverted, a leadership crisis (Gmelch, 1991) in

higher education. In performing this study of university department chairs, I found that the

chairs' increased emotional labour in certain contexts could be contributing to their workplace

stress—a) feeling like they do not measure up to a normative ideal of a chair, b) an urge to rebel

or protest against that idealized image of a chair, c) the possible absence of a stress-relieving

confidant in office staff or elsewhere, and d) the possible inability to satisfy the demands of their

'customer'. Each of these contexts were described by the chairs as requiring or resulting in

greater emotional labour—each context a potential source of stress. Sometimes, a simple

awareness of possible stressors can aid in the reduction of stress. Sometimes, a concrete change

is necessary. The value of this study to higher education literature is the elaboration of how

chairs perform emotional labour in their work environments. This information can be used to

strike at the three areas laid out in Hochschild's (2003) description of how emotion workers are

socialized into a company: selection, training, and self-regulation for the benefit of the company.

Department Chair Recruitment

To discuss how the information from this study can be used to improve department chair

recruitment, I must make a brief connection to Hochschild's early work with front-line service

workers. Hochschild's (2003) framework of emotional labour began as a study of flight

attendants and their induction into the social context and normative expectations governing

emotional expression in their role. One critical step described in this socialization process was

the selection of individuals who appeared to have a personality that was well-matched to that

which was desired in flight attendants. Once suitable candidates were selected, they could be further trained to bring their emotional expression even closer to that which was deemed appropriate for the role. By starting with individuals who appeared to already fit the mold of the standard ideal personality of a flight attendant, companies could avoid some employee burnout or attrition due to dissatisfaction. In the case of department chairs, it seems unlikely that, during the institutional recruitment process, a similar matching process regularly occurs between candidates' emotional expression and that of an ideal chair.

Department chair recruitment in Canadian universities is focused on tenure-track senior faculty, often full Professors (e.g., McGill University, 2017; University of Alberta, 2009a, 2009b; University of British Columbia, 2016, n.d.). As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, senior faculty have generally gained their positions through excelling in research, a solitary pursuit, and experienced researchers may not necessarily possess the skills in management required as chair. However, a candidate's lack of training or preparation for an administrative role has not always prevented institutions from selecting faculty members to act as chair. As I discussed earlier, chairs' reasons for taking on the role differ. In many cases, a lack of formal preparation had not caused candidates to refrain from stepping into an administrative position. Unlike the newly-hired flight attendants studied by Hochschild (1979; 1983; 2003), chairs do not necessarily undergo an explicit filtering process based on personality and emotionality during their recruitment, selection, and hiring. The lack of attention paid to chair candidates' emotionality leaves open a space for job dissatisfaction and potential burnout to occur if a candidate is hired whose emotional expression is not well-suited to the ideal standard of a calm, positive, and neutral leader. By attending to the emotional labour of the role of chair

during the recruitment process, institutions and chair candidates might be able to avoid chair dissatisfaction with the role, or at least predict it to some extent and take interventive action.

Given the likely importance of emotional self-management abilities for the role of department chair, recruitment materials such as policies and job descriptions could explicitly state that chairs perform emotional labour as a workplace task. Although changing the wording of policy documents will not necessarily affect who applies to the role or who is recruited for it, an acknowledgement of chair emotional labour in policy may help to legitimize the performance of emotional labour as part of the tasks inherent to the role. By explicitly stating that candidates should expect to perform emotional self-management to meet a standard of positive, calm, and neutral emotional expression, institutions might be able to reduce some of the difficulties faculty experience when transitioning to a role as chair. After a faculty member begins their time as chair, further training focused on emotional self-management might of service to the chair and the institution.

Training and Professional Development

The matter of a neoliberal administrative affect comes to a head in institutional training and professional development programs, where chairs have the good fortune (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999) of finding that such programs exist at their institutions. If the institution promotes a normative, cheerful, prepared, unfailingly optimistic attitude it likely does not encourage chairs to perform the role in a way that suits a broader range of personalities. Rebels against the affective norm may not be welcome in university leadership. If professional managers are desirable chairs in universities because of the need to answer to the inevitable bottom line, the difficult transition from regular research-focused faculty to socially-focused chair (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999) will not be made any easier. Training for department chairs may help bridge the

gap between being a researcher and being an administrator but it comes with its own challenges. At the research site for this study, chairs who participated in an on-site leadership training program described training materials and classes as strongly implying value judgments regarding leader affect and personality. However, the program's materials insist that multiple ways of leading and multiple leader personas are appropriate and acceptable. A further study into the divide between chairs' perceptions and the program's communication of normative standards for leadership may help determine where the gap lies between the two. Although addressing the delivery and perception of leadership training will only have an impact on those who participate in the program, it has the potential to shift the organizational norm of a 'good leader', at least at the university in this study. In broader contexts, we must consider whether a university can reasonably satisfy the demands of financial constraints without professional management and whether a professional manager can be expected to provide academic guidance to a department and its members. In support of the professional development of department chairs in general, Hunt, Pate, and Irvin (2007) advocate for the presence of chairs' councils at universities, to reduce isolation and provide unification of concerns and information sharing.

