

# FOUR

---

## Workplaces as Stages

---

*Individual commitment to a group effort—that is what makes a team work, a company work, a society work, a civilization work.*

—Vince Lombardi

*I want to share something with you: The three little sentences that will get you through life. Number 1: Cover for me. Number 2: Oh, good idea, Boss! Number 3: It was like that when I got here.*

—Homer Simpson

### **Introduction: Dramaturgy in Organizations and Workplaces**

Have you ever felt compelled to accommodate a difficult boss or cranky customer? Deliberated over what outfit to wear at work? Strategized with family and friends over how to impress colleagues? Have you (surreptitiously) not followed an onerous rule and hidden that violation? Allied with coworkers to form a covert team working against rivals? Rummaging

through memories of past employment experiences can make people appreciate just how much impression management occurs in workplaces.

This chapter begins by outlining how Goffman's dramaturgical ideas help conceptualize interactions inside workplaces. Following that section, the chapter surveys how scholars of impression management have illustrated and advanced these concepts. Two areas of emphasis are research into how people display emotion in the workplace and the concept of the *total institution* as an evolving organizational form. Overall, this chapter's purpose is to showcase and update insights that the dramaturgical approach offers for analyzing people's experiences in the workplace.

In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Erving Goffman (1959, p. xi) stated that his study was of "the way in which the individual in ordinary work situations presents himself and his activities to others." Analyzing presentation and performance in a workplace was the original focal base of Goffman's dramaturgical analysis. Many examples in his book come from his ethnographic research in the Shetland Islands, where he observed interactions between guests and employees. Goffman (1959) analyzed how people worked in what he called a social establishment.

A social establishment is any place surrounded by fixed barriers to perception in which a particular kind of activity regularly takes place. I have suggested that any social establishment may be studied profitably from the point of view of impression management. Within the walls of a social establishment we find a team of performers who cooperate to present an audience a given definition of the situation. This will include the conception of own team and of audience and assumptions considering the ethos that is to be maintained by rules of politeness and decorum. We often find a division into back region, where the performance of a routine is prepared, and front region, where the performance is presented. Access to these regions is controlled in order to prevent the audience from seeing backstage and to prevent outsiders from coming into a performance that is not addressed to them. Among members of the team, we find that familiarity prevails, solidarity is likely to develop, and that secrets that could give the show away are shared and kept. (p. 238)

This quote identifies prominent points that apply to any dramaturgical analyses of workplaces. Goffman notes that places of work have particular kinds of activity occurring there, with physical and aesthetic boundaries in place regulating who can access what activities. Performances

occur for customers and other observers in the front region, and back regions exist where preparatory work occurs for these front region performances. Backstage areas are sensitive and privileged places that are usually reserved to particular team members. One goal of preserving this space is to avoid communication out of character on the front stage and to maintain privacy for workers.

Teams of workers cooperate to present particular lines regarding work that constitute prevailing definitions of the situation of the social establishment's purpose. There is an ethos at hand, sometimes formed as workplace mission statements or in training about the organizational culture, that sums up values and actions that define the "lines" that teams support and that constitute "face" for the establishment. Team members develop loyalty over time from sharing performance work. Teammates have stakes in the impressions audiences form about the social establishment and its offerings.

Goffman's extended quote presents a basic summation of how the dramaturgical approach addresses different aspects of workplaces. Further analysis can explore how definitions of situations form and how workers perform in the front region. Another focus is maintaining team cohesion and morale. The organizational back region is a feature that impacts productivity. How is work produced? How much people really know about how work gets done is exposed when access to that backstage is granted.

Examining face-to-face interaction between customers and workers is our starting point. Face-to-face interactions are the means through which larger scale interactions operate in workplaces and a key forum through which people experience organizational impacts. As Goffman (1983) wrote,

A great deal of the work of organizations—decision making, the transmission of information, the close coordination of physical tasks is done face-to-face, requires being done in this way, and is vulnerable to face-to-face effects. Differently put . . . as agents of social organizations of any scale, from states to households, can be persuaded, cajoled, flattered, intimidated, or otherwise influenced by effects only achievable in face-to-face dealings. (p. 3)

Taken further, this perspective suggests that face-to-face interactions accumulate to help comprise organizations. Consider interactions like admissions counselors meeting with prospective students, professors teaching classes, a college president speaking to administrators,

development officers calling donors, cafeteria chefs preparing food, groups of students talking about a class, and maintenance workers repairing a building. Such actions, among countless repeated others, constitute in total the large-scale daily organization that is a college. An impression management perspective does not consider an organization as an abstract monolithic entity. There is no examining organizations as depopulated entities, or as empty shells that somehow do things, while the actions of people inside organizations are taken for granted and remain ignored or unexplored.

For example, a college could launch a development campaign as an organizational initiative. One could speak of colleges as having different endowments and following different investment strategies, and at that level, the category of all colleges constitutes the analytic unit, based on comparing the actions of different large-scale organizations. Yet to understand how any single campaign or investment decision in this category is built, one must understand how people work to attain those outcomes. You can compare donations, but you don't understand how donations happen unless you unpack the dynamics of doing "the ask." For people operating within the impression management perspective, analysis starts from the bottom up and examines ongoing face-to-face interactions as studying organizational activity. This choice comes with some obvious analytic limitations. Many interactions occur in organizations, and they all cannot be examined or even known. People can cherry-pick, under sample, or accidentally miss interactions that bear on their analyses. There are also means of delivering actions and decisions not based in face-to-face interaction. Knowing whether one has captured the right interactions from which to generalize is a problem. These concerns noted, the dramaturgical approach emphasizes examining what people (the actors) do together inside the social establishment using props and facilities associated with their work there.<sup>1</sup> Start with the physical front that exists in workplaces. There is usually a servicescape where services are delivered. There are boundary settings that organize work into private and public regions, such as signs on doors stating, "For employees only." A front

---

<sup>1</sup> Not all actions by organizational actors are limited to a single physical plant. Organizations also exist as entities outside a physical headquarters, as there is "working from home, business trips, conversations over the phone, all of which constitutes forums for interaction in which organizational and personal matters get sorted." See "Organizational Analysis: Goffman and Dramaturgy," Chapter 12 in *Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory and Organization Studies: Contemporary Currents*, by P. K. Manning, 2008, p. 289.

stage uses equipment intended to induce a particular impression, like outfitting an office luxuriously.

Goffman (1959, p. 27) notes that many fronts preexist us in that people can be assigned to roles. Fronts can be well established and already pre-assigned and trained as *de rigueur* in workplaces. People in workplaces, for example, wear uniforms as a part of that social establishment's front. Some uniforms imply seriousness like ones worn by militarized guards. For others, like athletes, models, and personal trainers, their bodies are also the "uniform" and part of the front stage. Many different fronts exist in workplaces. Consider how offices are decorated and the accoutrements on display in waiting rooms. Car showrooms entice buyers to explore the vehicles. Some retail stores pump in smells to induce a state of mind that attempts to prime purchases.

