

Rationality, Empathy and Bluntness

Emotionologies in an Information Systems Project

Stein, Mari-Klara; Hekkala, Riitta

Document Version

Final published version

Publication date:

2015

License

CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):

Stein, M.-K., & Hekkala, R. (2015). *Rationality, Empathy and Bluntness: Emotionologies in an Information Systems Project*. Paper presented at The Academy of Management Annual Meeting 2015, Vancouver, Canada.

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 18. Jun. 2025



Rationality, Empathy and Bluntness: Emotionologies in an Information Systems Project

Authors

Riitta Hekkala, Aalto U., riitta.hekkala@aalto.fi

Mari-Klara Stein, Copenhagen Business School, mst.itm@cbs.dk

Submission #11850 accepted for the 2015 Academy of Management Annual Meeting

Rationality, Empathy and Bluntness: Emotionologies in an Information Systems Project

ABSTRACT

Using Stearns and Stearns' (1985), and Fineman's (2008) view on emotionologies, this qualitative case study examines the attitudes that members of an inter-organizational information systems (IOIS) project hold toward emotions and their appropriate expression in this particular project. In order to understand the role of emotionologies in emotion management, we suggest the adoption of the concept of emotion structure, consisting of emotion rules and resources (Callahan, 2004), which we argue helps to understand both the attitudes a group holds towards emotions and their expression as well as the influence of these standards on emotion management. This study extends prior research on emotion rules (cf. Bolton & Boyd, 2003) and introduces the idea of personal emotion rules of IOIS project members. We show that organizational actors are indeed skilled emotion managers, but their behavior is guided not only by group emotionologies with their commercial, professional, organizational, and social emotion rules, but also by personal emotion rules. Based on earlier literature (e.g. Callahan, 2004), we suggest that emotion rules and their impact on emotion management emanate from two sources: external (authoritative) and internal (allocative). We then identify various types of emotion management that follow (prescriptive, situational, presentational, philanthropic, misanthropic), both confirming and extending prior research.

Keywords: Emotionology, Emotion management, Case study, Inter-organizational information systems project

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, emotion has become an increasingly popular topic in organization studies (e.g. Benozzo & Colley, 2012; Grant, 2013; Lindebaum & Cartwright, 2010; Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006). Despite emotions having been identified as an important topic (e.g. Lord & Kanfer, 2002), the concept of emotion remains elusive for different reasons (e.g. Lawler and Thye, 1999). First, different theoretical traditions discuss and define a multitude of emotion-related concepts, such as feelings, moods, affects, and temperament (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). Second, much of the work on emotions shows that feelings and emotions constitute a very demanding research object; for example, data collection situations may only reveal the display of emotions, not the internal experience of emotions, thus, partially obscuring the phenomenon under study (Kopelman, et al., 2006).

Feelings (and emotions) are said to be helpful for individuals, as they provide information on, for example, what is important, meaningful or harmful to an individual (e.g. Kopelman et al., 2006). Some researchers (e.g. Layder, 1997: 16) have highlighted that emotion is everywhere, often operating almost invisibly, as a ‘behind-the-scenes co-ordinator’. In short, it may transpire that we are much less rational than we like to believe (Groth, 1999; Kopleman et al., 2006), and emotions may be the source of both cohesion and conflict in our lives (e.g. Groth, 1999): *“Sometimes, our emotions lead us to do the oddest things. Grown men pull over so they can brawl over which driver is the biggest idiot. Parents lose their cool and bark hateful things at their children that they later regret. Adolescents who were best friends before a jealous spat vow never to speak again...”* (Gross, Richards & John, 2006: 13). Given this significant, both invisible and visible, presence of emotions in our lives, research has highlighted the importance of successful emotion

regulation as a prerequisite for adaptive functioning (e.g. Grant, 2013; Gross, et al., 2006; Gyurak, Gross & Etkin, 2011), that is, in order to, for example, keep one's career and friendships people need to manage their feelings. To get along with others, one must be able to regulate which emotions one has and how one experiences and expresses these emotions (Gross et al., 2006; Gross & John, 2003).

Regulation of emotion describes the ways in which people aim to actively manage their emotional states (Grant, 2103; Gross, 2002; Gyurak et al., 2011; Koole, 2009; Kopelman et al., 2006), for instance by denying, intensifying, weakening, masking, modifying, or completely hiding them (e.g. Gross, 2002). Based on Hochschild's (1983) seminal work, research has adopted the terms deep and surface acting to illustrate two forms of emotion management. Deep acting refers to the management of internally experienced and externally displayed emotions in such a way that they align, whereas surface acting refers to emotion management that focuses on the display of emotions, resulting in inconsistencies between the external display and internal experience of emotion (cf. Côté, 2005).

Our interest in emotion management lies in trying to understand the role it plays in complex, inter-organizational projects, specifically information systems (IS) development projects. There are just a few studies (e.g., Beaudry & Pinsonneault, 2010; Hekkala & Newman, 2011; Stein, Newell, Wagner & Galliers, 2014) that have examined emotions ('lived experiences') within information systems project contexts. These studies (ibid.) have shown that emotions have a powerful influence on everyday organizational processes and functioning, including how IS are implemented and used, and periods of change make extreme demands on individuals and organizations, often leading to intense ambivalence that is difficult to cope with (cf. Ashforth, et al.,

2014). These findings suggest that IS projects are settings ripe for ‘odd things’ to happen and, thus, also likely to place difficult demands on project members in terms of emotion management. Accordingly, in this study, we explore the emotional work of IS project members. We distinguish between the concepts of ‘feelings’ and ‘emotions’ to indicate that feeling is what is felt (personal experience), and emotion is what is displayed. Our departing standpoint is that “emotions [as displays of feelings] are social acts, and their role in social life is communicative” (Harre, 1998). We focus especially on the concept of ‘emotionologies’, that is, “*the attitudes or standards that a society, or a definable group within a society, maintains toward basic emotions and their appropriate expression; ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct*” (Stearns & Stearns, 1985: 813; see also Fineman, 2008). Our aim is to understand the *role such emotionologie(s) play in inter-organizational IS (IOIS) development projects*.

This study contributes to previous literature in three ways. First, in order to understand the role of emotionologies in emotion management, we suggest the adoption of the concept of emotion structure, consisting of emotion rules and resources (Callahan, 2004), which we argue helps to understand both the *standards* a group holds towards emotions and their expression as well as the influence of these standards on emotion management. Second, we extend prior research on emotion rules (cf. Bolton & Boyd, 2003) and introduce the idea of *personal* emotion rules of IOIS project members. In short, we argue that group emotionologies with their commercial, professional, organizational, and social emotion rules interact with *personal* emotion rules. Based on Callahan (2004), we suggest that emotion rules and their impact on emotion management emanate from two sources: external (authoritative) and internal (allocative). We identify various types

of emotion management that follow (prescriptive, *situational*, presentational, philanthropic, *mis-anthropic*), both confirming and *extending* prior research (Bolton & Boyd, 2003).

This rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the definitions of feeling and emotion, the basic aspects of emotionology and emotion management. The following three sections present the research case, the research method and our findings. We conclude by discussing our findings and their implications.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In the following section we introduce the definitions for feelings and emotions, the basic elements of the concepts of emotionology and emotion management.