Self-regulation

It is this final point that I believe holds the most meaning for chairs—the internalized self-regulation to meet an external organizational demand. We must consider if emotion really is a commodity, for sale and for barter in a market that has surpassed the bounds of the physical or digital and that makes its trades in our thoughts and feelings. The stress for chairs brought on by their emotionally laborious roles may be in part brought about by a corporate colonization of the mind. If a chair believes that an ideal chair should behave in a particular way, and if that chair does not behave in that particular way, they may experience an internal rebuke. The chairs

expressed regret about perceived missteps and spoke of feeling regret moments of expression that they felt were inappropriate. Self-regulation is necessary to perform most non-criminal adult lives, but we must be mindful of the regulations to which we bind ourselves. Standards and expectations of the role of the chairship ought to be questioned, especially if they have been the same for a long time or have gone unremarked.

Future Research

In future work, I intend to expand on this study by investigating the work of managing emotions that do not fit the shared standard of the positive, calm, and neutral chair. Based on the data I gathered from the chairs, I intend to look at chairs' emotional self-management of anger, fear, sadness, and surprise in response to events at work. These emotions are of interest to my work on chair emotional labour because chairs' interpretations of how they should be managed varied widely, with some chairs strongly opposed to, for example, expressions of anger, while others stated that such an expression could be justifiable. Further work focused on self-management of these emotions could provide a more complete image of the normative standard of emotional expression shared by department chairs.

The shared standard of chair emotional expression must also be considered as being enacted differently between female and male chairs. Future work on the gendered aspects of chair emotional labour could focus on the ways that female and male chairs perform emotional labour to meet normative expectations for their gender in addition to normative expectations for a department chair. A study of how male and female department chairs differ in how they navigate dual burdens of emotional labour as chairs and as members of their gender might give a more comprehensive description of the ways that chairs perform emotional work as individuals. An exploration of gendered aspects of emotional labour might also intersect with other

demographic factors, such as race, age, national origin, and cultural background. The norms around departmental leadership should be examined in great detail for disempowering structures of the social and economic forces around them. The emotional labour of chairs in this study was a constant, insistent pressure, always there, unavoidable in the context of the role, a ceaseless type of labour to be performed.

Bibliography

Acker, S. (2012). Chairing and caring: Gendered dimensions of leadership in academe. *Gender and Education*, *24*(4), 411-428.

Appadurai, A. (2009). Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *55*(31).

Armstrong, D. E., & Woloshyn, V. E. (2017). Exploring the tensions and ambiguities of university department chairs. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *47*(1), 97-113.

Aziz, S., Mullins, M. E., Balzer, W. K., Grauer, E., Burnfield, J. L., Lodato, M. A., & Cohen-Powless, M. A. (2005). Understanding the training needs of department chairs. *Studies in Higher Education*, *30*(5), 571-593.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *The International Journal of Public Administration*, *17*(3-4), 541-554.

Beatty, B. (2007). Going through the emotions: Leadership that gets to the heart of school renewal. *Australian Journal of Education*, *51*(3), 328-340.

Beatty, B. R. (2000). The emotions of educational leadership: Breaking the silence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *3*(4), 331-357.

Bellas, M. L. (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *561*(1), 96-110.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). *Washington DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education*.

Bentham, J. (1791). *Panopticon: or, the inspection-house.* Dublin, Ireland: Thomas Byrne. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Gale. University of Alberta. 15 June 2017

<http://find.galegroup.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gal e&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T001&docId=CW125793319&typ e=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

Berdrow, I. (2010). King among kings: Understanding the role and responsibilities of the department chair in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *38*(4), 499-514.

Berry, K., & Cassidy, S. (2013). Emotional labour in university lecturers: Considerations for higher education institutions. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *2*(2), 22.

Blackmore, J. (2010). Preparing leaders to work with emotions in culturally diverse educational communities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(5), 642-658.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *62*(4), 358–376. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00398.x

Bolton, C. L., & English, F. W. (2010). De-constructing the logic/emotion binary in educational leadership preparation and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(5), 561-578.

Bongiorno, R., Bain, P., & David, B. (2014). If you're going to be a leader, at least act like it! Prejudice towards women who are tentative in leader roles. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *53*(2), 217-234.

Bono, J. E., & Vey, M. A. (2005). Toward understanding emotional management at work: A quantitative review of emotional labor research. In Hartel, C.E., Zerbe, W.J. and Ashkanasy, N.M. (Eds), *Emotions in Organizational Behavior*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, NJ, 213-233.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture.* 1990 ed. London: Sage.

Boyko, L., & Jones, G. A. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of middle management (Chairs and Deans) in Canadian universities. In *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 83-102). Springer Netherlands.

