

# 직무관련 인식들과 감정간의 관계에 관한 고찰

홍용기\* · 조국행\*\* · 박종혁\*\*\*

## 〈목 차〉

I. Introduction	IV. Discussion and Conclusion
II. Related Theory about Emotions in the Workplace	참고문헌
III. The Rationales for each Research Propositions	Abstract

## I. Introduction

Organizational behavior scientists have studied emotions recently because of popular and inherent interest as well as partly because emotions are seen as important factor of organizational behavior. The last 20 years have seen an important development in the investigation of emotion's role as a variables of organizational behavior. In the organizational setting, many studies have begun to clarify the complex relation factor of a variety of kinds of behavior: emotion, personality, attitude, and motivation, behavior, and leadership. The literature that might support a coherent ways emotions influences behavior. Research on the link between emotions and behavior has increased substantially during the past decade. Yet it is no more emotions

\* 대림대학 경영정보계열 부교수

\*\* 대림대학 경영정보계열 조교수

\*\*\* 한국외국어대학교 경영학부 강사

than any other aspect of social life(Ashforth & humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Zerbe 2000; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000a).

Despite the last 20 years interest, the study of emotions in organization setting, and in particular the link between job performance and emotions, has only recently begun to attract organizational behavior scholar's attention(Weiss & Brief, 2001). Based on a historical review by Weiss and Brief(2001), they emphasis on positive description rather than theory development or deductive theory testing about between emotions and job satisfaction.

The purpose of this article is to review existing research on job performance and emotions, particularly at the job relevant cognitions level. In this study, We propose research propositions about correlates of job performance and emotions while working. The purpose of this article is to develop and propose research propositions about potential correlates of perceived performance at the job relevant level. Correlates include those that should function mainly as antecedents of performance, such as job difficulty, job interest, and job effort in the study are emotions experienced concurrently with job performance. Therefore, We suggest the predictive direction and bivariate relationship of the set of among variables in explaining job performance and emotions.

## **II . Related Theory about Emotions in the Workplace**

### **1. Emotions and Behavior**

Emotions lie at the core of much of our understanding of organizational behavior. The workplace is unavoidably saturated with emotion. Therefore emotions often has marked effects on thought and action within organizations and emotions are not something that can be walled off from rationalized work. Also Feelings and moods affects human being attitudes, motivation, behavior, and interactions with people around us. In Emotional

Intelligence, Goleman(1995) suggests that humans have “two minds”; a rational mind and an emotional mind. The emotional mind and how it affects our work-related interactions and behaviors is the focus for this segment of an organizational behavior course. Emotions and feelings often arise within us in response to various stimuli. within the context of, our personality temperament, and moods, emotions rise and fall in short-term cycles. Together with the cognitive component of our thought process, they shape the decisions we make and the behaviors we display. They can be invaluable guides to our ability to interpret events around us and make good decisions, often in quick-response situations.

Damasio(1994) indicates the crucial role that emotion-based intuition plays in making even simple decisions. Thus deprived, or emotionally unaware they struggle with everyday decision. Feelings can be very useful in helping us focus our attention, thoughts, and resources. Therefore feelings signal enjoyment, anger, fear, hurt, love, and so forth linked to surrounding stimuli.

## 2. Affective Events Theory

Weiss and Cropanzano argue that aspects of work environment, including environmental conditions, role, and job design, initiate emotions in organizational settings. These aspects of work thus constitute the “affective events,” described colloquially as “hassles and uplift”(Basch and Fisher, 2000), that act systematically to determine affective states lead to behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Emotions can also directly lead to behavioral outcomes such as productive work(Wright, Bonett, and Sweeney, 1993; Wright and Cropanzano, 1998), antisocial actions(Organ, 1990), or turnover behavior. AET also incorporates trait affectivity, a personal disposition that conditions the formation of positive and negative emotions. AET is of critical significance. It tells us that organizational characteristics and managerial policies can affect the emotional states of organizational member, and can affect members’ attitudes and performance.

One of the more important outcomes of AET studies is a new understanding of job satisfaction. In AET, attitudes and affective states

relating to job satisfaction are viewed as separable(Fisher, 2000). Many researchers have argued that job satisfaction constitutes a set of attitudes toward work that do not necessarily include affective feelings.