A "reception" area, for example, is a designated location where people receive clients. The name alone communicates that a reception space is also a venue for shaping a front calculated to produce a particular impression. An advertising agency might sport a "cool" exterior in the reception area that exhibits the company's creativity and inventiveness. Many restaurants have themes. Websites ignore the appearance and design of home pages at their peril, as people are impatient browsers and want to see what they want quickly and efficiently. Hence the *Google* home page uses a minimalist design that allows people to search for a link they want with no delay.

Fronts encompass appearance, manner, and setting. A workplace works to unite these elements, which should cohere in performance. People judge individuals by how consistent the appearance, manner, and setting of their performances are. Police officers sometimes stop people who wear heavy clothing on hot days where there have been burglaries. Politicians running for president are coached to "appear presidential." Sometimes they make mistakes. Michael Dukakis posing in a tank during the 1988 presidential campaign was a mistake. Former President George W. Bush passed himself off as a country, NASCAR-loving good ol' boy, yet he went to Harvard and Yale and spent time in a family compound in Maine, which are not exactly folkloric characteristics of "good ol' boy-ness." Observers scrutinize the coherence between appearance, manner, and setting in businesses. For example, if we perceive that "things just don't look right" at a business, we may move to an alternative. We could plan to go to a restaurant, but on arrival decide that the restaurant is too empty, so the food must not be good. This conclusion would not be based

on actually tasting the food; nonetheless, we judge that product by what we think of the surroundings. We can work in the reverse way. Sometimes people want to experience a "hole in the wall," where the décor is horrendous but the food may be on a much higher level. That inconsistency can work to help some businesses.

## **Performance Teams: Dramaturgical Circumspection, Discipline, and Loyalty**

A performance team refers to "any set of individuals who cooperate in staging a single routine" (Goffman, 1959, p. 79). The routine staged is the activity associated with the social establishment. This idea of staging acknowledges that people perform rather than just "are." This point is magnified within a business context. As Goffman (1959) writes,

There are many sets of persons who feel that they could not stay in business, whatever their business, if they limited themselves to the gentlemanly means of influencing the individual who observes them. At some point or other in the round of their activity they feel it is necessary to band together and directly manipulate the impression that they give. The observed becomes a performing team and the observers become an audience. Actions which appear to be done to objects become gestures addressed to the audience. The round of activity becomes dramatized. (p. 251)

To perform successfully, a team must proceed through different processes. They must establish a "party line," maintain loyalty to the team's performance, and sustain that "line" effectively during the show. To carry out those tasks, participants must trust partners. People cannot switch teams mid-performance, meaning that they betray one team to side with another during the show. Imagine, for example, a car salesperson switching from selling a car for the dealership to buying the car for the customer in the middle of the sale, telling the customer what to pay and taking on the manager. To organize performances, teams try to control as much of the performance setting as possible, with a person serving as a "director" and some division of performative labor allocated among different members during shows. Directors and team members will assign "parts" and work together to bring wayward performers back into line, avoid disruptions, and repair them as much as possible.

In *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Goffman (1959) analyzed some of these processes under the terms *dramaturgical circumspection*, *dramaturgical discipline*, and *dramaturgical loyalty*. Management duties can mean being in charge of *dramaturgical circumspection*. Dramaturgical circumspection involves focusing and taking the steps needed for the best performance to emerge out of the team. People want to arrange the best setting, cultivate the appropriate audience, and eliminate factors that might impinge on giving a successful performance. The manager must always keep a wary eye to encourage the best possible outcome. Great examples of dramaturgical circumspection exist in planning political campaign events. For example, a Republican candidate might speak at a rally organized by a senior citizen group of NRA members and take only prescreened questions. A Democratic candidate might take only prescreened questions after speaking at a pro-environmental regulation rally. In both settings, campaign managers work to ensure a positive reception that in turn helps produce a successful performance.

*Dramaturgical discipline* refers to team members being in control of all facets of performance possible during the show. That discipline extends, for example, to expressing no unmeant gestures, being poised, composed, and ready. In conjunction with teammates, discipline also encompasses keeping on top of and managing any disruptions to performances. Members of teams are to demonstrate this discipline during performances. An example Goffman cites is when parents believe they can take a child to a nice restaurant and count on the child's dramaturgical discipline in that formal situation. A different example is when coworkers worry about depending on a "loose cannon" on the team to hold her or his tongue when the team meets with important audiences.

*Dramaturgical loyalty* refers to feeling obligated to fellow performers on the team, which encourages them to perform appropriately in the mutual performance and not ruin the show. This loyalty hopefully develops over time through positive relations between coworkers. However, organizations also exercise social control to try to monitor and ensure dramaturgical loyalty. Coworkers will observe other workers to detect whether anyone is not fully committed to putting forth the best work performance for the team.

Goffman coined several concepts to describe interactions within teams. The term *treatment of the absent* refers to how teams speak about those who are out of earshot. *Team collusion* involves the staging work that team members engage in to carry off performances. An interesting example

is that professional wrestlers will often, unbeknownst to fans, “call” the match while performing, whispering to the other wrestler what move is coming for them to respond appropriately in order to choreograph the match. The wrestlers are working together to offer the audience the best show, so the more experienced or senior wrestler calls out different move sequences to appeal to the crowd’s mood. These communications occur during close-up holds so that audiences cannot see the communications. The result is a team collusion that makes the most out of “staging talk” to put forth a good performance.

## Organizations and Order

In the dramaturgical model, a team is not a social organization like a company or a social structure as a whole. The team is a small group that, through interaction, stages the business of larger entities by defining situations in their behalf. In his study *Asylums*, Goffman (1961, pp. 175–176) defined a formal organization as a “system of purposively coordinated activities designed to produce some overall explicit ends. The intended product may be material artifacts, decisions, or information, and may be distributed among participants in a variety of ways” (cited in Manning, 2008b). Face-to-face interactions constitute the “purposively coordinated activities,” with actors in the form of “singles,” “withs,” and “teams” animating those interactions. Ideas motivate and coordinate those actions, with persons being jointly focused on managing the situation at hand in the encounter between them. As Goffman (1983, p. 5) writes, “Orderliness is predicated on a large base of shared cognitive presuppositions, if not normative ones, and self-sustained restraints.”

People follow a loose recognizable plot of sorts that is at hand in their encounters with others. Most interactions between people have already had the table set, meaning that people mostly know what to do in these situations, or what is expected that they appear to do in the situation, although they may or may not meet that expectation or may fake the appearance or intent to do so. That interactions are coordinated reflects order in the organization. People approach their interactions with others knowing that in most situations, the forthcoming actions are preordained, those actions being laminated by the shared frame that people have about “what is done in situations we decide are like this one.” That order does not mean that people *do* exactly what norms might urge. People approach situations with self-interests, and the structure in which they are



embedded has its own interests. These individual interests in the interaction order and the social structure of settings in which they occur are “loosely coupled”—meaning that neither side automatically yields full compliance from the other. People can conflict, concede, change norms, and try to resist the order imposed on them. Interactions are ordered and entwined with social structure, but there is flexibility, as people are not automatons and order sometimes bends if not breaks.