Boyko, L. (2009). "An examination of academic department chairs in Canadian universities." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Toronto.

Brescoll, V. L., Dawson, E., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2010). Hard won and easily lost: The fragile status of leaders in gender-stereotype-incongruent occupations. *Psychological Science*, (11). 1640-1642.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work". *Journal of vocational behavior*, *60*(1), 17-39.

Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *8*(3), 79.

Brown, T. (2005). Mentorship and the female college president. *Sex Roles*, *52*(9-10), 659-666.

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies In Higher Education*, *32*(6), 693–710. http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Buller, J. L., (2012). The essential department chair: A comprehensive desk reference (2nd ed.), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. S., & Gmelch, W. H. (1995). Stress factors and occupational roles of department chairs. *Journal of Technology Studies*, *21*(1), 12-23.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: what do we know?. *School Leadership*

& Management, *34*(5), 553-571. doi:10.1080/13632434.2014.928680

Callahan, J. L. (2004). Reversing a conspicuous absence: Mindful inclusion of emotion in structuration theory. *Human Relations*, *57*(11), 1427-1448.

Cheung, F., & Halpern, D. (2010). Women at the top: Powerful leaders define success as work plus family in a culture of gender. *American Psychologist*, *65*(3), 182-193.

Chu, D. (2012). *The department chair primer: what chairs need to know and do to make a difference.* 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Constanti, P., & Gibbs, P. (2004). Higher education teachers and emotional labour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *18*(4), 243-249.

Copp, M. (1998). When emotion work is doomed to fail: Ideological and structural constraints on emotion management. *Symbolic interaction*, *21*(3), 299-328.

Cyr, J. (2016). The pitfalls and promise of focus groups as a data collection method. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *45*(2), 231-259. doi:10.1177/0049124115570065

Czech, K., & Forward, G. L. (2010). Leader communication: Faculty perceptions of the department chair. *Communication Quarterly*, *58*(4), 431-457. doi:10.1080/01463373.2010.525158

Davis, A. P., Dent, E. B., & Wharff, D. M. (2015). A conceptual model of systems thinking leadership in community colleges. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *28*(4), 333-353.

Davis, D. R., & Maldonado, C. (2015). Shattering the glass ceiling: The leadership development of African American women in higher education. *Advancing Women In Leadership*, *35,* 48-64.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford review of education*, *31*(2), 217-235.

Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism'and higher education: The management of performances

and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of*

Education, *8*(1), 47-70.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and

Entrepreneurialism in Universities: is the local dimension still important?. *Comparative*

education, *37*(1), 7-20.

DeFleur, M. H., Kurpius, D. D., Osborne, A., & Maxwell Hamilton, J. (2010). The masters:

Creating a new generation of leaders for mass communication education and

beyond. *Communication Education*, *59*(1), 19-40.

Degn, L. (2015). Sensemaking, sensegiving and strategic management in Danish higher

education. *Higher Education*, *69*(6), 901-913.

DeLander, G. E. (2017). Lessons from a recovering department chair. *American Journal Of*

Pharmaceutical Education, *81*(3), 1-3.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). A Tousand Plateaus. *Trans. BRIAN MASSUMI. Minneapolis:*

Te University of Minnesota Press.

Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2016). Making the invisible visible: A cross‐ sector analysis

of gender‐ based leadership barriers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *27*(2), 181-

206. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21248

Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the

contradictions. *Psychology of women quarterly*, *31*(1), 1-12.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders.

Psychological review, *109*(3), 573.

Embry, A., Padgett, M. Y., & Caldwell, C. B. (2008). Can leaders step outside of the gender box? An examination of leadership and gender role stereotypes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *15*(1), 30-45.

Ferlie, E. (1996). *The new public management in action*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Fineman, S., & Sturdy, A. (1999). The emotions of control: A qualitative exploration of environmental regulation. *Human Relations*, *52*(5), 631-663.

Foster, B. L. (2006). From faculty to administrator: Like going to a new planet. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 134, 49–57. doi:10.1002/he.216

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish : the birth of the prison.* 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Gmelch, W. H, & Miskin, V. D. (2004) *Chairing an academic department.* 2nd ed. Atwood Publishin.

Gmelch, W. H. (1991). Paying the price for Academic Leadership: department chair tradeoffs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).

Gmelch, W. H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 126, 69–84.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1993). The cost of academic leadership: Department chair stress. *Innovative Higher Education*, *17*(4), 259-270.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *32*(1), 79-94.

Gmelch, W. H., & Gates, G. S. (1995). *The Stressful Journey of the department chair: An Academic in Need of a Compass and Clock*. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2011). *Department chair leadership skills*. Atwood Pub..

Gmelch, W. H., & Parkay, F. W. (1999). Becoming a department chair: Negotiating the transition

from scholar to administrator. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American

Educational Research Association (Montreal, Ontario, April 19-23, 1999).