### 3. Emotional Labor

Emotional labor occurs when employees are required to display particular emotional states as a part of their job. Beginning with Hochschild(1983), emotional labor research has been the traditional a standard bearer of research into emotions in workplace. According to Hoshchild, employees in service organizations, such as airline cabin crews, shop assistants, funeral directors, and even debt collector, are required by their jobs to maintain particular displays of emotions. More recently, the concept of emotional labor has been extended to include emotional displays by employees within the organization. Humphrey(2000), Kruml and Geddes(2000) argues that norms exist as to how employees relate to each other in work and social situations.

One of effects of emotional labor concerns what happens when there is a discrepancy between the emotions felt and those that a job requires a worker to display to conform to role expectations. Mann(1999) argues that this sort of repressed emotional energy has negative consequences for employees. Ashkanasy, Fisher, and Hartel(1998) point out that such instances of emotional dissonance constitute affective events, and leading eventually to performance outcomes for employees. Indeed, Schaubroeck and Jones(2000), Tews and Glomb(2000), Wharton and Erickson(1995) found there has been a good deal of attention paid to emotional labor and its effects on employee well-being and its consequences for organizational performance.

Rafaeli and Sutton(1987, 1989) showed that service employees' displays of positive emotion were directly related to positive customer reactions and organizational effectiveness. Also, Schneider and Bowen(1985) argue that employees' attitudes and the attendant perception of service by customers are critical for maintenance of both individual and organizational performance. Pugh(2001) found a positive relationship between positive displays of emotion and ratings of service quality. Hartel, Barker, and

Baker(1999) have argued that emotional intelligence may be a critical determinant of service providers' ability to produce positive attitudes, intentions, and behaviors in consumers. Other authors have described aspects of emotional expression in service settings is emotional contagion(Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson, 1994). In this regard, service employees have a special duty to ensure customer retention and satisfaction thorough appropriate emotion management. Emotional labor can create benefits for organizations, it can have negative consequences on both the physical and the mental health of employees(Mann, 1999). The strain of emotional labor can even lead to employee burnout(Grandey, 2000), and even physical symptoms(Parker and Wall, 1998).

#### 4. Mood Effects

Mood differ from emotions in that they are mood diffuse and longer lasting. Consistent with AET, recent research has demonstrated that both positive and negative moods affect the way employees think and behave at work(George and Brief, 1996). Research into mood in organizations began in the early 1990s, at around the same time as mood researchers in social psychology were beginning to have an impact. Results of these studies have consistently highlighted the pervasive effects of mood. The bad mood is *intrinsically antithetical* to employee productivity. Thus, negative moods are accompanied by more negative evaluations. Positive mood, perhaps because it facilitates optimism, generally result in more positive outcomes(Isen and Baron, 1991).

#### 5. Emotional Intelligence

The emotional intelligence literature argues that individuals vary in their ability to manage their own feelings and the feelings of others. Emotional intelligence is a relatively recent concept(Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000b, 2000c). Also Emotional intelligence has the potential to be important for the

management of employees in organizations, from both an academic and a practitioner point of view. From a researcher's perspective, questions about the nature of emotional intelligence and its relationship with work outcomes remain to be answered. From a practitioner's perspective, emotional intelligence involves the identification, selection, and training of critical competencies involving emotional abilities. Four areas where emotional intelligence has been shown to be applicable in organizational settings are leadership, team effectiveness, interviews, and as a moderator of job insecurity.

In Summary, the five topics that we have discussed in this overview highlight the broad and pervasive role that emotions can play in organizational setting. emotion and behavior, Affective Events Theory, emotional labor, mood effect, and emotional intelligence cover distinct but overlapping areas of organizational functioning.

### **III. The Rationales for each Research Propositions**

In recent years, Studies of organizations have show that emotions play an important part in the managing between employee's behavior and performance. Titled *Managing Emotions in the workplace* was the book produced by Ashkananasy, Zerbe, and Hartel have been at the forefront of this interest rise, including the publication of *Emotions in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Practice*(Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Zerbe 2000). They presented subscribe to a number of premises, namely that (a) "emotions lie at the core of much of our understanding of organizational behavior," (b) the workplace is "unavoidably saturated with emotion", (c) "emotion often has marked effects on thought and action" within organizations, and (d) emotions are not something that can be "walled off from rationalized work". Many of the contributors suggest that a previous disinclination to recognize such ideas has led to a limited understanding of what is actually going on in the workplace.