Definitions: Emotion and Emotionology

This study distinguishes the concepts of ‘feelings’ and ‘emotions’ to indicate that feeling is what is felt (personal experience), and emotion is what is shown. Our departing standpoint is that “emotions [as displays of feelings] are social acts, and their role in social life is communicative” (Harre, 1998). The question of what (emotion) is appropriate to display in interaction has been investigated in some depth in prior research (e.g. Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005; Fineman, 2008; Goffman, 1974; Kelly & Noonan, 2008; Lawler & Thye, 1999). While the idea of emotionology was first defined in the 1980s, the concept has been investigated in more detail only recently (Fineman, 2008; Wright and Nyberg, 2012). Based on Stearns and Stearns (1985), we define an emotionology as *the attitudes or standards that a definable group within a society maintains toward feelings and their appropriate expression [display of feelings, i.e., emotions]; [and] ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct*. In a nutshell,

we focus on local emotionologies of different groups within an inter-organizational project that guide the project members in terms of *what to feel and express towards oneself, towards situations and objects, and towards other people*. According to Fineman (2008: 10) “*emotionologies are produced and reproduced through all manner of discursive and institutional practices, some more potent and enduring than others*”. Fineman (ibid.: 10) explains that different sources such as the family, television programs, schools, and religious authorities are linked by the dominant ideologies of their resident culture. As a consequence we inherit many emotionologies; we learn “*how we should feel, and express our feelings, about ourselves (“happy”, “positive”, “fine”) as well as how to feel about others*”. These shape our particular encounters, such as “*what to feel or reveal at weddings, funerals, dinner parties, places of worship, or before a judge*” (Fineman, 2008: 10). Wright and Nyberg (2012; see also Fineman, 2010) highlight that emotionologies are also relevant in organizational settings where they inform standards of emotional expression in regard to specific issues (e.g., climate change), subjects, or occupational groups (e.g., social workers, doctors, police officers); some occupational groups are expected to display, for example, a façade of a ‘cool’ and rational professional, while others are expected to display forcefulness and even aggression. Regardless of the fact that emotionologies seem to play a significant role in people’s everyday and work lives, little is known about the specific emotionologies and the processes through which they enter and impact upon organizational contexts (Wright & Nyberg, 2012).

In an effort to offer a unified theoretical framework for the understanding of emotions in organizations, Callahan (2004) reframed Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory to describe the process of how emotions and social contexts interact and, as a result, modify each other. He in-

troduces the concept of emotion structure, consisting of emotion rules and emotion resources. This emotion structure guides how people feel and express their feelings in everyday interactions, which in turn, maintain or modify the emotion structure. Emotion rules consist of emotion signification or display rules and emotion legitimation or feeling rules. Signification or display rules include, for example, explicit guidelines for employee performance (e.g., ‘smile at customers’) or more implicit guidelines for behaving at work. Legitimation or feeling rules, conversely, define a consensus about what is considered ‘right’ or ‘good’ about feelings. Emotion legitimation rules do not determine how we might actually feel, but they do guide how we are expected to feel in specific situations. Emotion resources form the second element of emotion structure. When individuals exert personal control over their emotions, they have an allocative resource (Callahan, 2004). However, when an organization exerts control over an individual to the extent that the individual’s emotions are controlled, that would be considered an authoritative resource (ibid.). In other words, the person owns the object (emotion) and either controls it directly (allocative) or it is controlled indirectly by another through the control of that person (authoritative). Thus, the components of emotion structure suggested by Callahan (2004) show how emotion rules and resources guide and control how we should feel, express these feelings (as emotions) and manage both feelings and emotions (as well as how we can change the rules and resources through changes in feelings, expressions and management).

Given that we defined an emotionology as *the attitudes or standards that a definable group within a society maintains toward feelings and their appropriate expression [display of feelings, i.e., emotions]; [and] ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct* (Stearns & Stearns, 1985), we consider Callahan’s emotion structure and

emotionology to be the same. The attitudes and standards referred to in the emotionology concept are incorporated in the emotion rules, while the way institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct is considered in emotion resources. We have summarized the various relevant concepts, their definitions as well as some examples in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here.

‘Emotionology’ and Emotion Management

In the 1970s, Hochschild (1979) was already investigating the management of emotions as the core dimension of work. *“Although there are definitional differences in the concepts of emotional intelligence, soft skills, emotional labour and social competence, they refer to overlapping skills such as to the ability to manage one’s own and other people’s feelings, to be empathic and inclusive, to get on with people in interactions, to be a good communicator and to display empathy”* (Kelan, 2008: 65). A large body of theoretical and empirical work testifies to the keen interest in how affective states influence work-related cognition and behavior (Forgas & George, 2001; Davis, 2009), or how people may use different strategies, such as “producing a false smile” in order to give a desired impression (Grandey, Fiska, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005).

In the management literature there is an increasing interest in studying how workers express emotions in a variety of work settings and how employers attempt to control and direct how employees display emotions (Fineman, 2008; Grandey et al., 2005; Grant, 2013; Kopelman et al., 2006; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Grandey et al. (2005) have highlighted that managing emotional expressions is an important strategy to achieve goals, such as to engender satisfaction and repeat

business in customers. Kopelman et al. (2006) even offer some guidelines for manipulation of strategic emotional display, for example on how to develop a positive bargaining style.

Bolton and Boyd (2003) and Bolton (2005) have presented different forms of emotion management that organizational actors perform that go beyond the categorization of deep and surface acting. They (ibid.) point out that different forms of emotion management are performed for many reasons (for example, legitimacy, conformity, instrumentality and/or empathy). In addition to this, actors may follow different ‘rules’ such as organizational regulations, professional norms and social guidelines. A key idea behind the typology of emotion management of Bolton and Boyd (2003) is that organizational actors are skilled emotion managers, who can effortlessly move from one performance to another (‘enacting multiple selves’) during a normal working day. For example, actors may perform ‘*presentational*’ emotion management (maintaining good relations with colleagues) in a social encounter in the workplace, while ‘*pecuniary*’ emotion management (‘making the sell’) is more common in face-to-face contacts with customers, or, equally, actors may decide to engage in ‘*philanthropic*’ emotion management (‘making the customer’s day’) as a voluntary ‘gift’. This illustrates how employees in the workplace can or are expected to draw on different sets of feeling ‘rules’ to match feeling and expression with particular situations. Despite organizational actors being skilled emotion managers, Bolton and Boyd (2003) also highlight that emotion management may not always be smooth. The gesture of the actor may not be genuine (carried out half-heartedly), or actors can ignore or disregard the ‘rules’ of the situation. It is also possible that people work harder at managing their emotions if they feel the situation is significant or special to them, or if they like the person / people they are interacting with; in such cases, the actors may offer a ‘tribute’ or a ‘gift’ as discussed above (Bolton & Boyd, 2003). We

have summarized the different types of workplace emotion management in Table 2. We suggest that Bolton and Boyd (2003) and Bolton (2005) offer a way to theorize the link between different emotionologies and types of emotion management. In our terms, different emotion rules seem to go hand-in-hand with different emotion resources and types of emotion management efforts. Our aim in this paper is to investigate these possible linkages further.