Gmelch, W. H., Tanewski, G. A., & Sarros, J. C. (1998). Role stress and satisfaction of academic

department heads. *International Journal of Business Studies: A Publication of the Faculty of

Business Administration, Edith Cowan University*, *6*(1), 97.

Gmelch, W.H. (1995). Department chairs under siege: Resolving the web of conflict. *New

Directions for Higher Education. 92*, 35-42.

Gmelch, W.H., & Chan, W. (1995). Administrator stress and coping effectiveness: Implications

for administrator evaluation and development. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in

Education*, *9*(3), 275-285.

Goffman, E. (1978). The presentation of self in everyday life. 1959. *Garden City, NY*.

Goffman, E. (2002). The presentation of self in everyday life. 1959. *Garden City, NY*.

Gonaim, F. (2016). A department chair: A life guard without a life jacket. *Higher Education

Policy*, *29*(2), 272-286.

Gonzales, L.D., & Rincones, R. (2013). Using participatory action research and photo methods to

explore higher education administration as an emotional endeavor. *The Qualitative Report*,

18(32), 1-17.

Gray, B. (2009). The emotional labour of nursing: Defining and managing emotions in nursing

work. *Nurse Education Today*, *29*(2), 168-175.

Gray, B., & Smith, P. (2009). Emotional labour and the clinical settings of nursing care: the

perspectives of nurses in East London. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *9*(4), 253-261.

Gunter, H. (2004). Labels and labelling in the field of educational leadership. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, *25*(1), 21-41.

Gunther, M., Evans, G., Mefford, L., & Coe, T. R. (2007). The relationship between leadership styles and empathy among student nurses. *Nursing Outlook*, *55*(4), 196-201.

Hadley, C. (2014). Emotional roulette? Symmetrical and asymmetrical emotion regulation outcomes from coworker interactions about positive and negative work events (English). *Human Relations (New York, NY)*, *67*(9), 1073-1094.

Hafford-Letchfield, T., & Harper, W. (2014). State of the arts: using literary works to explore and learn about theories and models of leadership. *Social Work Education*, *33*(2), 209-223.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional politics of teaching and teacher development: With implications for educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *1*(4), 315-336.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers college record*, *103*(6), 1056-1080.

Hargreaves, A. (2004). Inclusive and exclusive educational change: Emotional responses of teachers and implications for leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *24*(3), 287-309.

He, X. X., Li, Z. Y., Shi, J., Mao, R., Mu, R. H., & Zhou, Y. A. (2000). A comparative study of stress among university faculty in China and Japan. *Higher Education*, *39*(3), 253-277.

Hochschild, A. (2003). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American journal of sociology*, *85*(3), 551-575.

Hochschild, A. Russell. (1983). *The managed heart : commercialization of human*

feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. Russell. (2003). *The managed heart : commercialization of human feeling.* 20th anniversary ed., with a new afterword. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. Russell. (2012). *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling.* Updated, with a new preface. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoyle, E., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Educational leadership: Ambiguity, professionals and managerialism.* Sage.

Hunt, B. J., Pate, A. K., & Irvin, T. S. (2007). Chairs' assembly: Why your campus needs one. *Department Chair*, *18*(1), 17-18. doi:10.1002/dch.20007

Isenbarger, L., & Zembylas, M. (2006). The emotional labour of caring in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(1), 120-134.

Jacelon, C., & Imperio, K. (2005). Participant diaries as a source of data in research with older adults. *Qualitative Health Research*,*15*(7), 991-997.

James, N. (1992). Care = organisation + physical labour + emotional labour. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *14*(4), 488-509.

Jenkins, R. (2009). What new department chairs need to know. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56(9), 40–42.

Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *106*(1), 39-60.

Jones, S., Harvey, M., Lefoe, G., & Ryland, K. (2014). Synthesising theory and practice: Distributed leadership in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *42*(5), 603-619.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., & Ryland, K. (2012). Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *34*(1), 67-78.

Kaiser, R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. (2006). The deeper work of executive development: Outgrowing sensitivities. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*(4), 463-483.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research. Introducing focus groups. *BMJ: British medical journal*, *311*(7000), 299.

Knight, P. T. (2002). Learning from Schools. *Higher Education*, (2). 283.

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristkari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(4), 616-642.

Kulas, J. T., Komai, M., & Grossman, P. J. (2013). Leadership, information, and risk attitude: A game theoretic approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 349-362. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.01.002

Lawler, E. J. (2001). An affect theory of social exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(2), 321-352.

Leary, P. A., Sullivan, M. E., & Ray, D. (2001). The relationship of leadership styles of selected west Virginia deans and department chairs to job satisfaction of departmental faculty members. *National FORUM of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 17(4), 205-215).

Lees, N.D. (2016). Creating space, relieving stress, and making the job more enticing: Suggestions for academic department chairs. *Academic Leader*, *32*(5), 4-5.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When Leaders Display Emotion: How Followers Respond to Negative Emotional Expression of Male and Female Leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (2). 221-234.