Many articles by Ashforth and Humphrey(1995), and Weiss and Cropanzano(1996), Fineman(2000); Ciarrochi, Forgas, and Mayer(2001), Lord, Klimoski, and Kanfer(2002) were research interest in the role payed by emotions and affect in organization. However the workplace emotions literature is accumulating, it is still an young area of study As such it is characterized by diversity in the theoretical tradition and research focus. It also enjoys diversity of methodological practice, which some literature experience only as they mature. In this study, we attempt to systematically summarize emotion-performance research results. We propose that there may be bivariate relationship of reconciling the contradictions in past emotions and job performance research. We begin with basic definitions of performance and of emotions.

The current broader conceptualization of emotion incorporates a construct such as mood, affect, emotions. The meaning of emotions is still being debated, so the definition varies somewhat across sources. Emotions are psychological and physiological episodes experienced toward an abject, person, or events that create a state of readiness(This definition presented is constructed from information in the following sources: Ashkanasy, Zerbe, & Hartel, & Zerbe 2002, Weiss, 2002). Mood are less intense emotional states that are not directed toward anything in particular(Kanfer & Klimoski,, 2002). All employee have a emotions and Most employees are usually expected to manage their emotions in the workplace. When interacting with co-workers, customers, suppliers, and others, employee are expected to emotional labor, Emotional Labor refers to the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal transactions(Morris & Feldman, 1996; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). The problem is the most difficult emotions to control.

## 1. Antecedent of Job Performance and Job Interest, Difficulty, Effort

### (1) Job Interest to Job Difficulty

Job interest should be positively related to job difficulty. Similar

conclusions come from research on boredom(Fisher, 1993), interest(Chen, Darst, & Pangrazi, 2001), flow states(Reeve, 1989). Job complexity, job novelty, job uncertainty, and optimal challenge or incongruity stimulate job interest. Thus, the following hypothesis predict:

Research Proposition 1: They will be a positive relationship between job interest and job difficulty.

## (2) Job Interest to Job Effort

Job interest is a reason to exert job effort. people are more likely to initially undertake and then work hard on jobs that they find interesting(Sansone & Smith, 2000). Interest appears to play an important role in the self-regulation of motivation during job performance(Izard & Ackerman, 2000; Sansone & Smith, 2000). Sansone, Weir, Harpster, and Morgan(1992) showed that individuals intentionally make uninteresting jobs more interesting, when they believe that it is ti their benefit to continue working on the job. Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 2: They will be a positive relationship between job interest and job effort.

## (3) Job Difficulty and Job Effort

A Job difficulty should call more effort because more effort is seen as required to succeed on job. One of the basic thought by which more difficulty goals lead to improved job performance is increased effort(Lock & Latham, 1990). Although goals were not focused in this study, a similar mobilization of effort should occur when a more rather than less difficult job is being attempted. Thus, the following proposition predict:

Research Proposition 3: They will be a positive relationship between job difficulty and job effort.



## 2. Job Interest, Job Difficult, and Job Effort–Job Performance

### (1) Job Interest to Job Performance

Job interest may have an additional impact on performance beyond that due to effort intensity. Job interest may increase persistence or the amount of time that one works on a jobs, as job performance itself will be enjoyable(Renninger, 2000). Job interest may make it easier to block out intrusive thoughts or interruptions that may otherwise impede job performance(Sarason, Pierce, & Sarason, 1996). There is a lare body of research in educational psychology suggesting that interest facilitates performance on learning jobs(Renninger, Hidi & Krapp, 1992). Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 4: They will be a positive relationship between job interest and job performance.

### (2) Job Difficulty to Job Performance

A negative relationship between job difficulty and job performance would be expected, as jobs that are difficult, complex, and novel should be harder to perform well than relatively simple tasks on the same job. There is evidence that subjective job complexity is negatively related to objective job performance beyond the effects of manipulated job complexity(Maynard & Hakel, 1997). Alternatively, Perceived poor performance may be attributed to high job difficulty. Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 5: They will be a negative relationship between job difficulty and job performance.

### (3) Job Effort to Job Performance

Most theories of motivation are based on the idea that job effort is a major determinant of job performance. Empirical work confirms that job effort is a reasonably strong predictor of job performance(Fisher & Ford,

1998), with correlations often in the 0.40s. The most individuals believe that their level of job effort is monotonically associated with job performance across a wide variety of jobs(Yates & Kulik, 1977). Thus the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 6: They will be a positive relationship between job effort and job performance.

### 3. Interest, Difficulty, and Effort of job and Job Performance

#### (1) Job Interest to Emotions

Izard(2000) regarded interest as one of the basic positive emotions and reported that the other basic emotion that most frequently occurs in interest situations is joy. Interest researchers in educational psychology seem to agree that interest in a learning job is associated with positive affective outcomes(Hidi, 2000). Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 7: They will be a positive relationship between job interest and emotions.