An orderly situation produces, and is produced by, subsequent interactions in a mutually reinforcing relation. As a small example, we understand the need to greet someone appropriate to the situation. Each time we do further demonstrates that order to others and ourselves and reinforces that activity as “what is done.” That people work together in this way to manage greetings is clear. People exchange high fives, fist bumps, hugs, kiss noises, handshakes, nods, cordial greeting utterances, and formal greeting utterances in appropriate forms, which mark understandings between all present of the nature of social relationships between the involved parties. The exchange expresses that one understands those relations, and the exchanges express a working consensus to acknowledge them before others, whether someone truly wishes to be as friendly or formal as indicated.

What is shared publicly in this kind of example and with many others (with or without private disagreement) is a working consensus of public agreement to meet accepted ends and protocols, often organizational ones. Just watch a youth coach meet with her or his charges at a team talk, and see the team members nod and visibly assent to the coach’s claims and instructions. You can see that team members understand that a coach’s injunctions are not to be challenged openly, even though private conversations afterward could reveal a cascade of disagreement.

At work, there is a “party line,” and usually, no public disagreement with that party line emerges. Workers empower the working consensus by giving public fealty to that line, which demonstrates fealty to the social order there and reinforces that others should conform, which they may well sincerely do or wisely appear to do. Order and working consensus are evident in actions, but they are not actions alone, even though they are evident in them. Order and working consensus are ideas and motivations that inhere in personas and situations that people engage in when joining and working within an organization and in work as a team in everyday life. These ideas are manifest, for example, in organizational scripts, managerial cultures, and employee aspirations and ideologies.

## The Dramaturgy of Meetings

Consider the example of meetings. Organizations favor the appearance of having a united front, where all employees are solidly committed to the mission at hand. An embassy, as the official representative communicator of a country's interests, must have coherent, clear, and uniform messaging across both home and host country (Van Praet, 2009). Ellen Van Praet (2009) examined how an embassy staff fashions that front during staff meetings, as meetings serve as a locus for shaping those fronts. Meetings constitute occasions where face-to-face interactions reflect and form power relations in an organization more generally. Van Praet sought to understand how that power surfaces at the face-to-face level, by seeing how people create influence and dominance over others, through ongoing, moment-to-moment, organizationally set activity. While Van Praet studied staff meetings in her case, keep in mind how many kinds of meetings work out power within an organization. For example, events like stockholder meetings and meetings of "the Board" are highly significant, and they also often involve stage-managed performances (Biehl-Missal, 2011).

Van Praet revealed how influence flows during interactions at meetings. For example, when a powerful person entered the room, attendees stopped talking, fell silent, and paid observable attention to the authority. Those actions clarify to all present what individual gets to command the room. A pronounced form of that situation occurs when a judge enters a room and people in the courtroom rise. Van Praet comments that this kind of display of "formalized respect is a staging that clearly establishes power." At other times, meetings are occasions when people with different levels of power coordinate together to achieve goals. That end may require overcoming differences in status so that people across the hierarchy can give each other enough mutual support to overcome status-based impediments to achieving effective action. Van Praet notes, for example, that pursuing common causes at work successfully "needs to overcome resentments" that could bubble up at meetings.

A hierarchy typically exists in who talks and in what order. There are formal procedures that govern the meeting's structure. Yet people can also speak freely in some conversations. People work out a united front to project to audiences outside of the meeting. They inspect arguments and test different strategies in anticipation of how others outside the inner circle will react to them. The ambassador demonstrated power in

organizing all the work to arrive at a “front”—an official position and line for all employees to be cognizant of and follow. Meetings are venues during which people direct traffic in comments, and in which some people police others. People watch others to make sure that they pay attention and appear engaged. Yet there is common cause, as meetings are also a backstage space where people work on preparing later performances.

Capturing the social complexity involved in such occasions is a virtue of the dramaturgical approach. A meeting can be a social occasion where there is a nimble accommodation of different types of social traffic. Meetings integrate hierarchy, status, policing, and rule over others, while at the same time, a democratic component can emerge in some interaction, as people work together to arrive at the best way forward. People build a common front and generate the lines a team is to take, along with additional strategies intended to get an audience to accept proposed lines and react accordingly.

Examining face-to-face interactions between participants offers a means to understand all the above goings-on. For example, people offer different impressions to audiences depending on their status levels. They usually care more about impressing high-status people than low-status ones. Organizational settings offer opportunities to examine how different types of audiences connect to different types of self-presentation. People experience a heightened self-consciousness when the stakes of an interaction increase. Other audience factors include size and whether the observers are familiar or unfamiliar, insiders or outsiders, or hostile or friendly (Gardener & Martinko, 1988).

## Contemporary Takes on Dramaturgy in Organizations

Scholars of organizations have developed a range of analytic directions built on dramaturgical concepts. For example, David Boje (1989) has categorized different kinds of performances in organizations:

*Performance programs*, which are “stored repeatable programs” of performance that organizational participants put on to control the social order in the organization, like a bartender bantering with regulars; *games* between employees which are routine social interplay between employees, like teasing in familiar ways among accustomed characters; *linguistic* choices intended to give impressions, like using big words for one audience and

slang for another; *storytelling*, which refers to tales like war stories that workers tell to make sense of and influence activities, like suspicions of administrators based on “what happened when”; *ritual* events that are typical within the organization. (pp. 84–89)

Peter K. Manning (2008a, 2008b) has also identified appropriate foci for a dramaturgical theory of organizations. His list includes dramaturgically analyzable phenomena such as (1) displays of organizational action, (2) impacts of rules and records, (3) organizational rhetoric, (4) exercises (and non-exercises) of power in organizations, (5) organizations as career crucibles, (6) trust, (7) material components of organizations, and (8) organizations as partners in processes of according honor and status (and presumably of not according status). Lest people view organizations as purely rational venues, Manning (2008b, p. 281) also notes that organizations can be “seething cauldrons of emotion, rivalries and passions,” where constraints on performance and people’s hidden agendas infiltrate interactions.

Boje (1989) and Manning’s (2008a, 2008b) ideas demonstrate some directions for analyzing people’s performances in organizations. Scholars of organizations disagree, however, about how far to take the theatrical analogy. Some view dramaturgy as a metaphor that brings organizational processes into useful analytic relief, but they hesitate to conceive of organizations operating *as* theater. Boje, alternatively, rejects the dramaturgy as metaphor approach. For Boje, organizations *are* theater, in the simultaneous enacting of scripts across what he calls the “meta-theater” of organizations. For all individuals, impression management in organizations matters. Here performance comprises means through which people achieve more power and ingratiate themselves with others (Gardner & Martinko, 1988). Face-to-face interactions process people and actions in an organization’s work and serve as paths to downward or upward mobility.