Lindgren, M., Packendorff, J., & Sergi, V. (2014). Thrilled by the discourse, suffering through the experience: Emotions in project-based work. *Human Relations*, *67*(11), 1383-1412.

Longman, K. A., & Anderson, P. S. (2016). Women in leadership: The Future of Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, *15*(1/2), 24. doi:10.1080/15363759.2016.1107339

Luna, G. (2010). Succession planning: A doctoral program partnership for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *34*(12), 977-990.

Luthar, B., & Šadl, Z. (2008). Communication and emotion in gendered organization: The hidden transcripts of power in higher education. J. E. Canaan & W. Shumar, (Eds.), (2008). *Structure and agency in the neoliberal university* (211 - 233). New York, NY: Routledge.

Macionis, J. J, & Gerber, L. M. (2008). *Sociology*. 6th Canadian ed. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Madden, M. (2011). Gender Stereotypes of Leaders: Do They Influence Leadership in Higher Education?. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, *9*, 55.

Mann, S., & Cowburn, J. (2005). Emotional labour and stress within mental health nursing. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, *12*(2), 154-162.

Marx, K. (2007). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844*. Dover ed. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications.

Maxwell, A., & Riley, P. (2016). Emotional demands, emotional labour and occupational

outcomes in school principals: Modelling the relationships. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 1741143215607878.

McGill University. (2017). *Academic Administrative Appointment Process*. Montreal, QC.

McMaster University (2000). Terms of Reference for department chairs. Retrieved from: http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/AdminAcad/AdminProcedures/Chairs-Directors-TermsofReference.pdf

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Middlehurst, R. (2008). Not enough science or not enough learning? Exploring the gaps between leadership theory and practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *62*(4), 322-339.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J. S. (2015). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities. *Journal Of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *37*(2), 241–251. http://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2015.1019125

Muller-Juge, V., Cullati, S., Blondon, K., Hudelson, P., Maitre, F., Vu, N., & … Nendaz, M. (2014). Interprofessional collaboration between residents and nurses in general internal medicine: A qualitative study on behaviours enhancing teamwork quality. *Plos One*, *9*(4), e96160.

Mumby, D. K., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality. *Academy of management review*, *17*(3), 465-486.

O'Connor, M. (2008). The dimensions of leadership: A foundation for caring competency. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, *32*(1), 21-26.

Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2004). Work intensification and emotional labour among UK university lecturers: An exploratory study. *Organization Studies*, *25*(7), 1185-1203.

Osiemo, L. B. (2012). Developing responsible leaders: The university at the service of the person. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *108*(2), 131-143.

Pemberton, J., Mavin, S., & Stalker, B. (2007). Scratching beneath the surface of communities of (mal) practice. *The Learning Organization*, *14*(1), 62-73.

QS World University Rankings 2016. (2017). Retrieved July 20, 2017, from https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2016

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, USA: Sage.

Samad, A. (2015). Towards an understanding of the effect of leadership on employee wellbeing and organizational outcomes in Australian universities. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, *49*(6), 441-448.

Sarros, J.C., Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W.H., and Wolverton, M.L.. 1999. Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. *The Review Of Higher Education*, (2), 165-185.

Schmidt, M. J. (2010). Is there a place for emotions within leadership preparation programmes?. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(5), 626-641.

Schwinghammer, T. L., Rodriguez, T. E., Weinstein, G., Sorofman, B. A., Bosso, J. A., Kerr, R. A., & Haden, N. K. (2012). AACP strategy for addressing the professional development needs of department chairs. *American Journal Of Pharmaceutical Education*, *76*(6), 1-8.

Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (Eds.). (2009). *A dictionary of sociology*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Scott, K. A., & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *101*(2), 230-242.

Semple, J. (1993). *Bentham's prison: a study of the panopticon penitentiary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press.

Staden, H. (1998). Alertness to the needs of others: a study of the emotional labour of caring. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *27*(1), 147-156.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Taggart, G. (2015). department chair Advice on Teaching and Research at U.S. Research Universities. *Innovative Higher Education*, *40*(5), 443-454. doi:10.1007/s10755-015-9329-4

Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and gender: a dangerous liaison?. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(7), 574-590.

U15. (2017). U15: About Us. Retrieved July 20, 2017, from http://u15.ca/about-us

University of Alberta. (2009a). Selection of department chairs Procedure (Appendix A): Roles and Responsibilities. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (2009b). Selection of department chairs Procedure (Appendix B): Terms and Conditions for department chairs. Edmonton, AB.

University of British Columbia (n.d.). Selection Process for heads - Academic. Vancouver, BC. https://academic.ubc.ca/sites/vpa.ubc.ca/files/documents/Guidelines_appthead.pdf

University of British Columbia. (2016). Appointments and Extension of Appointments for Heads of Academic Units. Vancouver, BC. http://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/files/2016/12/policy22.pdf

University of Toronto. (2003). Policy on appointment of academic administrators. Toronto, ON.

