

# 1

## Teachers' Emotions and Emotion Regulation: An Overview of Contemporary Research Findings

**Irena Burić**

*Department of psychology, University of Zadar, Zadar, Croatia*

### Abstract

*Even though emotions have been recognized as core and inevitable part of teaching and professional lives of teachers, systematic research on teachers' emotional processes was largely lacking until the last several years. Nonetheless, the existing studies indicate that emotions teachers experience at work, as well as strategies they use to regulate them, are important determinants of teacher well-being, motivation, relationships with students, and teacher effectiveness. Considering the fact that contemporary knowledge on teachers' emotional processes is still rather scarce and fragmented, the present paper seeks to offer an overview of teachers' emotions with regard to their: 1) contextual triggers and components, 2) available assessment possibilities, 3) regulation, and 4) effects on teachers' well-being, instructional practices, and students' outcomes. Lastly, directions for future research and practical implications for promoting teacher well-being and effectiveness are provided.*

*Keywords: teachers, emotions, emotion regulation, effects on teachers and students*

Emotions are constituent parts of every classroom. And while the topic of students' emotions has received extensive research attention in the last couple of decades (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014), teachers' emotions have been largely neglected. Luckily, in the last several years, empirical studies devoted to investigation of emotional aspects of teachers' lives have started to emerge. It was recognized that teachers indeed experience a wide variety of emotions of significant intensity that affect both teachers, their students, and education in general (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Fried, Mansfield, and Dobozy (2015) proposed a broad conceptual model of teachers' emotions to guide future research in this area of investigation. According to their model, personal characteristics (i.e. identity, beliefs, values, and personality traits), cognitive appraisals, and wider social, cultural, and political factors influence teachers' emotions, which, in turn, provide quality to experience, trigger regulatory strategies, and shape teachers' cognitive and motivational processes (Fried et al., 2015). Indeed, studies show that teachers' emotions influence their well-being, burn-out risk, turnover, and dropout from the teaching profession (Chang, 2009; Macdonald, 1999). In addition, teachers' emotions are related to their instructional practices and relationships with students, thus, affecting students' outcomes too (Frenzel, 2014; Hagenauer & Volet, 2014). Nonetheless, the empirical evidence on teachers' emotions is still rather scarce and fragmented, and comprehensive theoretical frameworks on phenomenology, antecedents, and effects of teachers' emotions are largely missing. Therefore, the aim of the present paper is to offer an overview of teachers' emotions with regard to their: 1) contemporary definition, 2) available assessment possibilities, 3) regulation, and 4) effects on teachers' well-being, instructional practices, and students' outcomes.

### **Defining teachers' emotions: their sources and components**

In order for an emotion to emerge, a person needs to appraise the external or internal stimuli as relevant for his or her own goals (Scherer, 2009). Since teachers' emotions are variants of human emotions in general, it can be expected that teachers' emotions also emerge as a result of cognitively appraising certain situations as relevant for their own goals. Indeed, the reciprocal model on causes and effects of teachers' emotions (Frenzel, 2014) stipulates that teachers seek to achieve four classroom goals: 1) students' acquisition of knowledge and competences, 2) students' motivational engagement in learning, 3) students' development of socio-emotional competences, and 4) establishment of well-functioning teacher-student relationships. Based on teachers' cognitive appraisals whether students' behavior in classroom corresponds with these goals, diverse emotions can develop.

In support for the reciprocal model on causes and effects of teachers' emotions (Frenzel, 2014), students and their behavior in classroom are found to be great sources of teachers' emotions. For instance, students' thriving and succeeding, positive communication in class, exemplary student behavior in class, attainment of teaching and learning goals, motivated students, etc. are recognized as important sources of positive teachers' emotions like joy, pride, love, and affection. On the contrary, students' misbehavior and violation of classroom rules, rude and disrespectful students, lack of students' effort and interest, unfulfilled learning and teaching goals etc. lead to teachers' negative emotions such as anger, hopelessness, anxiety, exhaustion, and disappointment (Burić, Slišković, & Macuka, 2018; Hagenauer, Hascher, & Volet, 2015; Sorić, Burić, Slišković, & Macuka, 2015; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Moreover, it seems that teachers' emotions may be shaped by the quality of the relationship between teachers and their students. For instance, Hagenauer et al. (2015) found that teachers who felt more connected to their students, also experienced higher levels of joy and lower levels of anxiety and anger.