For Boje, many diverse performances are all ongoing inside organizations. Hence, he suggests that organizations be appreciated as sites of “meta-theater.” From this vantage point, organizations are theaters with many overlaying performances occurring at any one time. Boje’s perspective builds from Kenneth Burke’s work on dramatism. Burkean adherents refer to drama as practiced activity, not as an initial analytic metaphor, as a dramaturgical analogy does. According to Boje and Rosile (2003),

An organization is assumed to be a multiplicity of stages on which different plays are acted out by organizational members (actors) simultaneously. There is a metascript composed of the integrated senior executive’s scripts

combined with scripts from the less powerful to be pieced together in a narrative and set of stories that compose the organization. (p. 24)

## The Interaction Order and the Negotiated Order

Goffman (1983, p. 1) used the term *interaction order* to describe a “loose coupling between interactional practices and social structure.” He noted, “The workings of the interaction order can easily be viewed . . . as enabling conventions, in the sense of the ground rules for a game, the provisions of a traffic code or the rules of syntax of a language” (p. 5). These interactions establish an order that offers benefits of predictability, reliability, and legibility (Misztal, 2001, p. 314).

Workplaces have interactions that represent ordered situations; within them, face-to-face encounters repeat themselves predictably. Those interactions build up nested inside an enabling social structure. Because given environments have definite expectations that are repeated over time, those settings contain predictable enabling conventions. Social structures come with a sense of situational propriety that participants recognize. They can read what is going on in an encounter and what to do. That cognition and enabling knowledge, along with similarly clued-in other people, come to provide an order to subsequent activities. A single interaction can become a strand that over time and repetition becomes a web organizing activity. That web links social structure and behaviors. The interaction order allows people to reconcile structural impingements and shared definitions of reality, so that “everyone knows what is to go on here.”

The level of workplace dominance runs a spectrum from what Goffman called *total institutions*, which seek to control all interactions by individuals (like in prisons) and resocialize them to an organizational ideal, to organizations that are mostly free of controlling expectations for its denizens. Again, the ideas that inspire order may be sourced in the organizational host, but the spontaneity that workers have gives organizational routines some variability, so a governing idea can be transformed in interaction orders that follow. As Manning (2008a) writes,

Internally, organizations are clusters of work routines, dense interactions, cliques, and embedded groups that are constituted and reconstituted over time. The “place” of such standard conceptual paraphernalia as roles, selves, groups and even persons are negotiable in interactional sequences and are not free standing or incontrovertible. (p. 687)

While predictable compliant responses are important, variation in how people actually act, and as a consequence, what organizations produce, are resulting effects of interaction. There is a raw material and base structure in what people do to constitute the organization, but the best-laid plans evolve and morph, attributable to varieties of agendas among people in an organization. To capture that complexity, the analytic focus of the interaction order is fixed on how individuals act within and inhabit organizations. Sociologist Tim Hallett (2010) is spurring institutional and organizational analysts to move more in the direction of researching how people's work, and their understandings of their work, "inhabits" institutions.

The point here is complex. An analytic understanding must account for people accepting fixed routines—the party line—yet improvising off those routines in multiple ways and offshoots. A sociological tradition referred to as the *negotiated order* approach examines how people adjust formal rules and individual affinities. Developed by Anselm Strauss and colleagues (1963) and developed further by Gary Alan Fine (1984) and David Maines (1982), the negotiated order perspective stresses the socially constructed nature of formal and informal administration in the workplace. Strauss (1978) argued that the negotiated order

could be conceived of as the sum total of the organization's rules and policies, along with whatever agreements, understandings, pacts, contracts, and other working arrangements currently obtained. These include agreements at every level of the organization, of every clique and coalition and include covert as well as overt agreements. (pp. 5–6)

The negotiated order approach "emphasizes the construction of organizational culture, through analyzing how workers create the meanings that are embedded in routine organizational activities" (Fine, 1984, p. 247).

This tradition analyzes how people organize themselves to accomplish work "by the book" and how they "freelance at work" by negotiating informal working arrangements within a given organizational structure (Fine, 1984). This orientation was a response to criticisms of formal understandings of how people work. The negotiated order theorists believed that traditional explanations were at odds with how people actually negotiated and put into place informal understandings of how to do their work. Documenting these arrangements is a hallmark of organizational ethnography. No organizational sociologist is surprised when people state one set of official procedures for working while in actuality following others. In Melville

Dalton's (1959) *Men Who Manage*, for example, workers consistently bypass "onerous" regulations through shadow administration. These informal systems of administration exist to distribute unofficial rewards to valued executives, to forgo safety requirements, and to stave off disputes between union and management. The interaction order and negotiated order approaches demonstrate that consensus can be a mirage and an apparent community just a temporary illusion. For example, people can comply with a rule, but that does not mean that they always will or even that they actually support the rule though they abide by it. People can camouflage inappropriate intent and action while still appearing to comply. Someone can conform 10 times and then act against the rule a different day or help someone else resist an imposed rule. An apparent rebel, a tough government investigator, or a union member can be a double agent secretly in cahoots with management. Not all workplaces bubble over with minor intrigues, but they are also not full of norm-driven robots who perform like marionettes.

People work to get others to do things that they do not want to do, or that are not in their interest, and pass off those requests as being in the mark's interest. People will encourage others to follow rules and state why doing so is important, even though conforming may not actually be good for that individual, and the cajoling person avers complying himself or herself (Goffman, 1983, p. 5). We all can recognize the criticism inherent in the adage "Do as I say and not as I do." As a result, inquiring how long systems of managing people last and why they do not collapse under the burden of some noncompliance are great questions. The largest analytic issue at hand, though, remains appreciating the complexity of organizations, which all have stable routines and little pockets of resistance in them, some of which is in the organization's interest, and some of which is not.

A good analytic approach enables us to peer behind the appearance of stolidity in organizational routines and rules to try to make sense of the Machiavellian machinations of all levels of employees that occur in the backstage. The dramaturgical approach to organizations acknowledges that level of organizational underlife (Goffman, 1963). The coexistence of conformity and autonomy and resistance to conformity is an acknowledged part of working. People can feel committed to the organization's purpose, and other times subvert that purpose by freelancing or converting organizational resources and aims to personal use. Straightforward rules and maxims that mean to be helpful in understanding how organizations work are, unfortunately, sometimes unrealistic depictions of the complexity in how organizational life unfolds.