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Polici

es/PDF/ppoct302003i.pdf

van Kleef, G. (2014). Understanding the positive and negative effects of emotional expressions in

organizations: EASI does it (English). *Human Relations (New York, NY)*, *67*(9), 1145-1164.

van Manen, M. (2014). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in

phenomenological research and writing*. Routledge.

Wilson, V. (1999). *The department chair: Between a Rock and a Hard Place*. ERIC.

Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic

department chairs need to know. *Journal Of Higher Education Policy & Management*, *27*(2),

227-238. doi:10.1080/13600800500120126

Yang, F. H., & Chang, C. C. (2008). Emotional labour, job satisfaction and organizational

commitment amongst clinical nurses: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of

Nursing Studies*, *45*(6), 879-887.

Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and

Stake. *The Qualitative Report*, *20*(2), 134-152. Retrieved from

http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss2/12

Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of the literature and

some conceptual considerations. *Human resource management review*, *12*(2), 237-268.

Zembylas, M. (2010). The emotional aspects of leadership for social justice: Implications for

    leadership preparation programs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(5), 611-625.

Zhang, Q., & Zhu, W. (2008). Exploring emotion in teaching: Emotional labor, burnout, and

    satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Communication Education*, *57*(1), 105-122.

Appendices

Appendix A: Information Letter for Department Chair

Study Title: "Sanctioned Feelings: University Department Chairs' Emotional Labour"

Dear [Chair]:

My name is Summer Cowley and I am a Master of Education student in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta. I am contacting you to invite you to participate in my research study about Department Chairs' self-management of emotional responses (and expressions thereof) at work, a process herein referred to as *emotional labour*. This study forms the basis of my Master's thesis research. The results of this study will be shared with other academics and educational professionals through publications and/or presentations.

This letter explains the study as well as what your participation will involve. A consent form is included. I appreciate your time in reading through this information, and am happy to answer any questions about the study.

Purpose

The purpose of my case study is to examine university Department Chairs' emotional labour performed in the context of their role as Chair. This study asks: In what ways do Department Chairs perform emotional labour at work? Findings from this study may enable postsecondary Senior Administrators to improve Chair recruitment and training by providing further knowledge about the nature of emotional labour in Chairship. This knowledge may enable institutions and administrators to give Chairs the support they need to succeed in (and be satisfied with) their roles while maintaining healthy levels of stress.

The benefit of this study to leadership theory is the analysis of the process of transitioning into a leadership role as a process of socialization, rather than a process of skill or personal attribute

development. By examining the ways in which Department Chairs socialize themselves to fit their role as leader, we can consider the challenges and successes of individual leaders in higher education as related to interactions within a group, rather than traits and abilities of an individual.

North American universities are currently facing a scarcity of senior faculty able or willing to take on leadership positions, including Department Chairships (Luna, 2012; Appadurai, 2009; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). While professors often feel motivated (or obligated) to act as Chair, many find the position to be stressful or unpleasant, and only stay in the role for a short period due to job dissatisfaction (Gmelch & Burns, 1991; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Gmelch & Miskin, 2004, 2011; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Gmelch, 1991, 2016; Sarros, M. Wolverton, Gmelch, & M.L.Wolverton, 1999).

Although stressors affecting Chairs have been studied (Gmelch & Chan, 1995; Gmelch & Gates, 1995; Gmelch, 1991; Lees, 2016; Wilson, 1999), we lack information regarding Chairs' self-management of emotional responses (and expressions thereof) to these stressors, a process herein referred to as *emotional labour* (Gonzales & Rincones, 2013; Hochschild, 2003). Since it is possible that the Chairs' emotional responses (rather than the stressors themselves) determine whether Chairs experience job dissatisfaction, emotional labour requires further study. From my review of relevant literature, it appears that only one study on the topic currently exists— Gonzales and Rincones (2013)—an exploratory study of the emotional labour of one university Department Chair. Studies that expand on their work, or on Chair emotional labour in general, have either not been conducted or have yet to be published.

Study Procedures

I intend to interview up to 10 current department chairs. The overview of my data collection is as follows:

- conduct 1-2 focus groups with available participants (up to 10) before and after individual interviews

- conduct 2 face-to-face interviews with each participant to learn about the ways in which they performed self-management of emotional responses (and expressions thereof) at work

- participants will write daily reflective journal entries in any format they choose about their experiences self-managing emotional responses (and expressions thereof) at work

- participant journal entries will be collected after 2 weeks

- All interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed for data analysis

- conduct one follow-up contact via phone, Skype, or email to discuss interview responses and ask further questions about your emotional labour as required

The focus groups will take approximately 60 minutes. The individual interviews will take approximately 60 minutes. I will send you a transcript of the interviews via e-mail so that you can add, delete, or change any information. I will follow up with another conversation by telephone, Skype or similar to clarify any points made in the individual interviews. The follow-up call/email will take about 15 minutes. I will again summarize key points and e-mail copies to give you a chance to add, change, or delete information. Participant journal entries should take approximately 15 minutes per entry. I anticipate conducting data collection during the weeks of November 14, 2016 - March 24, 2017. Please find enclosed a copy of the first individual interview guiding questions, focus groups guide, and journal prompt.