However, it is important to emphasize that sources of teachers' emotions may go beyond students and their behavior in classroom. For example, anger as one of the most prominent negative emotion experienced by teachers (Burić et al., 2018; Chang, 2013; Frenzel, 2014) also results from factors related to

parents, colleagues, and features of educational system and policy. More specifically, teacher anger may be triggered by situations like parental accusations and verbal attacks, parental interference in teacher's job, parents who put pressure on teachers to assign good grades to their children, etc. In addition, unfair distribution of tasks among school staff, hostile and uncooperative colleagues, incompetent colleagues etc. may evoke teacher anger. Finally, issues like frequent changes in the curriculum, excessive paperwork, and degradation of public respect towards teaching profession are recognized as important triggers of teacher anger, too (Burić & Frenzel, 2019a).

According to the contemporary multicomponent definition, an emotion can be generally defined as a process which consists of five components: subjective feelings, cognitive appraisals, motivational tendencies, facial and bodily expressions, and physiological changes (Scherer, 2005; 2009). All these components also exist in emotions experience by teachers. For instance, in a qualitative study on phenomenology of teacher anger (Burić & Frenzel, 2019a), it was found that teachers used words like angry, frustrated, annoyed, irritated, and tense to illustrate subjective component of their anger. To describe their cognitive appraisal processes related to anger, teachers mentioned thinking about losing control, evaluating the situation as unfair, and having doubts in effort and energy invested in their job. Next, teachers spoke about urges to yell, hit something, leave the classroom or even quit their job to describe their motivational component of anger. Teachers were even aware of their expressive and physiological components of anger since they talked about blushing and frowning (i.e. facial expression of anger) and symptoms like sweating, headache, as well as rise in a blood pressure and heart rate (i.e. physiological component).

### **Assessment of teachers' emotions**

There are many ways to assess teachers' emotions. Emotions in academic settings can be measured by sophisticated methods such as observational approach, neuroimaging technique, and peripheral physiological measures of emotion-related arousal (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014). However, self-report is still one of the most frequently used methods for assessment of emotions in academic context (Pekrun & Bühner, 2014). Despite its obvious lack of objectivity, measuring teachers' emotions via self-report questionnaires has several advantages. For instance, self-report method is economical and the most useful tool for measuring subjective and cognitive component of emotion. Moreover, since teachers are aware of other emotional components too (i.e. motivational, expressive, and physiological) (Burić & Frenzel, 2019a), self-report method can be used to efficiently access to the experience of an emotion as a whole. Therefore, in the last couple of years, self-report instruments aimed at measuring teachers' emotions have started to emerge. Teacher Emotions Scale (TES; Frenzel et al., 2016) is one such instrument with good psychometric properties that measures teachers' emotions of enjoyment, anger, and anxiety related to teaching and students. Teacher Emotion Inventory (TEI; Chen, 2016) contains five scales measuring joy, love, sadness, anger, and fear, which teachers may experience not only in relation to teaching and students, but also in relation to colleagues, family, school, and wider societal factors. However, it is important to note that TEI captures a mix of these sources under the umbrella of the same emotion, which may result in lack of necessary precision when predicting specific teachers' outcomes. Teacher Emotion Questionnaire (TEQ; Burić et al., 2018) is a multidimensional self-report instrument that encompasses six scales aimed to measure teachers' emotions in relation to teaching and interacting with students, namely joy (e.g. "I am joyful when the class atmosphere is positive"), pride (e.g. "I feel like a winner when my students succeed"), love (e.g. "I feel warmth when I just think about my students"), anger (e.g. "Some students make me so angry that my face goes red"), hopelessness (e.g. "I feel hopeless when I think about the achievement of some students"), and exhaustion (e.g. "When I finish my work, I feel drained"). TEQ was developed and validated through a series of five independent studies that included more than two thousands teachers and employed both qualitative and

quantitative data, as well as exploratory and confirmatory approaches. TEQ scales have high reliability coefficients and function equivalently in terms of measurement across different educational levels. In addition, TEQ scales are theoretically meaningfully related to emotional labor, well-being indicators, teacher self-efficacy, and more general measures of positive and negative affect (Burić et al., 2018). Finally, since students and teaching are obviously not the only sources of teachers' emotions (e.g. Sutton & Wheatley, 2003), a scale that measures teacher anger as one of the most frequent teacher emotions (Burić et al., 2018; Chang, 2013; Frenzel, 2014) was developed. Teacher Anger Scale (Burić & Frenzel, 2019a) assesses anger that emerges in relation to various contextual triggers: *students* (e.g. "I am joyful when the class atmosphere is positive"), *parents* (e.g. "I feel my pulse speeds up out of anger when a parent tells me how to do my job"), *colleagues* (e.g. "The anger I feel about unequal workloads among the school staff makes me want to quit my job"), and *educational system* (e.g. "It infuriates me to think about how little the government invests in education"). These different contextual facets of teacher anger exhibited good psychometric properties too and showed to be meaningfully related to external measures of teacher emotion regulation and well-being.