Insert Table 2 about here.

RESEARCH CASE

The broader aim of this study is to understand issues that make public sector information systems development difficult through a study of a planned new registrar system for three public sector organizations (Alpha, Beta and Gamma) in Northern Europe.

The goal of the new registrar system is to provide a centralized means of collecting customer information as well as to facilitate the dissemination of certain information back to the customers. In addition, the system should provide some web based self-service capabilities to the customers. Alpha, Beta and Gamma have decided to modernize their IS because the current registrar system, and the platforms it is developed on, are coming to the end of their lifecycles, and the present state of maintenance is difficult (because of functional, technological and processual issues). It is also easier to develop a new IS together because of budgetary constraints in all organizations. Bespoke development was chosen over buying a packaged solution because suitable packaged software – capable of meeting the specific requirements of public sector organizations - could not be found.

It is important to shortly describe the legacy systems at the three organizations to contextualize the current ISD project. The shared legacy registrar system of Alpha and Beta is outdated, requires a lot of manual data entry and information security is very poor. This is particularly problematic, because the system contains sensitive data. The legacy registrar system has been in use since the 1990s and has evolved during that time to further automatize and simplify data entry. These previous development projects are often referred to by our interviewees, most of whom have been part of all or some of these prior efforts to modernize the system. Gamma, conversely, has a different legacy registrar system, which works quite well. The reason why Gamma is participating in the project is, thus, to provide a baseline for the new system. There are three different groups of stakeholders involved in the project: the project group, steering group and management group, each consisting of representatives from the three organizations. Mid-way through the project an external software development company also became involved. The roles these groups fulfill are described in Table 3.

METHOD

To investigate the role of emotionologies in this inter-organizational IS (IOIS) development project, we have chosen a qualitative case study approach. Our data consists of 42 qualitative interviews, collected in two phases: the first phase was initiated in February 2013, when we met with the project manager. 22 interviews were conducted in the period March 2013 - April 2013. All members from the project group, steering group and management group were interviewed. In addition to this, we familiarized ourselves with the pre-work for the project, done in 2012. The interviews were between 20 and 90 minutes long (average 52 minutes). All interviews were recorded and fully transcribed. In the second phase of data collection (May 2014 - June

2014), we interviewed 20 project members (everyone willing to be interviewed). The project is forecasted to end in 2016. In most cases, the second phase of data collection consisted of follow-up interviews with the people interviewed earlier, but for some project participants (who started later in the project), this was the first interview. These second round interviews lasted between 18 and 97 minutes (average 46 minutes).

Table 3 shows the interviewees, their roles, home organization and the group they belong to in the project, and how many times people have been interviewed. The two-phase data collection provided us with the opportunity to follow the development of the project and the work of the people over time, thus, allowing us to gain a deeper understanding of the emotionologies at play as well as trace the possible influence that different emotion rules have on emotion management in the project.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Data Analysis

In line with our research question and theoretical lens, we have chosen a qualitative case study approach to examine emotionologies in an inter-organizational information systems project. First, we analyzed the feelings and emotions that were prevalent among the project members. Given that we rely on interview data, we coded for feelings in the cases where people described what they feel, and for emotions in the cases where people described what they express to others. We identified different patterns of changing feelings and emotions among the various sub-groups working on the project. We then followed Stearns and Stearns's (1985) and Fineman's (2008) definitions for emotionologies as the standards a specific group within a society maintains toward

basic emotions and their appropriate expression; and the ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct. To be able to identify the standards potentially present in the different sub-groups, we examined our data for evidence of specific emotion rules of legitimation and signification (e.g. Callahan, 2004). This allowed us to identify, for example, an emotionology we described as ‘Cautious testing of the waters’, which includes *emotion legitimation rules* (‘fear is good and productive’, and ‘don’t be too enthusiastic, but cautiously optimistic’), and *emotion signification rules* (‘exercise care’, ‘learn to play the political game’, and ‘do not offend others’). Both legitimation and signification rules are largely social in this example (cf. Bolton and Boyd, 2003). After identifying different emotionologies, we moved on to trying to uncover how the emotion rules influence emotion management through authoritative and allocative emotion resources (Callahan, 2004), i.e. how external and internal powers exert control over how one should feel and how one should express these feelings. Our identified group emotionologies, emotion rules and authoritative and allocative emotion management among the project members are discussed in detail in the next section.

FINDINGS

In this section, we will describe project members’ felt feelings and displayed emotions. We then demonstrate the emotionologies at work in various sub-groups that project members belong to, linking these to various instances of emotion management.

Patterns in Feelings and Emotions among Project Sub-Groups

In order to understand the role that emotionologies play in the IOIS development project, it is necessary to first describe the feelings and emotions that seem to be prevalent among the project members. As outlined above, we understand feelings as professed individual affective expe-

riences, whereas emotions are defined as the more or less congruent displays of these feelings. We noticed considerable differences between groups involved in the project in terms of their professed feelings and emotions. We also noticed changes in these feelings and emotions over time (our data were collected at two time points: beginning of the project in spring 2013 and mid-project in spring 2014).

Within the project group, we noted three different sub-groups or individuals with varying patterns of feelings and emotions: Alpha sub-group, Beta sub-group and the project manager. The Alpha sub-group (Carol and Chloe) professed to feeling positive and ‘good’ at the start of the project, while also claiming to feel apprehensive about any potential negativity in the project. We have no evidence that the displays of their feelings (emotions) were incongruent with these feelings at the time.

“I’m a positive person, and I’ve a positive feeling about with whom we’re going to do work... we’ve a very good project manager, he is doing very well. [...] If there is only one person in the project who is negative ... it will be very hard...” (Chloe)

“I have strong confidence in that we’ll get something ready in this project [laughing]...”
(Carol)

Mid-project, these positive feelings and emotions show both continuance and change. First, a noticeable change is the addition of feelings of annoyance, distrust and anger. However, not all of these are expressed to other project members – in particular, it seems annoyance and anger are more freely expressed in, for example, complaints, whereas distrust is less freely discussed across the project group:

“It’s very annoying because some people think that they are doing a system for three organizations and the others are doing it for themselves... [...] The starting point was that they will guarantee equality, for example, Beta organization is paying for half of the project, but gets one third say...we have been horrified, [because] in some situations project members have somehow shown that they have more power in the project, although our decision-making rights are split equally ... it causes distrust...” (Carol)

“I haven’t cried, but I’ve had huge feelings of anger... and when I blow up, people can see it... I can say that my ears have been burning at times [laughing]” (Chloe)

The Beta sub-group (Amber, Nicole, Jacob) confessed to having mixed feelings in the beginning of the project: hope, uncertainty, as well as dissatisfaction were mentioned. As with the Alpha sub-group, we have no evidence that the displays of their feelings (emotions) were incongruent with what they felt at the time.