#### (2) Job Difficulty to Emotions

Job difficulty is defined as the extent to which the performer describes his or her current job as novel, complex, and difficult. Job difficulty should be inherently unpleasant. Working in a job at which one is job difficult may produce negative emotions, particularly worry, embarrassment frustration, and disappointment. Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 8: They will be a negative relationship between job difficulty and emotions

#### (3) Job Effort and Emotions

Eisenberger(1992) suggests that expending effort might be affectively

unpleasant. Because of organisms tend to choose the lowest effort solution to any given problem. However an opposite relationship is posited by theories suggest that exerting effort in exploration or while involved in a challenging job is inherently pleasurable. Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 9: They will be a relationship between job difficulty and emotions, but the Proposition is nondirectional given convincing rationales for both directions.

#### 4. Relationship Job Performance and Emotions

There is substantial reason to believe that performance has an important role in contributing to emotions while working and that this role will remain even after accounting for the effects of the other potential antecedents of emotions hypothesized(Pekrun & Frese, 1992). research on performance that sign of feedback is strongly related to affective responses such as mood, satisfaction, and task enjoyment(Deci, Koestner, & Rayn, 1999). Fisher and Noble(2000) showed that individuals reported feeling more positive emotion and less negative emotion than usual compared to their own baseline when they thought they were performing better than usual. Thus, the following Proposition predict:

Research Proposition 10: They will be a positive relationship between job performance and emotions.

### IV. Discussion and Conclusion

We have attempted to review the major exiting research on emotions and performance and to use it to formulate a conceptual integration to guide future study. This study proposed relationships among job-relevant

cognitions and emotions. These were based on the idea a great deal of the variation in perceived job performance should be predicted by the levels of job difficulty, job skill, job interest, and job effort. Furthermore, there are many reasons to expect that perceived job performance would be an important contributor to emotions experienced while working. Most of the bivariate relationship proposed in research propositions were predicted.

As expected, perceived job performance was positively predicted by job interest(RP4), job effort(RP6) and negatively predicted by job difficulty(RP5) with each predictor accounting for unique variance in performance. It is possible that the relative importance of job interest, job difficulty, and job effort as predictors of performance may be different at job. A major focus of this study was on predicting emotions experienced during job engagement. Research propositions were offered about the likely relationship between job interest and emotions(RP7), job difficulty and emotions(RP8), job effort and emotions(RP9) as well as positively relationships perceived job performance and emotions(RP10). Also, Bivariate relationship expected that between job interest and job difficulty(RP1), and job interest and job effort(RP2), and job difficulty and job effort(RP2). Therefore the effects of prior positive or negative emotions on performance also expect.

We review, to presenting 10 research propositions about emotions and performance at job relevant cognitions for future research. We pointed out theoretical methodological issues that need to be attended to in future work. An example of the conceptual issues we covered is the need for specificity about the emotions and job relevant cognitions construct and systematic selection of measures or manipulations to adequately represent the breadth of relevant variables. We recommend further job relevant level research to better understand antecedents or determinant of real-time emotions while working.

## References

1. Ashforth, B.E., & Humphrey, R.H.(1995), Emotion in the Workplace: A Reappraisal, *Human Relations*, 48, pp.97~125.
2. Ashforth, B.E., & Humphrey, R.H.(1993), Emotional Labor in Service Roles: The Influence of Identity, *Academy of Management Review*, 18, pp.88~115.
3. Ashkanasy, N.M., Fisher, C.D., & Hartel, C.E.J.(1998), "Investigating the Causes and Consequences of Emotional Experience at Work," in *Emotion at Work: New Research Directions*, Symposium Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Austral-asian Social Psychologists, Christchurch, NZ.
4. Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E., & Zerbe, W.J.(2002), *Managing Emotions in the Workplace*, Armonk, NY.: Sharpe.
5. Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E., & Zerbe, W.J.(2002), *Managing Emotions in the Workplace*, Armonk, NY.: Sharpe.
6. Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J., & Zerbe, W.J.(2000). *Emotion in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice*, Westport, CT: Quorum.
7. Basch, J., & Fisher, C.D.(2000). "Affective Events-Emotions Matrix: A Classification of Work Events and Associated Emotions," in *Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice*, ed. Ashkanasy,N.M., Hartel, C.E.J., & Zerbe, W.J., pp.36~48. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
8. Chen, A., Darst, P.W., & Pangrazi, R.P.(2001), "An Examination of Situational Interest and its Sources," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, pp.383~400.
9. Ciarroch, J., Forgas, J.P., & Mayer, J.D.(2001), *Emotional Intelligence in Everyday Life: A Scientific Inquiry*, Psychology Press.
10. Damasio, A.R.(1994), *Descartes's Error: Emotions, Reason, and the Human Brain*, N.Y.: Avon Books.
11. Deci, E.L.Koestner, R. & Ryan, R.M.(1999), "A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, pp.627~668.
12. Eisenberger, R.(1992), "Learned Industriousness," *Psychological Review*,