### **Regulating teachers' emotions**

Despite their diversity and intensity, not all teachers' emotions are seen as appropriate to be experienced or freely expressed. Instead, the experience and expression of emotions while teaching and interacting with students are bounded by implicitly prescribed emotional display rules of the teaching profession (Hochschild, 1983; Winograd, 2003). In general, teachers are expected to experience and display positive emotions such as enjoyment or enthusiasm and to suppress or hide negative emotions such as anger and frustration. In addition, it is believed that teachers should keep their emotions at moderate level of intensity, that is, avoid expressing emotions that are too weak or too strong (Taxer & Frenzel, 2015; Yin & Lee, 2012; Winograd, 2003; Zembylas, 2003). It is important to note that teachers often view these emotional display rules as discretionary, non-obligatory, and voluntary elements of their teaching role (Oplatka, 2007). In addition, they believe that compliance to those rules makes them more effective in reaching their teaching goals and desired learning outcomes in their students (Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight, 2009; Taxer & Gross, 2018). Nonetheless, in order to align their emotional experiences with those that are expected from them, teachers oftentimes need to engage in emotional labour.

Emotional labour can be defined as a process in which an employees modify the internal and expressive component of emotion to match them with the emotional display rules of their profession (Hochschild, 1983). Two main forms of emotional labor can be distinguished: 1) deep acting or conscious management of internal feelings in order to consequently change the observable emotional expression, and 2) surface acting or modification of outer display of emotion by hiding it or faking a more desirable one (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). For instance, when teachers engage in deep acting, they may really try to feel the emotions that are desirable and expected from them by stimulating thoughts and activities that foster such emotions (e.g. thinking about the steady progress of their students to foster enjoyment and satisfaction). Alternatively, when teachers engage in surface acting, they invest effort in suppressing and hiding the observable signs of undesirable emotion and faking the more desirable one (e.g. hiding the observable signs of anger and faking calmness instead).

It is believed that emotions and emotional labour are reciprocally related to each other. For instance, it was established that individuals who are high in positive affectivity trait (i.e. a general tendency to be energetic, active, alert, and enthusiastic), are more prone to deep acting, while individuals who are high in negative affectivity trait (i.e. a general tendency to feel anxious, fearful, or guilty), are more likely to engage in surface acting (Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013). In return, engaging in certain emotional labour strategy affects the kind of emotion a person would experience. Empirical evidence indicates that surface

acting generally results in experiencing negative emotions while deep acting consequently increases positive affective experiences (Hülshager & Schewe, 2011; Scott & Barnes, 2011).

Even though it has been widely acknowledged that teachers perform emotional labor (e.g. Chang, 2009; Sutton, 2007; Taxer & Frenzel, 2015; Yin & Lee, 2012), there are not many studies that linked emotional labor to specific emotions. One exception is a panel study conducted by Burić, Slišković, and Penezić (2019b) which showed that teachers' emotions experienced while teaching and interacting with students and emotional labour strategies are indeed reciprocally related to each other over time. More specifically, it was found that teacher love positively predicted deep acting while teacher anger positively predicted surface acting (i.e. hiding feelings and faking emotion). On the contrary, teachers who more frequently engaged in deep acting, consequently experienced higher levels of joy, while teachers who more frequently hid their true feelings at work, consequently experienced higher levels of hopelessness. In addition, Burić & Frenzel (2019b) found that teachers who more frequently perform surface acting also experience higher levels of different facets of teacher anger, that is, anger experienced in relation to students, their parents, colleagues, and educational system in general. However, deep acting was negatively and weakly associated only to anger that teachers experience in relation to students. It is important to note that when it comes to employees' well-being, surface acting has adverse and deep acting has positive or neutral consequences; however, surface acting may have positive effects on organizational performance indicators (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015; Hülshager & Schewe, 2011).