“I hope that it will be possible to do the kind of project that we could be very proud of, that we could even say on Facebook that ‘hey, we did this one’” (Amber)

“These five years that I’ve been here, the situation has been getting worse all the time, our leaders have made a fool of themselves [talking about the old projects]... a lot of wrong people, lack of know-how, [...] old technology... and they just continued. It cost very much and it is rubbish... so it is difficult to be satisfied...” (Jacob)

Mid-project, these mixed feelings changed into overwhelmingly negative feelings of anger and anxiety, of which anger seems to be expressed also to the other project members in, for example, project meetings:

“There were six shouting people, talking about some process... it was quite harrowing... there is a very strange dynamic in the project group because of Chloe and Carol... they talk a lot... and then there is Alex (Project manager, Alpha) who is rather quiet and does something that I’m not aware of... and if there are conflicts in the project, ... of course I assumed that someone would come and would like to solve the situation, but no... I guess they are quite satisfied now that we are not in the project anymore...” (Amber)

“It seemed awful and we [other Beta people in the project group] had a feeling that they [management group people] can set aside anyone, if the faces are not pleasant... this project started to distress me a lot [she says that the reason was that Chloe and Carol (Alpha, project group) complained all the time that Beta people are doing things wrong]” (Nicole)

The project manager (Alex), while part of the project group and employed by Alpha, was not considered fully part of either the Alpha or Beta sub-groups. While in the beginning of the project, his only comment around feelings and emotions was the expectation that many of these will arise, by the 2nd round of interviews, he described having mostly negative feelings of frustration, irritation and even hate.

“It’s frustrating, we’re having power struggles inside our own organization... I’m quite irritated at times, because the issues proceed so slowly, especially decision-making. [...] I even feel hate at times, because some people are throwing spanners in the works” (Alex)

Based on the comments from other project group members, it seems however that Alex did not express these to them (*“Alex is rather quiet and does something that I’m not aware of”*).

The steering and management group members seemed to share similar, generally neutral or positive feelings in the beginning of the project and mixed feelings as the project progressed. Feelings of uncertainty, expectation of strong opinions as well as hope were described in the beginning:

“It feels at the moment that I don’t know exactly what is coming in this project” (Grace)

“I’m quite hopeful at the moment, I guess we are going to get a new common system for these three organizations, of course we need to be able to compromise...” (Sean)

“There are enthusiastic people in this field and they have very strong opinions....” (Lily)

As the project progressed, these feelings also continued, but were accompanied by new, mostly negative feelings of sadness, disappointment, worry and failure.

“I’m very enthusiastic at the moment... but I know that some people can have different opinions about things, but I’m going to win them over [laughing]...” (Sean)

“I was very disappointed that Amber (Beta, project group) left the project... I feel sad even more because she was so committed...[...] I’m worried, because I feel that we don’t have a strong product owner, instead we have five product owners...” (Tyler)

“It has been very sad and when we had this crisis, it was the beginning of last fall [2013]...everything culminated and we had to solve the situation ... Of course, I feel that we failed [talking about Jacob (Beta, project group) and the decision that they discharged him from the project]...” (Lily, project leader)

It is interesting to note, however, that many of these feelings were not expressed publicly, especially not to members of the project group. For example, Nicole (Beta, project group) read about Amber and Jacob (Beta, project group) no longer being in the project from the minutes of

the management group meeting. And while Nicole expressed her distress to Eliza (Beta, member of the steering group) (discussed below), we have no evidence that similar emotional displays in reverse direction (from management and steering group members to project group members), either one-to-one or in groups took place.

Emotionologies in the project

While in the previous section we described the patterns of feelings and emotions among the various sub-groups working on the project, we now turn to considering the identifiable ‘emotionologies’ of these sub-groups. Our focus in this section is particularly on “*the attitudes or standards that a definable group maintains toward [feelings] and their appropriate expression [display of feelings, i.e., emotions]*” (based on Stearns & Stearns, 1985; Fineman, 2008). In other words, we focus on Callahan’s (2004) emotion rules of legitimation and signification, while the ways these attitudes are encouraged in human conduct are considered in the next section in terms of authoritative and allocative emotion resources.

In the beginning of the project, we noticed that all the sub-groups working on the project seemed to have a similar set of standards they maintained towards their own and others’ feelings and their appropriate expression. This emotionology could perhaps best be described as ‘*caution with varying degrees of optimism*’. The Beta sub-group described the importance of exercising care in taking initiative in organizing things, in not offending others in the project, and the positive aspects of discussing fears. The emotionology is veering on the side of very cautious and not very optimistic in this sub-group.

“Alex (Project manager, Alpha) asked me to do something and I started to organize it but then suddenly thought if the other members will be offended... that I need to be very care-

ful because there is this political game ... [...] People are talking about their fears at the moment [at the beginning of the project]... I think it's quite good, because the project members have seen so many failed projects...” (Amber)

“I've been doing this for a long time, and it's a miracle if there will not come the feeling of jumping into a well and leaving the whole project...” (Nicole)

The Alpha sub-group also described the attitude of being cautious and not expressing too much enthusiasm: *“I think that some people are feeling more positive than they are saying aloud...”* (Carol). Similar attitudes were revealed by steering and management group members:

“There will definitely be many kinds of feelings and annoyance, because it is not possible to show green lights to everyone...” (Tyler)

“The project manger is collecting expectations in this phase. It's common that if you are too enthusiastic, you'll be disappointed at the end...” (Ewan)

As the project progressed, we see this emotionology of caution and not showing too much enthusiasm shifting in all the sub-groups. Notably, much of the attitude of exercising care and not offending others disappears. The Beta sub-group explains their attitude in terms of expectations of fair and respectful treatment (perhaps even favourable treatment, given that they are financing half of the project) by the leaders and the Alpha sub-group:

“There have been some failures in personnel administration ... Leaders [management group] have admitted it... I feel that they've treated people badly and set them aside from the project. [...] We had very bad conflicts in the project group... from our point of view it seemed that there was a juxtaposition between Alpha and Beta organizations, Alpha people said that Beta people are stupid... the situation was like we are on the playground

[laughing], *and we are just going to play with the kids who live in the same apartment... it can't be so that you want to dismiss all the Beta people, damn it, you're not going to manage this project alone, we are paying half of this shit...*" (Nicole)

The Alpha sub-group, conversely, sets the standard of expecting all parties to be able to take criticism, while also stressing the importance of celebrating the 'good moments':

"I've felt that the people in Beta show a lot of solidarity to their own people, at times I feel that they don't criticize each other..." (Carol)

"We have tried to enjoy good moments and have tried to highlight them. We gave a big hand to developers last Friday. Carol bought some sweets...[...] I think that Beta people are praising their own employees too much. We have noticed that other people can't criticize them ... It makes their blood boil, although it would be justified." (Chloe)

In the management and steering groups, the common professional standard of 'rationality' (cf. Wright and Nyberg, 2012; Ashforth and Humphrey, 1995) has come to the fore - members of these groups are expected to make decisions rationally even if such decisions may be unpopular. In addition to the 'golden standard of rationality', the management and steering groups now share the attitude that the major conflicts the project has been experiencing are inevitable and actually productive:

"If you feel aggressive or irritation, you need to be able to make a decision in a rational way. We look at what kinds of solutions we need in order to get a functional system...and if there is a solution that you don't like, you just need to handle it somehow..." (Sean)

"It's a good sign that there are conflicts in the project because there are conflicts inevitably. There will not be any progress if there are no conflicts. If everyone is saying like yay,

yay, we're having a nice time; it is not going to lead anywhere. Conflicts are signs that people are committed..." (Lily)

We have summarized the identified group emotionologies (per project phase) in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Emotion Management

As discussed above, emotionologies or emotion structures (Fineman, 2008; Callahan, 2004) are the guidelines and forms of control that tell organizational actors how to feel, how to express these feelings (as emotions) as well as how to manage both feelings and emotions (Table 1). As such, it is to be expected that emotionologies are in some ways implicated in emotional labour and emotion work, i.e., the management of emotions that employees do for a wage and due to pressures and control from an organization, and the management of emotions that employees do for themselves due to socialization, personal goals, etc. (cf. Hochschild, 1990; Bolton & Boyd, 2003). Authoritative and allocative emotion resources (Callahan, 2004) are two concepts that can help us understand how external powers (project organization, members' home organizations, professions) and internal powers (individual's skills, personality) exert control over how one should feel and how one should express these feelings.