- 99, pp.248~267.
13. Fineman, S.(2000), *Emotion in Organizations*, 2nd. ed., London: Sage.
  14. Fisher, C.D. & Ashkanasy, N.M.(2000b). "The Emerging Role of Emotions in Work Life: An Introduction," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Special Issue, pp.123~129.
  15. Fisher, C.D.(1993), "Boredom at Work: A Neglected Concept," *Human Relations*, 99, pp.248~267.
  16. Fisher, C.D.(2000a), "Mood and Emotions while Working: Missing .of Job Satisfaction," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp.185~202.
  17. Fisher, C.D., & Ashkanasy, N.M.(eds.)(2000c). "Special Issue on Emotions in the Work Life," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 3.
  18. Fisher, C.D., & Nobel, C.S.(2000), *Affect and Performance: A within Person Analysis*, in Dosier, L.N., & Keys, J.B., eds., *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceeding*, Pleasantville, NY. : Academy of Management.
  19. Fisher, S.L., & Ford, J.K.(1998). "Differential Effects of Learner Effort and Goal Orientation on Two Learning Outcomes," *Personnel Psychology*, 51, pp.397~420.
  20. George, J.M. & Brief, A.P.(1996), "Motivational Agendas in the Workplace: The Effect of Feelings on Focus of Attention and Work Motivation," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, pp.75~109.
  21. Goleman, D.(1995), *Emotional Intelligence*, New York: Bantam Books.
  22. Grandey, A.A(2000). "Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: A New Way to Conceptualize Emotional Labor," *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, pp.95~100.
  23. Hartfield, E., Cacioppo, J., & Rapson, R.(1994), *Emotional Contagion*, N.Y.: Cambridge Univ. Press.
  24. Hidi, S.(2000), *An Interest Researcher's Perspective: The Effects of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Factors on Motivation*, in Sansone, C., & Harackiewicz, J.M., eds., *Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivations: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*, pp.341~372, San Diego, CA: Academic.
  25. Hochschild, A.R.(1983), *The Managed Heart*, Berkeley: University of

California Press.

26. Hartel, C.E.J., Baker, S., & Baker, N.(1999), "A Model for Predicting the Effects of Employee-Customer Interactions on Consumer Attitudes, Intentions, and Behaviors, The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Service Encounters," *Australian Journal of Communication*, 26, 2, pp.77~87.
27. Humphrey, R.H.(2000), "The Importance of Job Characteristics to Emotional Displays," in *Emotions in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed., Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J., & Zerbe, W.J., pp.236~249. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
28. Isen, A.M., & Baron, R.A.(1991), "Positive Affect as a Factor Organizational Behavior," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 13, pp.1~53.
29. Izard, C.E., & Ackerman, B.P.(2000), Motivational, Organizational, and Regulatory Functions of Discrete Emotions, in Lewis, M., & Haviland-Jones, J.M., eds., *Handbook of Emotions*, pp.253~264., N.Y. : Guilford.
30. Kruml, S.M., & Geddes, D.(2000), "Catching Fire without Burning out: is there an Ideal Way to Perform Emotional Labor?" in *Emotions in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed., Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J., & Zerbe, W.J., pp.236~249. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
31. Lock, E.A., & Latham, G.P.(1990), *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice.
32. Lord, R.G., Klimoski, R.J., & Kanfer, R.(eds.)(2002), *Emotion in the Workplace: Understanding the Structure and Role of Emotions in Organization Behavior*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
33. Mann, S.(1999), *Hiding what we Feel, Faking, what we don't*, Dorset, England: Element Books.
34. Maynard, D.C., & Hakel, M.D.(1997), "Effects of Objective and Subjective Task Complexity on Task Performance," *Human Performance*, 10, pp.303~330.
35. Morris, J.A., & Feldman, D.C.(1996), "The Dimensions, Antecedent, and Consequences of Emotional Labor," *Academy of Management Review*, 21, pp.986~1010.
36. Organ, D.W.(1990), "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, pp.43~72.