Despite the fact that emotional labour is an unavoidable mechanism through which teachers regulate their emotions at work, its conceptualization is rather narrow. In other words, it is reasonable to assume that teachers engage in strategies to regulate their emotions that go beyond deep acting and surface acting. The process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998; 2015; Gross & John, 2003) may be used as a useful wider theoretical framework for understanding teachers' emotion regulation. According to this model, five families of emotion regulation processes can be distinguished: situation selection (i.e. taking actions that alter the likelihood of ending up in a situation that will trigger certain emotion), situation modification (i.e. modifying the characteristics of a situation that will trigger certain emotion), attentional deployment (i.e. redirecting attention from a stimuli that evokes certain emotion), cognitive change (i.e. cognitively re-appraising the situation in order to modify subsequent emotion), and response modulation (i.e. employing strategies like suppression to change physiological, experiential, or behavioral emotional responding). It is important to note that first four families of emotion regulation strategies are antecedent-focused, that is, they are used before an emotion is activated, while the response modulation is used to alter the components of emotion once it is already fully developed (Gross & Thompson, 2007).

The knowledge regarding teacher emotion regulation strategies is still scarce. However, in a qualitative study on a sample of middle-school teachers, it was found that teachers regulate their emotions in classroom both in order to act professionally (i.e. to experience and display emotions that are expected from them as teachers) and to avoid subjectively disruptive and unpleasant emotions (Sutton, 2004). The richness of strategies that teachers mentioned in this study fitted well into the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998; 2015). Teachers used antecedent-focused strategies such as modifying the situation (e.g. good preparation for class), attentional deployment (e.g. changing attention direction towards more pleasant content), and cognitive change (e.g. changing the view on the situation through self-talk), but also the response-focused strategies (e.g. suppressing the external signs of emotion, deep breathing, etc.) in order to regulate their emotions in classroom. Similar results were obtained in a descriptive study of Taxer and Gross (2018) as well as in a qualitative study conducted on Croatian sample of middle-school teachers (Burić, Penezić, & Sorić, 2017). Teachers in the latter study reported to use a wide variety of emotion regulation strategies to regulate emotions experienced at work. These strategies could be grouped into the five broader families proposed by the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998; 2015) as well. Among

the antecedent-focused strategies, Croatian teachers mentioned strategies such as avoiding conflicting or emotionally disturbing situations and interactions in the classroom (i.e. avoiding the situation); developing professional skills and competences, seeking solutions to problems, and adapting teaching techniques and methods (i.e. active modification strategy); fantasizing and thinking about something else (i.e. attentional deployment); and positive thinking, prioritizing, taking another perspective of the situation etc. (i.e. reappraisal). Teachers in this study also talked about a variety of strategies that are response-focused. More specifically, teachers reported to hide external signs of emotions and to ignore their subjective feelings (i.e. suppression); to deep breathe, count to ten before reacting, taking some fresh air (i.e. immediate tension reduction); to yell, cry, pour out problems to colleagues, family members, or friends (i.e. venting); and to use a wide set of other unspecific strategies (e.g. socializing with friends, engaging in hobbies and sport, reading, praying, etc.). Moreover, these emotion regulation strategies were related to teachers' discrete emotions – teachers who more frequently use active modification strategy and reappraisal, experience higher levels of joy and pride towards their students. On contrary, teachers who more often rely on suppression and tension reduction, experience anger, exhaustion, and hopelessness to a greater extent. Interestingly, strategy of avoiding the situation was positively associated both positive and negative teachers' emotions (Burić et al., 2017).

### **The importance of teachers' emotional processes for teachers' well-being and motivation**

Considering their diversity and outspread, it is not surprising that teachers' emotional processes are important factors in explaining teachers' well-being and motivation. For instance, teachers' negative emotions have been acknowledged as important for predicting teacher burnout and even for an increased risk for dropout from the teaching profession (Carson, 2006; Chang, 2009; 2013; Day & Gu, 2000). In addition, it seems that higher levels of initial teacher burnout are also predictive of higher levels of negative emotions of anger and hopelessness experienced at subsequent assessment (Burić, Slišković, & Penezić, 2019a). Moreover, teachers' anger is not only related to their emotional exhaustion; it also stimulates teachers to engage in emotional labor, which is of great importance for developing burnout symptoms (Keller, Chang, Becker, Goetz, & Frenzel, 2014).