Our data showed various instances of authoritative and allocative emotion management among the project members. Most of the significant emotion management episodes took place as the project progressed, so we will focus on these in the following. In the project group, the project manager commented on various expression management efforts he engaged in:

“I can see that Beta people are a bit spineless, and the other people are then ‘Shush, shush, please don’t make them angry’ [laughing]. It has been that way over a year now, it is quite emblematic, I automatically act so that I try to avoid making them angry. Oh, this is a long story... the story about monkeys, ladders, and bananas, and how to condition monkeys comes to my mind. [...] I’m not good at showing emotions. I would say that emotions become more visible in the way I behave [...] I’m not aggressive or volcanic. But I can comment on issues very sarcastically. And then the other way round, I don’t necessarily remember to say if I’m satisfied or remember to say thank you to people...” (Alex)

The Alpha sub-group described similar instances of *organizationally-conditioned* ‘tip-toeing’ around the members of the Beta sub-group:

“Many people here say that ‘Shush, shush, you can’t say things straight to Beta people, because they are going to get insulted’. I was very unsatisfied with the work the user interface designers did, but I wasn’t able to say what I felt although we needed to restart ... I was unsatisfied because they were so unprofessional...” (Carol)

“I think that Beta people are praising their own employees too much. We have noticed that other people can’t criticize them, it’s not sensible... It makes their blood boil, although it would be justified, but no, it’s better to be quiet.” (Chloe)

However, the two members of the Alpha sub-group (Chloe and Carol) also described different *individual* tactics they employed in relation to this expression management around Beta:

“If you would ask Carol, she probably would say that it’s always better to say it straight if you’re annoyed about something...but somehow I feel that if you want to develop as a

human, it's not always best to say it straight. I want to think empathetically, I don't want to hurt anyone..." (Chloe)

"I'm politically incorrect.... If something comes to my mind, I blurt everything out without thinking about the consequences..." (Carol)

At the same time, members of the Beta sub-group felt overwhelmed by the complaints coming from Carol and Chloe, but instead of expressing this to them, Nicole turned to another member of Beta (Eliza), a steering group member:

"I poured my heart out to Eliza (Beta, steering group), that this is quite unbelievable, very absurd that our guys are not good enough for them. That it can be so that when I leave the room, they (Chloe and Carol) start to complain that Nicole is an idiot and so on. I was so distressed, and I almost cried... I needed to tell to Eliza ..." (Nicole)

The steering and management groups also mentioned instances of emotion management, both within these groups but also across all groups:

"If you feel annoyance, you need to handle it and think how to say it. I'm not saying that you cannot show that you are not satisfied, but you need to think and consider how you say it... be-cause if you are showing it all the time, it doesn't work anymore..." (Lily)

"I can remember two steering group meetings, where I've had the feeling that I need to contain myself, because I need to work with these people ..." (Grace)

"I'm quite an emotional person, but I try to hide my emotions at work. Well, I don't want to restrict the showing of enthusiasm. But I think that it is essential that you're aware of it, just in case you might become too enthusiastic [laughing]..." (Sean)

Given the sub-group emotionologies (emotion rules) observed earlier (Table 4), we can suggest some noteworthy links between emotion rules, emotion resources and the kinds of emotion management project groups engaged in. Our findings in that regard are summarized in Table 5. In line with prior research (Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005) we find the project members following multiple different emotion rules in guiding their feelings and expressions. To illustrate, we find many examples of organizational, social and professional rules influencing emotion management together. Based on Callahan (2004) we are able to extend this prior work by identifying the locus of control of these different rules. Social rules, despite what one might expect, are followed as part of allocative, internally-controlled emotion management. Social rules, therefore, seem to successfully guide feelings and expressions only when they have been internalized by actors. Professional and organizational rules, conversely, are followed as part of authoritative, externally-controlled emotion management. However, we find that these rules may be both prescriptive (e.g., many professions come with a few strongly encouraged pre-defined standards, such as appearances of rationality) and situational (e.g., other standards emerge from the everyday activities of professionals and organization members in context). Furthermore, our findings shed light on one potential reason for emotion management not always proceeding smoothly – as argued in prior studies, actors may choose not to follow certain rules or may do so with visible insincerity (Bolton and Boyd, 2003). Our findings suggest that beyond collective emotion rules (group emotionologies), we should also consider personal emotion rules and distinguish these from internalized social rules. We find that personal rules are followed as part of an allocative, internally-controlled emotion management and it is possible that the rules may contradict group emotion rules. For example, we find that although Carol and Chloe (Alpha sub-group) share the

same group emotionology they have different personal emotion rules, leading them to more and less readily comply with external organizational emotion rules because these align with their personal rules to a different degree. While Chloe follows the philanthropic rule of offering a ‘gift’ of empathy as part of her personal growth, Carol follows what we label the ‘misanthropic’ rule of always ‘saying it straight’. While we have chosen the label ‘misanthropic’, we do not mean it in a derogatory sense – rather, the labels denote a distinction between the rules being other- (e.g., ‘be kind to others’) and self-oriented (e.g., ‘stay true to what you believe and be honest’). A skilled emotion manager will likely draw on both kinds of rules in a workplace.

Insert Table 5 about here.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this longitudinal case study research was to study the role of emotionologies in an inter-organizational information system (IOIS) project. Our findings showed how the feelings and emotions (displayed feelings) of project members developed as the work on system development progressed. From largely positive feelings in the beginning of the project, all sub-groups moved towards more negative feelings midway through the project, for example, describing increased annoyance, distrust, anger and anxiety. Jointly with these changes in feelings, our findings revealed the growing presence of some form of emotion management – we noticed that, among the project group, anger was more freely expressed to others, while distrust and anxiety were often hidden. The steering and management group members and also the project manager showed particular reluctance to share their negative feelings with others (especially project group members) and communication of emotionally charged topics (e.g., staffing changes in the pro-

ject) was often left to formal meeting minutes. Earlier studies have highlighted similar patterns in employees who frequently engage in surface acting; in such cases actors are likely to feel confident that they can mask their fear, and only express the negative and positive emotions necessary to speak up constructively and effectively (Grant, 2013). However, in our case, while the project members were undoubtedly acting in what they perceived as a constructive manner, the actual effectiveness of their emotion management remains an open question (especially given the high level of conflict we observed) and requires further research.