Benefits

Your participation in the study will help to expand on our understanding of Department Chairs' self-management of emotional responses to stress, which may give us new insight into one aspect

of Chair job dissatisfaction. As all participants are department chairs, participants could benefit personally from reading the study after it is complete. The benefits would occur through self-reflection and would not be monetary or positional.

Risk

There are no foreseeable risks arising from your participation in this study.

Voluntary Participation

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. The participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time prior to April 2017.

Freedom to Withdraw

Even if you agree to be in the study, you can change your mind and withdraw up until the point that data analysis has started. The primary investigator will notify you prior to the interview as to the approximate deadline for data withdrawal. If data analysis has not yet started, your data will be withdrawn and destroyed. There will be no penalty to you for withdrawing.

Confidentiality & Anonymity

The findings from my study will be used for writing my thesis, research articles, presentations, and teaching. I will not personally identify any participants in the writing or presentations.

The data from my study will be kept confidential, and only a co-investigator may have access to the data. Every effort will be made to protect your identity as a participant in the study. You will not be identified in any report or publication of this study or its results. Even though we will emphasize to all participants in the study that comments made during the focus group sessions should be kept confidential, it is possible that participants may repeat comments outside the group

at some point in the future. Therefore, we encourage you to be open as you can, but remain aware of our limits in protecting confidentiality.

Participation in individual interviews will guarantee anonymity, and the data will be confidential. Participation in focus groups will not be anonymous but focus group participants will sign a consent form that indicates that they agree to keep the contents of focus groups confidential. I will ask participants to select a pseudonym (false name) to represent their voice in the writing.

In the writing and presentation of the findings from my study, I will not share information that could disclose the identity of participants.

During the study, all written data and audio recordings will be secured in digital files on my laptop, which is password protected. Hard copies of transcripts and consent forms will be kept in a binder in a locked cabinet in my office. These data will be kept for 5 years, and then destroyed. I may use the data I collect from this study in future research, but if I do this will have to be approved by a Research Ethics Board.

You will have the opportunity to request an electronic copy of the report of the findings when the study is completed. I will give you my contact information and a time frame for anticipated completion of the report so that you can request a copy.

Further Information

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me, Summer Cowley, or Dr. Bonnie Stelmach.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office at University of Alberta.

Appendix B: Invitation to Participate

Dear [Chair]:

My name is Summer Cowley and I am a Master of Education student in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta. I am contacting you to invite you to participate in my research study about Department Chairs' self-management of emotions (and expressions thereof) at work, a process herein referred to as *emotional labour*.

The purpose of my case study is to examine university Department Chairs' emotional labour performed in the context of their role as Chair. This study asks: In what ways do Department Chairs perform emotional labour at work? Findings from this study may enable postsecondary Senior Administrators to improve Chair recruitment and training by providing further knowledge about the nature of emotional labour in Chairship. This knowledge may enable institutions and administrators to give Chairs the support they need to succeed in (and be satisfied with) their roles while maintaining healthy levels of stress.

Your proposed role in this study would be as an interview and focus group participant as well as writing one or more reflective journal entries over a period of two weeks. I would like to conduct two focus groups, one before and after your individual interviews, two in-person interviews with you, at a time and place that is convenient for you to learn about ways in which you have performed self-management of emotions at work. I would like you to write a daily journal entry for two weeks in any format on your experiences with emotional labour at work. I would also like to conduct one follow-up contact via phone, Skype, or email to discuss interview responses and ask further questions about your emotional labour as required.

The focus groups will vary in number of participants and will be approximately 60 minutes long, dependent upon participants. The individual interviews will take approximately 60

minutes. I will send you a transcript of the interview via e-mail so that you can add, delete, or change any information. Participant journal entries should take approximately 15 minutes per entry. I will follow up with another conversation by telephone, Skype or similar to clarify any points made in the first interview. The follow-up call/email will take about 15 minutes. I will again summarize key points and e-mail copies to give you a chance to add, change, or delete information. I anticipate conducting the initial interview during the weeks of November 14, 2016 - March 24, 2017

 If you are interested, please let me know of a few dates and times that may work for you. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Appendix C: Consent Form for Department Chair

Participant Consent Form – Department Chair

 Consent Statement: I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. I also agree to keep whatever information is shared during focus groups confidential. If I have additional questions, I have been told whom to contact. I agree to participate in the research study described above and will receive a copy of this consent form. I will receive a copy of this consent form after I sign it.