Emotions experienced at work are relevant factors in shaping job-related attitudes (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Indeed, teachers who experience higher levels of negative emotions seem to be less satisfied with their job (Burić, Cvijetović, & Macuka, 2017; Burić & Frenzel, 2019a; Burić et al., 2018; Frenzel et al., 2016). On contrary, experience of positive emotions is positively related to greater level of teachers' job satisfaction (Burić et al., 2018; Macuka, Burić, & Batur, 2017). Finally, teachers' negative emotions experienced in relation to students, parents, and educational system were found to be related to an increased risk for impaired mental health, that is, to symptoms of depression, anxiety, and somatization (Macuka, Burić, & Slišković, 2017). However, heightened levels of psychopathological symptoms also resulted in elevated levels of negative emotions of anger and hopelessness among teachers (Burić et al., 2019a).

Besides emotions, emotion regulation is also related to teacher well-being indicators. For example, emotion regulation strategies such as active modification strategy and reappraisal are positively related to teachers' job and life satisfaction (Burić et al., 2017; Yin, Huang, & Wang, 2016). Next, suppression used by teachers to regulate their emotions seems to be related to higher levels of anxiety and depression, while reappraisal is found to be positively related to teachers' levels of enthusiasm and contentment (Yin, Huang, & Lv, 2018). Moreover, research indicate that these two emotion regulation strategies may play an important role in explaining teachers' emotional exhaustion – emotional exhaustion is found to be positively related

to suppression, but negatively to reappraisal (Tsouloupas, Carson, Matthews, Grawitch, & Barber, 2010; Yin et al, 2016). Lastly, the existing findings indicate that teachers' use of surface acting is positively related to burnout, but negatively to job satisfaction, while for the use of deep acting, the opposite pattern of relationships was found (Macuka et al., 2017; Philipp & Schüpbach, 2010; Slišković, Burić, & Bubić, 2017).

Teachers' emotional processes are not only relevant in predicting teacher well-being, but are also of great importance for explaining their motivation. It was empirically established that teachers' emotions and work engagement are reciprocally related to each other over time – teachers who experience more joy, love, and pride while teaching and interacting with students, consequently experience higher levels of vigor, dedication, and absorption at their work. On the contrary, teachers who experience higher levels of anger, exhaustion, and hopelessness in relation to their students, are consequently less engaged in their work. The opposite direction of causation was also confirmed – highly engaged teachers consequently experience more positive and less negative emotions (Burić & Macuka, 2018). Teachers' emotions are also associated with their sense of efficacy, which is considered to be one of the most important motivational constructs that explain teaching behavior (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Results of the existing studies that explored the relationship between teachers' emotions and self-efficacy demonstrated that teachers who experience positive emotions to a greater extent, also have higher levels of self-efficacy. On the contrary, teachers' negative emotions seem to be negatively related to teacher self-efficacy (Burić & Frenzel, 2019a; Burić & Macuka, 2018; Burić et al., 2018).

### **The importance of teachers' emotional processes for teachers' instructional behavior and student outcomes**

Students' relationships and interactions with teachers are of crucial importance for their academic engagement and healthy development. A widely used theoretical framework of classroom processes refers to Teaching Through Interactions (TTI; Hamre & Pianta, 2007) according to which classroom interactions between teachers and students can be organized into three major domains – emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Interactions between teachers and students are proposed to be influenced by students' emotional processes. For instance, according to the reciprocal model on causes and effects of teachers' emotions (Frenzel, 2014), emotions influence teaching quality, that is, cognitive and motivational stimulation, classroom management, and social support they provide during teaching. Furthermore, these aspects of instructional behavior have effects on students' cognitive growth, motivation, social-emotional behavior in class, as well as on the quality of teacher-student relationship. Indeed, available research shows that teachers' reports of their enjoyment experienced while teaching are positively related to students' ratings of various aspects of teaching practices (i.e. monitoring, elaboration, comprehensibility, autonomy support, teacher enthusiasm etc.; Frenzel, Goetz, Lüdtke, Pekrun, & Sutton, 2009; Frenzel, Goetz, Stephens, & Jacob, 2009; Kunter, Frenzel, Nagy, Baumert, & Pekrun, 2011). In addition, there is evidence showing that teachers' emotions are directly related to students' outcomes. For instance, positive teachers' emotional experiences such as enjoyment and enthusiasm are found to be positively related to students' affective and motivational outcomes (Burić, 2019; Frenzel, Becker-Kurz, Pekrun, Goetz, & Lüdtke, 2017; Frenzel, Taxer, Scwab, & Kuhbandner, 2018; Keller, Becker, Frenzel, & Taxer, 2018). Lastly, scattered existing findings show that teachers' emotional labour strategies are also important in explaining their instructional behavior and students' outcomes. More specifically, hiding feelings was found to be negatively related to class-perceived teacher enthusiasm, while faking emotions had positive associations with both class-perceived teacher enthusiasm, and with class levels of intrinsic motivation and positive affect, implying that teacher enthusiasm mediates the relationship between teacher emotional labour and students' outcomes (Burić, 2019). Moreover, hiding feelings in class reported by teachers was associated with lower instruction-

al quality as perceived by the students; however, teachers' faking emotions was also positively linked with class-level of cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement (Burić & Frenzel, 2019b).