37. Pekrun, R., & Frese, M.(1992), "Emotions in Work and Achievement," *International Review of industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7, pp.153~200.
38. Pugh, S.D.(2001), "Service with a Smile: Emotional Contagion in the Service Encounter," *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, pp.1018~1027.
39. Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R.I.(1987), "Expression of Emotion as Part of the Work Role," *Academy of Management Review*, 12, pp.23~37.
40. Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R.I.(1989), "The Expression of Emotion in Organizational Life," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11, pp.1~42.
41. Reeve, J(1989). "The Interest Enjoyment Distinction in Intrinsic Motivation," *Motivation an Emotion*, 13, pp.83~103.
42. Renninger, K.A.(2000), Individual interest and its Implications for Understanding Intrinsic Motivation, in Sansone, C. & Harackiewicz, J.M., eds., *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation an Performance*, pp.373~404., San Diego, CA: Academic
43. Renninger, K.A., Hidi, S., & Krapp, A.(1992), *The Role of Interest in Learning and Development*, Hillsdale, N.J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, inc.
44. Sansone, C., & Smith, J.L.(2000), Interest and Self Regulation: The Relation between having to and Wanting to, in Sansone, C., & Harackiewicz, J.M., eds., *Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivations: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*, pp.341~372, San Diego, CA: Academic.
45. Sansone, C., Weir, C., Harpster, L., & Morgan, C.(1992), "Once a Boring Task Always a Boring Task? Interest as a Self-Regulatory Mechanism," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, pp.379~390.
46. Sarason, I.B., Pierce, G.R., & Sarason, B.R.(1996), *Cognitive Interference: Theories, Methods, and Findings*, Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, inc.
47. Schaubroeck, J., & Jones, J.R.(2000), "Antecedents of Workplace Emotional Labor Dimensions and Moderators of their Effects on Physical Symptoms," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp.163~183.
48. Schneider, B., & Bowen, D.E.(1985), "Employee and Customer Perceptions



- of Service in Bank: Replication and Extension,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, pp.423~433.
49. Tews, M.J., & Glomb, T.M.(2000), “The Feelings at Work Scale: Theoretical Basis, Development of the Instrument, and Preliminary Validity Testing,” *Paper Presented at the Second Conference on Emotions and Organizational Life*, Toronto, Ontario, August.
50. Weiss, H.M.(eds.)(2002), “Special Issue on Emotional Experience at Work,” *Motivations and Emotion*, 26, 1.
51. Weiss, H.M., & Brief, A.P.(2001), Affect at Work: An Historical Perspective, in Payne, R.L., & Cooper, C.L.(eds.)(2001), *Emotions at Work: Theory, Research, and Applications for Management*, Chichester, England: Wiley.
52. 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 Organization Behavior*, 18, pp.1~74.
53. Wharton, A., & Erickson, R.(1995), “The Consequences of Caring: Exploring the Links between Woman’s Job and Family Emotion Work,” *Sociology Quarterly*, 36, pp.273~296.
54. Wright, T.A., & Cropanzano, R.(1998), “Emotional Exhaustion as a Predictor of Job Performance and Voluntary Turnover,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, pp.486~493.
55. Wright, T.A., Bonnett, D.G., & Sweeney, D.A.,(1993), “Mental-Health and Work Performance: Results of a Longitudinal Field Study,” *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, pp.277~284.

## Abstract

### Relationship among Job-relevant Cognitions and Emotions : A Conceptual Review

Hong, Yong-ki · Cho, Kook-haeng · Park, Jong-hyuk

In this article, We propose research propositions about correlates of job interest, job difficulty, job effort, and job performance as well as job performance and emotions while working. The purpose of this study is to review existing research on emotions and job performance, particularly emotions at work. The purpose of this article is to review existing research on job performance and emotions, particularly at the job relevant cognitions level. In this study, We propose research propositions about correlates of job performance and emotions while working. The purpose of this article is to develop and propose research propositions about potential correlates of perceived performance at the job relevant level. Correlates include those that should function mainly as antecedents of performance, such as job difficulty, job interest, and job effort in the study are emotions experienced concurrently with job performance. Therefore, We suggest the predictive direction and bivariate relationship of the set of among variables in explaining job performance and emotions.

key words: emotions, emotional labor, Job interest, job difficulty, job effort, job performance