Manning (2008a) observes,

Goffman's aim is to show how situated constraints work on actions whatever their setting. The moral constraints on "rational choice," on "gaming" or any strategic analysis errs because it does not begin with (a) the moral meanings imputed to action prior to the first move, (b) the fundamental inequalities produced by the unequal distribution of resources prior to action, (c) constraints that do not inhere in the rewards at issue—the investment of moral stakes in the actions undocumented in the formal schemata. Thus, organizational "rationality" cannot be explicated from the actor's point of view outside practice-based exchanges. (p. 681)

Individual agendas, moral or otherwise, are not inherent in formal procedures. People's actions inject them into routines, and they are only visible when they affect and alter action and when the interactional level is examined. The interaction order, as a pattern of interaction, has significant meaning at the individual and structural levels. For example, the repeated patterning of interviews as auditions for opportunity helps determine life chances for individuals, and at the same time, they constitute a gatekeeping structure that restocks occupations and professions. The interview process is vulnerable to corruption, as some interviews are gamed to produce a preordained yes or no. At other times, the interview process is the fairest medium for a winner to emerge for an open position. The interview process reflects particular "enabling conventions" and rules that govern how they are to work as a social practice, and they organize how "traffic" of a particular meaningful social interaction flows. The interactional approach can then address two important analytic inquiries: (1) How do involved participants structure and present the meaning of their work and record to others? (2) How do organizations attempt to control the interpretation and nature of organizational work? Individual and organizational interests can align or diverge in these interactions.

People have two kinds of identities: categoric and individual (Goffman, 1983). A categoric identification involves placing "a person into one or more social categories," while the individual form of identification refers to how a subject "under observation is locked to a uniquely distinguishing identity through appearance, tone of voice, mention of name or other person differentiation device" (Goffman, 1983, p. 3). In workplaces, people are embedded within a preexisting categoric identity as a worker of a particular rank and nature. Whatever identity distinguished you as a particular individual before is now enmeshed in the organizational or work category to which you belong. In extreme cases, for example, such



as becoming a prison inmate, your individual identity is minimized. For example, you are to act in the category of prisoner and obey that new reality and the rules of incarceration that diminish problematic individuality. Public projections of self tend to be suited to the circumstances and frames prevailing around individuals.

Consider other basic examples. When people join an organization, they gain and are usually instructed in a repertoire of actions to enact as part of their work. They receive an ID or uniform or hear how they ought to appear in their new role. They are asked to identify with an organization's purpose, and being employed suggests that they have committed to that position. They walk into a set of coordinated activities across teams that precede them, whose importance to the organization is recognized through orientation and training to familiarize the new employees with them. Put back into a dramaturgical sense, workplaces supply people with fronts, appearances, manner, routines, and teams, and we can research those organizational features analytically (Manning, 2008b).

In general, people are creatures of the contexts that surround them. If an individual sees herself or himself as being a different person than the persona he or she is to exhibit, that internal judgment matters to him or her. But the external manifestation of self marks what other human beings treat as "real" and what they act toward. Divergent private feelings inside our head can make us feel like individual islands, but the personas we manifest count as the external self, in so far as living in society is concerned, in that observable persona is the one that receives social contact. A waiter can know in his own head that he is a great actor and that he is just working a "day job" for now, but what the world knows is him in the category of being a waiter.

In nonfiction performances, the situation tying together the audience and interaction precedes the self in defining a situation that then paves the way for a presentation of self. Here the interaction order intersects with social structure. Put more at an individual level, a stage and purpose must exist to then structure an act and its consequent personal meanings. Consider a value like saving face. The "face" to be saved or stripped away is held hostage by an audience. A person can think what they want as an individual, but the social identity of the person exists outside of them. Face is not self-defined but belongs as a measuring in the situation around the person. Further, when people enter situations, they save not only their own face, but that of their team and their organization.

In this regard, impression management has deep connections to administering and completing work. For example, in a study of management

consultants, "performance was central to the training as clients' perceptions of (name omitted), and therefore future sales and revenues, depend entirely upon employees' performance at the client site" (Poulter & Land, 2008, p. 72). Again a duality exists in employees adopting the persona needed to conduct official work well, while also trying to preserve some independent identity. People must learn the ropes during training, but they may also want to avoid complete overidentification with the organization. Some role distance is helpful for maintaining sanity. A company can pay for time and emotional labor, but people may not want organizations to truly own their inner self to the point of remaking the individual over completely (Poulter & Land, 2008, p. 74). A little cynical distance offers a buffer to keep people, as anthropologists say, from going completely native.

By adopting the mien of an actor, and consciously *performing* in accordance with expected forms of behavior, employees are able to project the appearance of a competent, enthusiastic and professional employee requisite for a successful career, whilst also sustaining a sense of self outside this game of appearances. (Poulter & Land, 2008, p. 67)

## Asylums and Secondary Adjustments

In *Asylums*, Erving Goffman (1962) examined how organizational structure affects people's behaviors. He developed concepts of *secondary adjustments* and the *underlife* of organizations. He acknowledges that

the official doctrine according to which an institution is run may be so little honored in practice, and a semi-official perspective may be so firmly and fully established, that we must analyze secondary adjustments relative to this authorized-but-not-quite-official system. (p. 193)

His model of secondary adjustments is a concept intended to help capture the duality of formal rules and individual adjustment to the imposition of rules.

Goffman defines secondary adjustments as "any set of habitual arrangements by which a member of an organization employs unauthorized means, or obtains unauthorized ends, or both, to get around the organization's assumptions as to what he should do and get and hence what he should be" (Goffman, 1961, p. 189). Secondary adjustments also can be unauthorized or unofficial means to complete work, all while

sustaining the pretense of meeting an organization's assumptions of how employees are supposed to work. An organization also can use secondary adjustments to complete work, while maintaining an official facade that misleads outsiders about what real organizational activities actually are.

Secondary adjustments recognize and thus reveal a hidden infrastructure within organizations and their administrative and social processes. Individuals may manipulate and convert resources to their own ends by subverting rules or amend obstructive rules to do better work. That some secondary adjustments are also in an organization's interests can be a public and legal problem to cloak, as countless concealed government initiatives demonstrate. Secondary adjustments are responses whose purpose is to thwart particular rules governing behavior, whether for individuals or organizations. How secondary adjustments are functional, and cloaked, is a legitimate subject for analysis, particularly for those interested in white-collar crimes. Organizations take their own steps to increase discipline and to legitimate selective worker practices and unofficially tolerate others. The social control of secondary adjustments is complex. This strategic minuet between worker and manager captures the complex dance between the organizational member seeking autonomy and the manager seeking control (Goffman, 1963). Goffman also distinguished between an individual's activities and the organizational landscapes in which secondary adjustments take place:

An individual's use of secondary adjustment is inevitably a social-psychological matter, affording him gratifications that he might not otherwise obtain. But precisely what someone gets out of it is not the point—what is crucial is understanding not what the practice brings the practitioner, but what the character of the social relations are that its acquisition and maintenance require. This constitutes a structural, as opposed to a consummatory or social-psychological point of view. (pp. 200–201)

Goffman urges people to focus on the social relations that create and sustain particular kinds of impression management. An individual's secondary adjustments, in combination with the secondary adjustments of other organizational members and their cumulative effects, make up the underlife of an organization. Goffman (1963) metaphorically compares the organizational underlife to the role that an underworld has in a city. He argues that there are technological, political, structural, and cultural components to analyze in organizations, to which he adds the fifth of dramaturgical. He then shows how these different aspects are intertwined and that dramaturgy cuts through them all.