### **Directions for future research and practical implications**

In spite of the fact that research on teachers' emotions has shown steady progress in the last several years, many unanswered questions remain. For example, much more research on individual, contextual, and situational antecedents of teachers' emotions and emotion regulation strategies is needed. More specifically, effects of teachers' personality traits, motivation, or cognitive appraisal patterns in predicting teachers' specific emotions need to be empirically established. Next, quantitative studies on the role of school leadership or school climate on teachers' emotional processes are practically non-existent. In addition, joint effects of personal and environmental factors on teachers' emotional processes are yet to be revealed. Finally, more research is needed to establish the effects of teachers' emotions and emotion regulation on their performance, namely the instructional quality they deliver, as well as their students' cognitive, motivational, and affective outcomes. Bearing in mind that contemporary theories emphasize the dynamic and malleable nature of emotion and emotion regulation (Gross, 2015; Kuppens, 2015), future research should be focused on extending and replicating the existing findings by implementing longitudinal designs and intervention studies and by relying on assessment tools other than self-report (e.g. students' perceptions of teachers' emotions and/or observing and videotaping teachers' emotional processes; Chang, 2009; Frenzel, 2014; Keller, Frenzel, Goetz, Pekrun, & Hensley, 2014).

Finally, the existing knowledge on effects of teachers' emotions and emotion regulation on teacher well-being, instructional practices, and students' affective and motivational outcomes, could serve as useful tools in creating education programs for pre-service teachers and professional development programs for in-service teachers. More specifically, teachers could be trained to use more beneficial emotion regulation strategies that would prevent the experience of intense and adverse emotions that, in the long run, can erode their well-being. Strategies that are generally related to positive emotions and adaptive outcomes are reappraisal and active modification strategy (Burić et al., 2017; Gross & John, 2003). On the other side, research indicate that suppression or hiding feelings likely leads to impaired well-being and suboptimal teaching performance (Burić, 2019; Burić & Frenzel, 2019b; Burić et al., 2017; Burić et al., 2018) and therefore, should be avoided. However, faking emotion, even though a component of less beneficial form of emotional labor in terms of employees' well-being (Hülshager & Schewe, 2011), actually may have positive effects when it comes to teacher effectiveness (i.e. their instructional quality and students' outcomes) (Burić, 2019; Burić & Frenzel, 2019b). Nonetheless, caution is needed when giving practical meaning to these results because of potentially undesirable and adverse consequences that faking emotion can exert on teachers' well-being.

### **References**

- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the Workplace: A Reappraisal. *Human Relations*, *48*(2), 97–125. doi:10.1177/001872679504800201
- 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. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1815
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*(3), 365–379. doi:10.1348/096317903769647229
- Burić, I., & Frenzel, A.C. (2019a). Teacher Anger: New empirical insights from a multi-method approach.