In order to better understand why the project members engaged in emotion management the way they did, we explored the group emotionologies present in the project. Earlier studies (e.g., Wright & Nyberg, 2012; Fineman, 2010) have highlighted that, in organizational settings, emotionologies are relevant because they set the standards of emotional expression in regard to specific issues, subjects, or occupational groups. A key element of emotionologies is, thus, the feeling and display rules or emotion legitimation and signification rules (Callahan, 2004). We identified three different sub-groups in the project that were guided by different emotionologies: the Alpha and Beta sub-groups in the project group and the sub-group of ‘Managers’ (consisting of steering and management group members). In the beginning of the project, all three sub-groups shared an emotionology we described as ‘cautious testing of the waters’, characterized by the feeling rules that ‘fear can be good and productive’, and ‘don’t be too enthusiastic, but cautiously optimistic’ as well as the display rule of not offending each other. As the project progressed, we noticed that this emotionology started to shift. While in the beginning the focus lay on ‘what *we* should expect, feel and express *ourselves*’, gradually an additional emphasis on

‘what *we* should expect from *others* and feel/express towards *others*’ started to creep in among all sub-groups.

While identifying the group emotionologies (Table 4) provided us with hints as to why the project members expressed and masked their various feelings as they did, how the emotionologies (emotion rules) actually guided project members in terms of what to feel and express needed further exploration. First, we could differentiate the source of the different emotion legitimation and signification rules. Bolton and Boyd (2003) distinguish between commercial, professional, organizational and social rules and link these to different kinds of emotion management, such as prescriptive, presentational and philanthropic (Table 2). Given that our research setting does not lie in the service industry, it is perhaps unsurprising that we did not find commercial rules to play a role; however, professional, organizational and social rules were all present. Callahan’s (2004) concept of authoritative and allocative emotion resources helped us link the emotion rules and different forms of emotion management (Table 5). As discussed above, our findings demonstrate that not only do different *group* emotion rules (organizational, professional and social) interact, but they are also supplemented by *personal* emotion rules. As a result, authoritative and allocative emotion management work hand-in-hand. Table 6 offers a general categorization of emotion legitimation and signification rules and corresponding forms of emotion management based on prior research (Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005; Callahan, 2004) and our findings.

Insert Table 6 about here.

Extending prior research (Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005), we suggest that professional and organizational rules, followed as part of authoritative, externally-controlled emotion management may not only be prescriptive (e.g., pre-defined professional standards, such as appearances of rationality) but also *situational* (e.g., emergent standards arising from the everyday activities of professionals and organization members in context). Furthermore, our findings suggest that beyond collective emotion rules (group emotionologies), we should also consider personal emotion rules, distinguish these from internalized social rules and explore the conditions under which these personal rules may contradict or reinforce group emotion rules. For example, future research could investigate whether personal rules are more likely to override organizational rules that are situational (as in our study) than those that are prescriptive. Furthermore, while philanthropic emotion management has been discussed in prior research as linked to social rules (ibid.), we suggest that it may be better conceived of as following personal emotion rules. In addition to philanthropic emotion management, which is *other-oriented*, we also find what we call ‘misanthropic’ emotion management, which is *self-oriented*. Individual differences in emotion regulation have been considered in prior research (e.g. Gross and John, 2003) in terms of antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation (reappraisal or suppression) and their impact on interpersonal functioning and well-being. Our distinction between philanthropic and misanthropic emotion management builds on a social distinction of *self-*, and *other-focus* rather than a cognitive distinction of antecedent-, and response-focus, and thus, it is possible that both philanthropic and misanthropic emotion management may contain elements of cognitive reappraisal and suppression.

The idea that employees in organizations have the skilful ability to mix philanthropic and misanthropic emotion management based on personal emotion rules has some affinity to the contested concept of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2008). However, our findings clearly demonstrate that personal rule based allocative emotion management is almost always accompanied by authoritative emotion management based on professional or organizational rules (or allocative emotion management based on social rules). Thus, our findings indicate a strong need for theorizing emotion management in a way that allows for the bridging of the gap between studies that acknowledge the power of the ‘social’ in our emotional lives (cf. Callahan, 2004; Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005; Fineman, 2008; Hochschild, 1979) and studies that highlight the power of our explicit and implicit cognitive skills (Mayer, et al. 2008; Gross and John, 2003; Gyurak, et al. 2011). Callahan’s (2004) attempt to describe the emotion system in terms of interplay between structure and actions (as in structuration theory) represents one such theorization. However, while Callahan explicates the structural side in some detail in terms of emotion rules and resources, the actions undertaken by actors, in which the emotion rules and resources are applied on a recurring basis and that create, maintain or destroy the emotion system in an organization, receive limited consideration (Callahan, 2004: 1434-35). Further research is needed to understand the mutual implication of emotion-related structural conditions and actions on one another. For example, in a recent study, Toegel et al. (2013: 334) highlighted that there are often discrepancies in role interpretations, so that “employees treat caring as part of the manager's role that requires no reciprocation, whereas managers see such help-giving as discretionary extra-role behavior that requires reciprocated commitment”. Such discrepant expectations can lead to positive outcomes (e.g., managers being attributed leadership qualities by subordinates)

but also negative outcomes (e.g., managers feeling disappointed at the lack of reciprocity). How these outcomes, in turn, impact on role expectations remains an open question, however.

In sum, this study makes several contributions. First, in order to understand the role of emotionologies in emotion management, we suggest the adoption of the concept of emotion structure, consisting of emotion rules and resources (Callahan, 2004), which we argue helps to understand both the *attitudes* and *standards* of a group towards emotions and their expression (emotion rules) as well as the *influence* of these attitudes and standards (through emotion resources) on emotion management. Second, we extend prior research on emotion rules (cf. Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005) and introduce the idea of *personal* emotion rules of IOIS project members. In short, we argue that group emotionologies with their commercial, professional, organizational, and social emotion rules interact with *personal* emotion rules. Organizational actors are, thus, skilled emotion managers whose performances are guided by both external rules (some of which may be internalized) and internal rules and principles. As a result, various forms of emotion management follow (prescriptive, *situational*, presentational, philanthropic, *misanthrop-ic*), both confirming and *extending* prior research (Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by the N.N.

REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B. E., Rogers, K. M., Pratt, M. G., & Pradies, C. 2014. Ambivalence in organizations: A multilevel approach. *Organization Science*, 25(5): 1453-1478.
- Ashforth, B.E., & Humphrey, R.H. 1995. Emotion in the work place: a reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48: 97-125.