## The Dramaturgical Infrastructure

In a previous book, I developed a conceptual framework called the *dramaturgical infrastructure* to describe the relationship between impression management, administration, and organizational structure (Shulman, 2007). I developed this framework to address deceptive behavior in organizations, but the framework also applies to studying nondeceptive impression management inside organizations. Deceptions are a subcategory of impression management, but whether deceptive or nondeceptive, people still confront similar situations where they must perform credibly. You can perform in different ways, truthfully or dishonestly, badly or well, but you will have to perform. In social life, as in the theater, the show must go on.

People participate in many “shows” at work. They have to fake or produce the right impressions legibly to others, gain access to and operate within different backstages, be familiar with and competent to manage role conflicts to avoid spoiling their own identities or those of others (unless they want to), and be invested in rationalizing work-related activities and attitudes. People try to look good at work and appear to embody desirable social characteristics if they do not authentically hold them. If they have those features, then they must be able to perform them convincingly enough to an audience in order to make them legible, so they can receive credit and rewards for them.

All kinds of variability must be accounted for in examining impression management. A person’s gender, race, assigned work, and place in the hierarchy all influence how they are expected to act at work and what starting points they face in managing the assumptions made about them. A person’s external resources, such as money, allies, and experience, also can affect what quality of performances a person gives. Does someone have the resources to fake an air of sophistication or access to superiors or to dress the part? Everyone’s desire to embody social characteristics that are prized in the workplace culture structures how people work. People also will act deceptively to meet these demands in the workplace.

Scholarship on impression management requires more than just describing how people act—attention must focus on the results those actions produce. Impression management is a powerful determinant of workplace activities and structural outcomes, more so than people conventionally acknowledge. Impression management can play a crucial role

in organizational outcomes such as determining who gets ahead, how well someone sells a product, and whether people get caught breaking important rules. The argument on which this framework is based is that a strategic dance exists between the structural or workplace demands for particular appearances, the subsequent impression management by workers to produce credible performances to respond to those demands, and the results that emerge as an organizational product based on those performances.

As implied in the interaction order concept, a predictable set of expected interactions inside a social structure constitutes an infrastructure that people must operate within to accomplish organizational work. The individual dramaturgy involved in working life can be traced out to administrative processes and their outcomes in organizations. This framework organizes different domains of impression management in workplaces based on Goffman's dramaturgical model and divides the workplaces into four dimensions, each containing a required form of performance.

The first dimension, *authentication and credibility practices*, refers to establishing a credible persona effectively. The second dimension, *subterranean education and shadow organizations*, focuses on hidden, informal, irregular, or unofficial means of administering organizational activities. The third dimension, *managing identity and role conflicts*, involves secondary adjustments to move up and resolve role conflicts and turf battles between people. The fourth dimension, *ethical disengagement*, investigates legitimating deviant, frowned upon, deceptive, or illegal actions that may occur at work. The above domains are neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive. They represent an initial conceptual and theoretical foray into mapping out significant areas of workplace impression management.

The first dimension of *authentication and credibility practices* emphasizes exploring how people construct convincing impressions, sometimes incorporating deception in doing so. How do people maintain a facade of working when they are goofing off? How do they convince others during interviews that they possess sought qualities? Authentication and credibility practices reference a microsociological level of analysis that examines how people produce what appear to be authentic impressions. The idea here is to consider what tactics people use to construct convincing performances, sometimes of lies and sometimes of truth, in ambiguous circumstances. Vince Lombardi once said, "If you are not fired with

enthusiasm, you will be fired with enthusiasm.” How do people appear engaged when they are unenthusiastic? How do they force on their smiles? How does a quiet person learn to appear like an active go-getter? How do people demonstrate that they are team players so that others “get” that they are team players? All of these impressions require appearing authentic and convincing to others.

The second dimension, *subterranean education and shadow organizations*, connects secondary adjustments, the organizational underlife, and the negotiated order tradition in organizational ethnography. These aspects build on Goffman’s organizational analysis in *Asylums*. How people exchange information, advance their careers, use secret means of managing and administering, or break rules to accomplish their work requires a subterranean education and constitutes a shadow administration of work. Here is where workers obtain hidden means to actually do their work and where going “by the book” meets roadblocks that informal arrangements bypass.

Work experience familiarizes us all with examples of how people fight, instruct others, exchange covert information, pursue better jobs, and break rules to complete work. Unofficial information builds into all of these kinds of actions and constitutes a backstage, subterranean education. A subterranean education represents an instructional and practical immersion in the right kind of background knowledge to engage in impression management that suits an organization’s required appearances. Performances and teams can form in shadows to manage backstage aspects of organizational administration.

The third dimension addresses *managing identity and role conflicts*. People must use impression management to confront and manage the role conflicts that inhere in organizations. Whereas authentication and credibility practices reference an actor’s actions toward himself or herself, the managing of identity and role conflicts refers to managing mutual interactions. People confront different dramaturgical pressures that others thrust on them, to pick sides, to abandon one responsibility for another, to soothe hurt feelings, or to isolate a troubling person. These situations exist throughout the workplace.

One such conflict occurs when supervisors ignore rule breaking by coworkers who are their friends instead of enforcing the organization’s rules. People must address conflicts associated with different expectations in their workplace roles and sometimes hide noncompliance with one side of the conflict. For example, a worker may think that a decision

to implement a new policy is idiotic, but he or she will appear to assent happily to the policy implementation in a meeting and then work to that end. Working consensus is paramount.

The last dimension, *ethical disengagement*, addresses how people overcome moral inhibitions against disreputable actions. This category references rationalizing untoward impression management. A crucial workplace phenomenon is that individuals and organizations attempt to disown any moral responsibility for acting against situational propriety. Ethical disengagement addresses how people overcome those inhibitions. Identifying rationalizations that individuals and organizations use in their mutual and sometimes competing efforts to disown engaging in deceptive behaviors is a growing area of research interest. Researching why moral inhibitions fail in concrete circumstances and identifying social influences that effectively counter guidelines to act ethically and responsibly is important.

In *Asylums*, Goffman identifies social processes that institutions use to transform an individual's identity into an impersonal organizational one. In his article "Symbols of Class Status," Goffman (1951, p. 303) writes about how legitimate holders of status symbols try to protect them from being appropriated by impostors; hence they develop "curator groups" to help maintain the machinery of status. Goffman clearly recognizes structural incentives that influence adopting techniques of impression management, but he did not always choose to identify and analyze them in his writings. The dramaturgical infrastructure maps out the range of performance arenas that people engage in at work. Workers must use impression management to appear legitimate and competent in their occupational and professional roles (Abbott, 1988; Hughes, 1984). Impression management requires demonstrating desired attributes and concealing undesirable ones. People fake competence strategically to try to appear legitimate. Workers may act deceptively to exclude information that threatens a legitimate appearance while substituting rosier information in its place. Socialization into organizations is often training in learning what impressions are most useful. Later this information informs how individuals pursue upward mobility, as success is based in part on appearances and putting on a facade that reflects organizationally desirable personality traits (Bosk, 1979; Jackall, 1988). Workplaces constitute a social system that demands outward shows of appearance from individual workers. Total institutions constitute the most controlled setting for such presentations.