- Teaching and Teacher Education*, under review.
- Burić, I., & Frenzel, A.C. (2019b). Teacher emotional labour, instructional quality and student engagement: A multilevel analysis. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, under review.
- Burić, I., & Macuka, I. (2017). Self-Efficacy, Emotions and Work Engagement Among Teachers: A Two Wave Cross-Lagged Analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(7), 1917–1933. doi:10.1007/s10902-017-9903-9
- Burić, I. (2019). The role of emotional labour in explaining teachers' enthusiasm and students' outcomes: A multilevel mediational analysis. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 70, 12–20.
- Burić, I., Cvijetović, J., Macuka, I. (2017). Ličnost, radna angažiranost i zadovoljstvo poslom kod učitelja - posredujuća uloga razočaranosti u obrazovni sustav. *Suvremena psihologija*, 20(1), 7–22.
- Burić I., Penezić, Z., Sorić, I. (2017). Regulating emotions in the teacher's workplace: Development and initial validation of the Teacher Emotion Regulation Scale, *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24(3), 217–246.
- Burić, I., Slišković, A., & Macuka, I. (2018). A mixed-method approach to the assessment of teachers' emotions: development and validation of the Teacher Emotion Questionnaire. *Educational Psychology*, 38(3), 325–349. doi:10.1080/01443410.2017.1382682
- Burić, I., Slišković, A., & Penezić, Z. (2019a). Understanding teacher well-being: a cross-lagged analysis of burnout, negative student-related emotions, psychopathological symptoms, and resilience. *Educational Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1577952>
- Burić, I., Slišković, A., & Penezić, Z. (2019b). A two-wave panel study on teachers' emotions and emotional-labour strategies. *Stress Health*, 35(1), 27–38. doi: 10.1002/smi.2836 doi: 10.1002/smi.2836.
- Carson R. L. (2006). *Exploring the episodic nature of teachers' emotions as it relates to teacher burnout*. West Lafayette: Purdue University.
- Chang, M.-L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: examining the emotional work of teachers. *Educational Psychology Review*, 21 (3), 193–218. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-009-9106-y
- Chang, M.-L. (2013). Toward a theoretical model to understand teacher emotions and teacher burnout in the context of student misbehavior: Appraisal, regulation and coping. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37(4), 799–817. doi:10.1007/s11031-012-9335-0
- Chen, J. (2016). Understanding teacher emotions: The development of a teacher emotion inventory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 68–77. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.001.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Teacher Emotions: Well Being and Effectiveness. In M. Zembylas and P. Schutz (Eds.), *Teachers' Emotions in the Age of School Reform and the Demands for Performativity* (pp. 15–31). New York: Springer.
- Frenzel, A., Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Daniels, L.M., Durksen, T.L., Becker-Kurz, B., & Klassen, R.M. (2016). Measuring teachers' enjoyment, anger, and anxiety: The Teacher Emotions Scales (TES). *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 46, 148 – 163. DOI: [org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.05.003).
- Frenzel, A. C. (2014). Teacher emotions. In E. A. Linnenbrink-Garcia & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *International Handbook of Emotions in Education* (pp. 494–519). New York: Routledge.
- Frenzel, A. C., Becker-Kurz, B., Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Lüdtke, O. (2018). Emotion transmission in the classroom revisited: A reciprocal effects model of teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(5), 628–639. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000228>
- Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Sutton, R. E. (2009). Emotional transmission in the classroom: Exploring the relationship between teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 705–716. doi:10.1037/a0014695
- Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Stephens, E. J., & Jacob, B. (2009). Antecedents and Effects of Teachers' Emotional Experiences: An Integrated Perspective and Empirical Test. *Advances in Teacher Emotion Research*,

- 129–151. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-0564-2\_7
- Frenzel, A. C., Taxer, J. L., Schwab, C., & Kuhbandner, C. (2018). Independent and joint effects of teacher enthusiasm and motivation on student motivation and experiences: A field experiment. *Motivation and Emotion*. Springer New York LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9738-7>
- Grandey, A. A., & Gabriel, A. S. (2015). Emotional Labor at a Crossroads: Where Do We Go from Here? *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 323-349. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111400>
- Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781>
- Gross, J.J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 271–299. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.2
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348
- Gross, J.J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3-24). New York: Guilford Press.
- Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. E. (2014). Teacher–student relationship at university: an important yet under-researched field. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), 370–388. doi:10.1080/03054985.2014.921613
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hülshager, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 361–389. doi:10.1037/a0022876
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Rubenstein, A. L., Long, D. M., Odio, M. A., Buckman, B. R., Zhang, Y., & Halvorsen-Ganepola, M. D. K. (2012). A Meta-Analytic Structural Model of Dispositional Affectivity and Emotional Labor. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(1), 47–90. doi:10.1111/peps.12009
- Keller, M. M., Becker, E. S., Frenzel, A. C., & Taxer, J. L. (2018). When Teacher Enthusiasm Is Authentic or Inauthentic: Lesson Profiles of Teacher Enthusiasm and Relations to Students' Emotions. *AERA Open*, 4(2), 233285841878296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858418782967>
- Keller, M. M., Chang, M.-L., Becker, E. S., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2014). Teachers' emotional experiences and exhaustion as predictors of emotional in the classroom: An experience-sampling study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1442.
- Keller, M. M., Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Pekrun, R., & Hensley, L. (2014). Exploring teacher emotions: A literature review and an experience sampling study. In P. W. Richardson, S. A. Karabenick & H. M. G. Watt (Eds.), *Teacher motivation: Theory and practice* (pp. 69-82).
- Kunter, M., Frenzel, A. C., Nagy, G., Baumert, J., & Pekrun, R. (2011). Teacher enthusiasm: Dimensionality and context specificity. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36, 289-301. DOI: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.07.001
- Kuppens, P. (2015). It's about time: A special section on affect dynamics. *Emotion Review*, 7, 297-300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915590947>
- Macdonald, D. (1999). Teacher attrition: A review of literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 835-848. DOI: 10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00031-1
- Macuka, I., Burić, I., & Batur, I. (2017). Emocionalne odrednice iscrpljenosti i zadovoljstva poslom predmetnih učitelja. *Društvena istraživanja*, 26(2), 227-248. <https://doi.org/10.5559/di.26.2.05>
- Macuka, I., Burić, I., & Slišković, A. (2017). Emocionalna iskustva učitelja kao prediktori njihova mentalnoga zdravlja. *Psihologijske teme*, 26, 355-375.