- Bagozzi, R.P. 2007. The Legacy of the Technology Acceptance Model and a Proposal for a Paradigm Shift. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 8(4): 244–254.
- Beaudry, B.A., & Pinsonneault, A. 2010. The Other Side of Acceptance: Studying the Direct and Indirect Effects of Emotions on Information Technology Use. *MIS Quarterly*, 34(4): 689-710.
- Benozzo, A., & Colley, H. 2012. Guest Editorial, Emotion and learning in the workplace: critical perspectives. *Journal of workplace learning* 24(5): 304-316.
- Bolton, S.C., & Boyd, C. 2003. Trolley Dolly or Skilled Emotion Manager? Moving on from Hochschild's Managed Heart. *Work, employment and society*, 17(2): 289–308.
- Bolton, S.C., 2005. *Emotion Management in the Workplace*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Callahan, J.L. 2004. Reversing a conspicuous absence: Mindful inclusion of emotion in structuration theory. *Human Relations* 57(11): 1427-1448.
- Coté, S. 2005. A social interaction model of the effects of emotion regulation on work strain. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(3): 509–530.
- Davis, M.A 2009. Understanding the relationship between mood and creativity: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108: 25–38
- Fineman, S. 2010. Emotion in organizations - a critical turn. In B Sieben & Å Wettenberg (Eds.), *Emotionalizing organizations and Organizing emotions*: 23-41. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fineman, S. 2008. *The Emotional Organization: Passions and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Forgas, J.P., & George, J.M. 2001. Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human decision Processes*, 86: 3-34.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Grandey, A.A., Fiska, G.M., Mattila, A.S., Jansen, K.J., & Sideman, L.A 2005. Is “service with a smile” enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 96: 38–55
- Grant, A.M. 2013. Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: the role of emotion regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6): 1703-1723.
- Gross, J.J. 2002. Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39: 281-291.
- Gross, J.J., Richards, J.M., & John, O.P. 2006. Emotion Regulation in Everyday life. In: D.K. Snyder, J. Simpson., & J.N. Hughes. (Eds.), *Emotion regulation in couples and families: Pathways to dysfunction and health*: 13-35. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

- 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(2): 348–362.
- Groth, L. 1999. Future Organisational Design. The Scope for the IT-based Enterprise. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Gyurak, A., Gross, J.J. & Etkin, A. 2011. Explicit and Implicit Emotion Regulation: A Dual-Process Framework. *Cognition and Emotion* 25(3): 400-412.
- Harré, H. R. 1998. *The singular self*. London and Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hekkala, R., & Newman, M. 2011. The complex nature of emotions in an inter-organizational information system project. In V-K. Tuunainen, M. Rossi & J. Nandhakumar (Eds.) *ECIS 2011 Proceedings*. Atlanta, GA: Association for Information Systems. AIS Electronic Library (AISeL).
- Hochschild, A.R. 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3): 551–75.
- Hochschild, A.R. 1983. *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling*. London: University of California Press.
- Kelan, E.K. 2008. Emotions in a rational profession: the gendering of skills in ICT work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 15: 49-71.
- Kelly, S., & Noonan, C. 2008. Anxiety and psychological security in offshoring relationships: the role and development of trust as emotional commitment. *Journal of Information Technology*, 23: 232-248.
- Kopelman, S., Rosette, A.S., and Thompson, L. 2006. The three faces of Eve: Strategic displays of positive, negative, and neutral emotions in negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99: 81-101.
- Koole, S.L. 2009. The psychology of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Cognition and Emotion*, 23(1): 4-41.
- Lawler, E.J. & Thye, S.R. 1999. Bringing Emotions into Social Exchange Theory. *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 217-244.
- Layder, D. 1997. *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*. London: UCL Press.
- Lindebaum, D., & Cartwright, S. 2010. A Critical Examination of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(7): 1317-1342.
- Lord, R., & Kanfer, R. 2002. Emotions and Organisational Behavior. In R. Lord, R. Klimoski, & R. Kanfer (Eds.) *Emotions in the Workplace: Understanding the Structure and Role of Emotions in Organisational Behavior*: 5-19. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. 2008. Emotional Intelligence. New Ability or Eclectic Traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6): 503-517.

- Stearns, P.N., & Stearns, C.Z. 1985. Emotionology: Clarifying the history of emotions and emotional standards. *The American Historical Review*, XC: 813-816.
- Stein, M., Newell, S.M., Wagner, E.L., & Galliers, R.D. 2014. Felt quality of sociomaterial relations: Introducing emotions into sociomaterial theorizing. *Information and Organization*, 24(3): 156–175.
- Toegel, G, Kilduff, M., & Anand, N. 2013. Emotion Helping by Managers: An emergent understanding of discrepant role expectations and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(2): 334-357.
- Wright, C., & Nyberg, D. 2012. Working with passion: Emotionology, corporate environmentalism and climate change. *Human Relations*, 65(12): 1561-1587.

TABLE 1*

Key concepts related to emotionology or emotion structure

Concept	Definitions (based on Callahan, 2004)	Example (based on Callahan, 2004; Fineman, 2008)
Emotionology or emotion structure, consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emotion rules - Emotion resources 	The rules and resources associated with the experience and expression of emotion in a social context	Guidelines and control that tells us how to feel, how to express these feelings and how to manage them (see below)
Emotion rule: Legitimation	The social guidelines or rules about how one should <i>feel</i> (i.e. feeling rules)	Explicit or implicit guidelines that tell us how we should feel in a given context (which feelings are legitimate for different situations) (e.g., ‘Feel sad at a funeral’, ‘Feel happy at a wedding’, ‘ <i>Feel</i> neutral in the office’)
Emotion rule: Signification	The social guidelines or rules about how one should <i>appear to feel</i> (i.e. display rules)	Explicit or implicit guidelines for behaving and expressing feelings in a given context (e.g., ‘ <i>Look</i> interested and engaged during meetings’)
Emotion resource: Authoritative	An external power (e.g. the organization) holds control over the experience and expression of emotion (enforced emotional labour)	External power exerting control over emotions (e.g., Disney dictates how its employees should display emotions in their theme parks)
Emotion resource: Allocative	The individual holds control over the experience and expression of emotion (self-imposed emotional work)	Autonomous emotion management (e.g., being positive will make a person more likeable, so individuals strive to manage their emotions to feel/appear to feel positive)

TABLE 2*

Typology of workplace emotion management (adapted from Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005)

	Pecuniary (i.e., managing one's feelings and emotions at work to receive monetary rewards / avoid monetary punishments)	Prescriptive (i.e., managing one's feelings and emotions at work to meet professional / organizational expectations)	Presentation (i.e., managing one's feelings and emotions at work to <i>meet</i> general social expectations)	Philanthropic (i.e., managing one's feelings and emotions at work to <i>exceed</i> general social expectations)
Feeling rules	Commercial	Professional (P) Organizational (O)	Social	Social
Associated motivations	Instrumental	Altruism Status Instrumental	Ontological Security	Gift
Performance	Cynical Compliance	Cynical/sincere Consent/ commitment	Sincere/cynical Commitment/ consent	Sincere Commitment
Example	Being nice to all customers to make a sale and receive a bonus.	P: Making all decisions rationally. O: Not questioning the leadership in an organization.	Being polite, saying 'Thank you', 'If life gives you lemons, make lemonade', etc.	Giving sincere compliments, offering help without expecting something in return, etc.