## Total Institutions

As a microsociologist, Erving Goffman did not research organizations as groups, such as analyzing operations at an industry level. He did examine how organizational contexts impact individual interactions, most prominently in his analysis of a mental hospital in his book *Asylums*. Goffman coined the term *total institution* to refer to organizations whose operations take steps to exert a nearly complete control over people's activities under their power. Examples of such institutions include mental hospitals, military institutions, and prisons. As will be noted in the section on emotional labor that follows, organizational contexts help dictate what emotional displays on the part of inhabitants are considered appropriate. However, total institutions move beyond managing the emotions of others to the complete resocializing of inhabitants of total institutions. A prison is to rehabilitate and help deter future crime, a military organization takes new recruits and makes them soldiers, and a mental hospital takes in the mentally ill and hopes to return them to outside society in an improved state.

Goffman noted that total institutions force people to live together in batches. These organizations process people such that they cannot carry out individual activities autonomously. Instead, people inside total institutions do not control their actions, movements, and schedule anymore. What people can wear, how they are addressed, their freedom of movement, and their activities are under organizational control. Goffman examined how people were socialized into this form of control and their attempts to engage in small acts of resistance, which he labeled as "adjustments," against the organization's encroachment over their autonomy. Goffman, using an asylum as a field setting, saw the subordinating interactions that people experienced there in vivid action.

Moving from the asylum setting, the total institution can be considered today as an organizational "ideal type" in the sense of describing a particular organizational form under which people are subject to an inordinate amount of controls (Scott, 2011). Consider the variety of such controls. They include the spaces people can enter; what they can do there, and when they can do so, occurs on a tightly controlled schedule; there is control over daily privileges, constant surveillance, and procedures of degradation that ensure dissenters lose individual status. People who work for the organization manage the process of resocializing occupants into the new batch identity common to the total institution. The staff is an agent of social control over those that inhabit the total institution.



The total institution is a type of organization that may strike people as a threat to freedom. However, some total institutions can be held to operate in the social interest. Some total institutions benefit some against others, and perhaps in cases like hospitals, a total institution may serve the interests of all. A hospital controls occupants for the end of healing. Boarding schools control the actions of its charges to ostensibly socialize their development as the next generation of elites, and some religious institutions have monastery-like total institutions that build religious adherents and staff to spread, in their view, prosocial values. Total institutions teach socialization and appropriate impression management to their occupants. A total institution is an overt arbiter of interaction. Individual choice and freedom of behavior are impeded, and orchestrated performances emerge that fit the institution's goals. Refusals to comply are punished. Goffman was interested in uncovering how people attempt to resist control. A key point for organizational analysis then is to examine ways to control the performances of people under organizational sway and, in response, how people resist. Some techniques of control include bribing. Or people assimilate or face an escalating series of punishments. Reduced individual autonomy in the organization includes speaking only when spoken to, wearing a uniform rather than the individual choosing clothing, and picking one's own schedule.

Think back to how some people experience high school as an institution that aims to control impulsive youth and put the clamp down on rebels. Some people embrace the system of control and prestige that comes with going along with the system, while others find rewards in nonconformity. What is clear in the situation is a war exists over the stakes of what identity people will have within the organization. Sometimes organizations win that war; sometimes a wayward identity wins in being insubordinate and finding work-arounds or rebellion. Goffman coined a number of useful concepts to describe the processes through which organizations fight to control the identity of a captive population.

*Role dispossession* is the process through which new "recruits" are prevented from being who they were in the world they inhabited prior to entry. *Trimming and programming* describe steps involved in a new denizen being "shaped and coded into an object that can be fed into the administrative machinery of the establishment, to be worked on smoothly by routine operations" (Goffman, 1963, p. 16). Personal artifacts that highlight a person's individuality or personal identity, referred to by Goffman as an identity kit, disappear within total institutions. Authorities confiscate

or forbid personal items that lend themselves to a divergent identification other than what an institution establishes. Shaming occurs, as do degradation ceremonies that punish people before others by humiliating them. "Privilege systems" exist that reward conformity, some of which pit occupants against one another. For example, one tradition is to punish a group of innocents when a guilty party does not come forward, which then depends on individuals to betray one another or turn on each other for the institution's interest. As an organizational type, the concept of the total institution opened inquiries into forms of social control inside coercive institutions and efforts by occupants to resist that imposition through making secondary adjustments.

Susie Scott (2011) has advanced on the total institution concept by examining what she calls the modern version of the total institution, the *reinventive institution*. A total institution is considered to resocialize an individual self into a new batch identity that suits the organization's purpose. A *reinventive* institution is an organization that a person chooses to commit oneself to in order to be reinvented into an organizationally sponsored identity, typically one that markets a reinvented identity to occupy. In a total institution like a prison, people are inmates who are involuntarily placed in that institution and controlled. In reinventive institutions, which can involve a much larger range of organization, Susie Scott notes that people voluntarily commit themselves to pursue the new identity on offer—they want to throw away an old me and suit up a new self. Scott insightfully sees the reinventive institution arising to match today's new era of people pursuing self-development schemes on offer by organizations. Examples of reinventive institutions include religious and spiritual communities, military academies, secret societies, therapeutic clinics, educational enrichment institutions, and virtual institutions (Scott, 2011). In a DIY era, people are not going alone in their self-reinvention. They are met with a marketplace that supplies institutions that enable them to resocialize and "reinvent their selves" on demand.

Goffman's total institution has an authoritarian air of making the inhabitants comply through various control schemes. In a reinventive institution, people opt in, and that shared commitment to a new identity links the inhabitants of the reinventive institution in a chain of mutual social control. Scott (2011, p. 6) uses the term "performative regulation" to describe how inmates monitor and sanction each other's behavior by sustaining a shared belief in the institutional reality, which they enact

dramaturgically. Individuals learn both to present themselves as ideal inmates, doing conformity and seeking to appear committed, and to appraise each other's claims to authenticity, evaluating their progress in relative terms. Where the total institution imposes its power, the reinventive institution involves people choosing to have power imposed on them. They collaborate with their peers in controlling themselves and their ongoing interpretation of their self's "journey."

So what kinds of organizational experiences are on hand here? Time spent in weight loss clinics and "fat" camps, conversions to cult religions and living styles and new age communities, entry into specialized academic communities like music conservatories, and sending a child to a military school. Presumably, any form of specialized batch living qualifies where a common identity and transformation are sought with the willing assent of inhabitants. The key transformation of the individual is not only a process of top-down social control by the heavy hands of the institution. Instead, fellow pilgrims judge the person's commitment to the new identity and his or her progress along the way and help construct the joint reality of the new self being forged in the experience. A person joins a fraternity and becomes an observer of the commitment of others and himself to the new identity.