By signing this form, you indicate your understanding of the research project and agree to participate. In giving your consent, you acknowledge you understand that:

- the interviews and focus groups will be audio-recorded and that the recordings will be destroyed 5 years after completion of the study

- you may participate in any one of the study procedures or all of them

- the anonymous results from this study will be used for the principal investigator's Master's thesis and published in various scholarly communication media

- you have read and received a copy of the attached Information Letter

In giving your consent, you have the right to:

- privacy, anonymity and confidentiality

- withdraw participation at any point during the study before data analysis begins without explanation or penalty

- approximate withdrawal deadline will be communicated prior to initial interview

- safeguards to security of data

- disclosure of the presence of any apparent or actual conflict of interest on the part of the researcher

- a copy of the final report upon request

All data will be handled in compliance with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office at University of Alberta.

Name of Department: _____

 Name and signature of Department Chair:

_____   _____

    Printed name   Signature

Years of experience as Department Chair: _____

Gender identity: _____

Date: _____ Telephone: _____

E-mail: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Researcher's Signature _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: Initial Interview Script

Emotional labour: the effort required to express or suppress one's own particular emotions based on a social context.

Before the interview: discuss information letter and sign consent form.

1. How long have you been department chair?

2. Were you previously a regular faculty member in this department? For how long?

3. What does 'emotional labour' mean to you in the context of your role as chair?

4. Can you tell me about situations in which you have performed emotional labour at work?

5. Are there particular emotions that are more appropriate for a chair to express? Less appropriate? How do you self-manage inappropriate emotions that may arise?

6. Are there particular situations or contexts at work that require more emotional labour from you? Can you describe those situations/contexts?

7. Can you recall a time when you expressed an emotion at work that you do not think was appropriate for the context? What was that like compared to similar situations in which you expressed an appropriate emotion?

8. What emotions do you think a department chair should express? What emotions shouldn't they express? Does this change over time or in different contexts?

9. Are there other experiences or reflections you have on the role of emotions in your daily work as chair?

10. Are there rules of emotional expression/emotions that you live by as chair? Rules of behaviour?

Appendix E: Participant Journal Instructions

Emotional labour: the effort required to express or suppress one's own particular emotions based on a social context.

The purpose of this journal is to give the researcher an additional way to see what your experiences are in self-managing emotions at work. Please spend approximately 15 minutes a day either writing (in an email, in a file, by hand) or taking an audio recording. Please comment on anything you think will help me understand what it is like to perform emotional labour at work. At the end of two weeks, I will collect the journal entries in whatever form they take.

Appendix F: Focus Group Guide

Emotional labour: the effort required to express or suppress one's own particular emotions based on a social context.

Purpose

The following topics are meant as a guide for discussion in this focus group. The aims of this group discussion are to: 1) aid in the development of individual interview questions/topics, 2) potentially reveal topics related to emotional labour that have not yet been considered by the research team and participants, 3) provide a method of preliminary and follow-up data collection to support the individual interviews and reflective journals.

Introductions

What department are you from and how long have you been working in an administrative capacity in higher education?

Discussion Topics

1. What is emotional labour? What does it look like at work?

2. Does your current role require emotional labour? In what ways?

3. Did your previous roles require emotional labour? In what ways?

4. What emotions are most commonly expressed in your department? Have you noticed a difference in emotional tone in different departments?

5. What role do you consider emotion to play in your work as Chair? As a faculty member?

Appendix G: Script for Follow-up Contact

Dear [Chair]:

I have finished transcribing the recording of our recent interview and I have attached it as a Word document to this email. Please have a look and let me know of any changes that you might want to make. I have included a brief summary (in the document) of our discussion and the major themes that I believe we talked about. Please feel free to amend those as well, as you see fit.

If you are available to respond to the following questions, that would be appreciated. Either an in-person or email response would be suitable. The questions are as follows:

[Individualized follow-up questions based on interview content]

Thank you again for your participation thus far.

Summer Cowley

Appendix H: Second Interview Questions

Did you have an example of a chair or leader that you think of/thought of when you became chair? Someone that you modelled yourself on as chair or modelled yourself in opposition to?

1. When you first became chair, was there any person or persons who you think helped support you in that transition? Somebody who perhaps gave advice/guidance or who showed you how to perform as chair day to day?

2. Is it possible for a chair to be too neutral/circumspect/emotionally removed from a situation at work? When must a chair show strong emotion? When must a chair publicly take sides and voice strong opinions?

3. Is emotion a tool to use to achieve an end or is it an obstacle to achieving an end? Can you comment on situations in which either have come up in your role as chair?

4. Other people's' emotions are stressful. Can you tell me about how you respond as chair to the emotions of others at work? What are some ways of responding that are appropriate? Inappropriate?

5. Have you found any difference in how you interact with students since you became chair versus as a regular faculty member?

6. How would you define "authenticity" in the context of how you perform as chair? What would be authentic or inauthentic behaviour?

7. How would one of your close colleagues describe you as chair in terms of the way you perform the role? How would you describe yourself as chair?

8. If you were to leave your role as chair at the end of this term, what changes might you make to your relationships with colleagues?