TABLE 3*

The project groups, their roles, the organizations of interviewees, and the number of interviews

Project Group	Role	Members	# of Interviews
MANAGEMENT GROUP	Members of the management group decide all personnel and budgeting issues. They guide other project groups and define general policies. It is also a duty of the management group to take a stand on issues, which project group or steering group are not able to solve. The members of the management group have different roles in their home organizations. For example, Ben, Ewan and Sean are IT managers and Lily, Kelly and Leon are service managers. In the project, Lily is the project leader and also a member of the steering group.	Lily (Beta)	2
		Kelly (Alpha)	1 (left the project in June 2013)
		Leslie (Alpha)	1 (started in June 2013, substituting the role Kelly had)
		Leon (Gamma)	2
		Ewan	2
		Ben (Beta)	2
		Sean	2
STEERING GROUP	Members of the steering group guide the project group and try to resolve problems that have occurred in the project group. If the steering group is not able to resolve the problem, it is escalated to the management group. Steering group includes both business domain and technical experts. These experts have various different roles in their home organizations (customer relationship manager, IS manager, Software designer, etc.). Isaac from Gamma is acting in both steering group and project	Lily (Beta) (see management group)	(see management group)
		Tyler (Beta)	2
		Erin (Alpha)	2 (left the project in April 2014)
		Mark (Alpha)	1 (started in April 2014)
		Debra (Alpha)	2
		Eliza (Beta)	2
		Megan	2
		Tracy (Alpha)	1 (on longer leave at the

	group.		moment)
		Janet (Gamma)	2
		Isaac (Gamma)	1
		Grace (Gamma)	2
PROJECT GROUP	<p>The aim of the project group is to find possible technical solutions for the new registrar system and to make sure that the processes are defined and done by people who know the substance well.</p> <p>It includes software developers and representatives of users. These individuals also have different roles in their home organizations (project designer, coordinator, user).</p> <p>Alex is the overall project manager for the development of the registrar system. He was hired externally to run the project, but is now paid by Alpha, so can be considered an employee of Alpha.</p>	Alex (Alpha)	2
		Isaac (Gamma)	See steering group
		Carol (Alpha)	2
		Jacob (Beta)	1 (left the project in Sept 2013)
		Amber (Beta)	2 (left the project in Sept 2013)
		Nathan (Beta)	1
		Chloe (Alpha)	2
		Nicole (Beta)	2 (on longer leave at the moment)
SUPPLIER	<p>Omicron is an agile software house. Omicron was founded in 2005. The company grew out of its founders' desire to fill a void in the market: create an expertise-based company to provide top quality software development. Omicron is an independent, privately owned limited-liability company. The staff consists of about 20 people.</p>	Robert (Omicron)	1 (Started in April-May, 2014)

TABLE 4*

Group emotionologies in the project

Project phase	Definable group in the project	Emotionology (standards/attitudes the group maintains towards feelings, their appropriate expression)
Beginning	Alpha (project group)	<p>‘Cautious testing of the waters’ Emotion legitimation rules (what to feel):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fear is good and productive - expect many feelings - don’t be too enthusiastic, but cautiously optimistic <p>Emotion signification rules (what to express):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exercise care; learn to play the political game - do not offend others <p>Both legitimation and signification rules are largely social here.</p>
	Beta (project group)	
	‘Managers’	
Mid-project	Alpha (project group)	<p>‘Critiqueing each other’s work is part of the project and everyone should be able to take critique; good moments should be celebrated’ Emotion legitimation & signification rules (what to feel & express):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beta people cannot take criticism - It is important to celebrate the good moments <p>Both legitimation and signification rules are organizational (Alpha vs. Beta) and social here.</p>
	Beta (project group)	
	‘Managers’	
	Alpha (project group)	<p>‘All project members should be treated fairly and respectfully; some maybe more fairly and more respectfully’ Emotion legitimation & signification rules (what to feel & express):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alpha people are immature and disrespectful - The one who pays more gets a bigger say - Project members expect to be treated well <p>Both legitimation and signification rules are organizational (Alpha vs. Beta) and social here.</p>
	Beta (project group)	
	‘Managers’	
	Alpha (project group)	<p>‘Rationality is the golden standard; conflict is productive’ Emotion legitimation rules (what to feel):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflict is important (cathartic and shows commitment) <p>Emotion signification rules (what to express):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decisions must be made in a rational way <p>Legitimation rule is organizational (particular project related) and social. Signification rule is professional (managerial profession).</p>
	Beta (project group)	
	‘Managers’	

TABLE 5*

Group emotionologies (emotion rules), and corresponding authoritative and allocative emotion management among the project members

Alpha sub-group (mid-project)	
Emotion rules	Emotion management
Group emotionology: - organizational rules (Beta people cannot take criticism) - social rules (celebrate the good moments)	Authoritative (external): situational (experiences from this project organization suggest to Carol and Chloe to learn not to criticize Beta people) Allocative (internal): presentational (Carol and Chloe want to celebrate the good times based on internalized general social rules)
Individuals (Carol & Chloe): - personal rules ('say it straight' or 'be emphatic')	Allocative (internal): philanthropic (based on her personal rules, Chloe wants to be empathetic and not hurtful, even when criticism is deserved) Allocative (internal): misanthropic (based on her personal rules, Carol wants to say it straight regardless of consequences)
Beta sub-group (mid-project)	
Emotion rules	Emotion management
Group emotionology: - organizational rules (Alpha people are immature and disrespectful; the organization that pays, gets a bigger say) - social rules (people expect to be treated well)	Allocative (internal): presentational & Authoritative (external): situational (based on internalized general social rules that all people should be treated equally and fairly & experiences from this project organization, Nicole goes up the project hierarchy and turns to Eliza to try to indirectly make Carol and Chloe stop complaining)
Management and steering groups (mid-project)	
Emotion rules	Emotion management
Group emotionology: - organizational and social rules (conflicts in this project are good) - professional (decisions must be shown to have been made in a rational way)	Authoritative (external): prescriptive (leadership and managerial authority dictates to the management and steering group members that rationality is the golden standard to be expressed always) Authoritative (external): situational & Allocative (internal): presentational (experiences from this project organization and general internalized social rules of 'seeing the bright side of everything' suggest that conflicts should be considered as productive)

TABLE 6*

Emotion legitimation and signification rules, and corresponding category of emotion management (adapting and extending Bolton & Boyd (2003) and Callahan (2004))

Emotion Legitimation and Signification Rules	Corresponding Category of Emotion Management
Commercial (feeling and expression rules individuals follow for money) E.g., To make the biggest commission on sales, I need to be friendly to my customers	Authoritative: pecuniary
Professional (feeling and expression rules individuals follow based on their profession) E.g., Managers should not be overly emotional and should express rationality; knowledge workers are expected to be able to engage in a heated intellectual debate and receive critique, without taking it personally	Authoritative: situational & prescriptive
Organizational (feeling and expression rules individuals follow based on what their organization prescribes or expects) E.g., Call center employees should be polite to the customers, but can complain about them loudly to their colleagues	Authoritative: situational & prescriptive
Social (feeling and expression rules individuals follow based on their fundamental socialization) E.g., I should be polite, say ‘Thank you’, etc.	Allocative: presentational
Personal (feeling and expression rules individuals follow based on their personality and principles) E.g., I want to be emphatic and not hurt anyone; I know I should be polite, but I cannot keep it in, so I think it’s best to ‘say it straight’	Allocative: philanthropic & misanthropic