- Oplatka I (2007). Managing emotions in teaching: Toward an understanding of emotion displays and caring as nonprescribed role elements. *Teachers College Record*, 109(6),1374-1400.
- Pekrun, R., & Bühner, M. (2014). Self-report measures of academic emotions. In R. Pekrun & L. Linnenbrink-Garcia (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 561–579). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2014). *International handbook of emotions in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Philipp, A., & Schüpbach, H. (2010). Longitudinal effects of emotional labour on emotional exhaustion and dedication of teachers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(4), 494–504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021046>
- Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotion? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information*, 44, 695–729. DOI: 10.1177/0539018405058216
- Scherer, K. R. (2009). The dynamic architecture of emotion: evidence for the component process model. *Emotion*, 23, 1307–1351. DOI: 10.1080/02699930902928969
- Scott, B. A., & Barnes, C. M. (2011). A Multilevel Field Investigation of Emotional Labor, Affect, Work Withdrawal, and Gender. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 116–136. doi:10.5465/amj.2011.59215086
- Slišković, A., Burić, I., & Bubić, L. (2017). Uloga strategija emocionalnog napora u objašnjenju izgaranja nastavnika. *Suvremena psihologija*, 20(2), 151-163.
- Sorić, I., Burić, I., Slišković, A., & Macuka, I. (2015). A kako se učitelji osjećaju? Kvalitativna analiza pojavnosti i izvora emocionalnih iskustava predmetnih učitelja [How do teachers feel? Qualitative analysis of sources and components of middle-school teachers' emotions]. Paper presented at 22. Dani Ramira i Zorana Bujasa, Zagreb.
- Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. F. (2003). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15, 327–358. DOI: 10.1023/a:1026131715856
- Sutton, R. (2007). Teachers' anger, frustration, and self-regulation. In P. A. Schutz, & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (pp. 259-274). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372545-5/50016-2>
- Sutton, R. E. (2004). Emotional regulation goals and strategies of teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7, 379-398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11218-004-4229-y>
- Sutton, R. E., Mudrey-Camino, R., & Knight, C. C. (2009). Teachers' emotion regulation and classroom management. *Theory into Practice*, 48, 130-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405840902776418>
- Taxer, J. L., & Frenzel, A. C. (2015). Facets of teachers' emotional lives: A quantitative investigation of teachers' genuine, faked, and hidden emotions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 42, 78-88. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.003
- Taxer, J. L., & Gross, J. J. (2018). Emotion regulation in teachers: The “why” and “how”. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 180-189.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805. DOI: 10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1
- Tsouloupas, C. N., Carson, R. L., Matthews, R., Grawitch, M. J., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Exploring the association between teachers' perceived student misbehavior and emotional exhaustion: The importance of teacher efficacy beliefs and emotion regulation. *Educational Psychology*, 30, 173-189.
- Weiss, H.M. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1-74.
- Winograd, K. (2003). The functions of teacher emotions: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 1641–1673. DOI: 10.1046/j.1467-9620.2003.00304.x
- Yin, H., & Lee, J. C.-K. (2012). Be passionate, but be rational as well: Emotional rules for Chinese teachers'

- work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(1), 56–65. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.08.005
- Yin, H., Huang, S., & Lv, L. (2018). A Multilevel Analysis of Job Characteristics, Emotion Regulation, and Teacher Well-Being: A Job Demands-Resources Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02395
- Yin, H., Huang, S., & Wang, W. (2016). Work environment characteristics and teacher well-being: The mediation of emotion regulation strategies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(9), 907.
- Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9(3), 213–238. DOI: 10.1080/13540600309378