A person who seeks to have the reinvented self has a new crew to learn from and with, about how to interpret what one feels and how to stay and know that one is on the right path to the new organizationally sanctioned version of self that they seek. Interpretive experts come to rate one's commitment and progress along the ways of the belief system in highly hierarchical reinventive institutions like quasireligious ones, while in other forms like month-long retreats, people are there to prop up the meaning of the "journey" to each participant. The total institution enforces an external dramaturgical self. The reinventive institution involves exerting self-control with the prompting of other committed actors to engage in getting people to believe that they have reinvented themselves.

## Emotional Labor

Work on displaying emotions is a key development from Goffman's dramaturgical model. The focus on studying emotions in action as displays to others is often sited physically in workplaces, hence the inclusion of that subject in this chapter. Arlie Hochschild pioneered the growth of

this subfield of sociology drawing on the notion of acting contained in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*.

Drawing on Jonathan Turner's (2009, pp. 340–354) review of dramaturgical theories of emotion, Arlie Hochschild (1979, 1983) is lauded for extending Goffman's early work by conceptualizing the role of emotions in social situations. People live in cultures "composed of emotion ideologies about the appropriate attitudes, feelings, and emotional responses in generic types of situations" (Turner, 2009, p. 345). We all understand that there are expectations that dictate what emotions people should display in situations. Hochschild researched how people in certain occupations, like flight attendants, are required to present particular emotions while on the job. This work was identified as *emotional labor* or *emotion work*, particularly if they must perform emotions that they do not actually feel but must depict to do their jobs, such as service with a smile.

Hochschild developed the ideas of deep and surface acting to distinguish variety in people's emotional displays to others and to draw analytic attention to what people feel when they manifest different or intense emotions. In *surface acting*, people perform an emotion without actually trying to authentically feel that emotion internally. They demonstrate the emotion on the surface in their presentation, but they do not actually feel that emotion. When *deep acting*, people actually try to summon up emotions internally to feel an authentic connection with the emotional part they play. Organizations pay for and regulate performances by employees that involve surface acting. With deep acting, people really try to summon up the feelings so as to be authentic (Grandey, 2003). The connection between surface and deep acting built on Goffman's work and also highlighted a new issue, which is the dissonance people feel when asked to demonstrate feelings that they don't actually feel. What burnout can result from being inauthentic or too superficial over time?

Impression management in general also requires managing emotions, as people must abide by feeling rules, whether due in part to the interaction order or other influences, that dictate what emotions they must demonstrate publicly in certain situations (Hallet, 2003). People should cry at funerals, be happy at celebrations, be angry at insults, and laugh at jokes. People, through emotion management in workplaces, "essentially recreate and reaffirm the appropriate expectations for that role through their interactions with others" (Lively & Weed, 2014, p. 205).

People use strategies to display proper demeanor and emotions. That work also involves authentication practices. Think over some strategies

you might have seen people use. People adopt pouty postures and depressed-looking body language. Other people use energetic, go-getter movements. Sometimes people try to think of something sad in order to cry. People will practice expressions in the mirror to capture the right look to communicate the right impression. Modeling is a case where people who have what Ashley Mears (2011) called body capital are supposed to manifest particular looks. Some are never to smile in pictures, and others are to summon up whatever emotion is necessary to connect with a product's image. Thinking back to childhood, or socializing a child, we can remember incidents where parents cajoled the child to approach events with the proper solemnity or exuberance. People learn quickly that they are supposed to make their face the right kind of canvas to avoid trouble with authority. Few smart alecks completed school without hearing some scolding along the lines of "wipe that smirk off your face."

When social settings urge people to feel things that they don't feel and hide authentic feelings, a discrepancy emerges between actual feelings and feeling rules (Thoits, 1996). Peggy Thoits and other sociologists noted the importance of researching social situations where these discrepancies occur. In role conflicts, people may have to put on one face when they would prefer to wear another. Parents have encountered putting on a more serious demeanor at a child's infraction when they actually find the violation that they are punishing more amusing than not, such as when a child swears but mangles the swear word into a comedic work of art. More severe situations occur where people are asked to support political viewpoints that they do not believe in or have belief systems and things that they take seriously that others do not. People may hide their discomfort at encountering prejudice and "hold it all in" because of situational circumstances. If stress involves frustration in being annoyed, blocked, or helpless to change something, that discrepancy can arise from not being able to feel what one wants to feel or in having to feel in public in ways that are not felt authentically. The more people are thwarted emotionally in this way by social situations, including at work, the unhappier they are.

Research on emotional labor and interactive service work (Hochschild, 1983; Leidner, 1993) demonstrates that a worker's emotional performance, whether in an airplane, insurance office, or restaurant, is part of a service landscape in which organizations deliver their products. Employers pay for certain emotional displays that are key to work. As Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) note, emotions can be control moves meant to improve

the employer and employee's situation by influencing others, no matter whether the involved emotions are authentic or inauthentic.

Display rules govern the forms that emotional displays take, and scholars of emotions in the workplace are keen to connect such displays with financial returns to the bottom line. A sociological point here is to examine how social situations call for some to control the emotions of others. This point was relevant in Goffman's work, for example, in cases like managing the emotions of inmates in total institutions or in quelling the irate victims of confidence schemes.

People use many different means to incite emotion in others. Lights, music, and smells can elicit emotions such as candlelight dinners or "make-out" music. People try to offer sympathetic displays to deflect anger toward them. In workplaces, people may go through training to simulate and stimulate examples of required surface acting on the job. The idea here also may be that the more people simulate the emotion, the more they might condition themselves to actually begin to authentically feel that emotion. Certainly the area of therapy is a rich forum for such simulations where people are asked to role-play or confront provocations or triggers that target emotional responses. People may be asked to organize their bodies in ways that summon up feelings like hugging, violating norms of personal space, trying to smile, and touch. Thoits (1996), in addition to identifying some of the above actions, also identifies venues where emotion management is used for various organizational purposes, such as military training, love bombing, and hazing—in her analysis targeting the emotions of others is a classic social strategy at hand in courts, meetings, and other occasions (Thoits, 1996, p. 106). Transforming recruits into aggressive people and humiliating people in rites of passage are socially functional examples of organized management of others's emotions to make them conform.

Many workplace products also involve emotional performance, whether in a doctor's display of professionalism, a professor's capacity to reach students, or a river-rafting guide's "aren't we having fun" demeanor (see Arnould & Price, 1993). The emotional labor of workers plays a major part in determining the productivity of services marketing, sales, and workers (Grayson & Shulman, 2000). Turnover in the workplace is also linked to burnout from burdensome emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983; Leidner, 1993). Excessive demands for emotional labor from ethnic and racial minorities (don't speak so "ghetto") and/or women ("just smile, honey") also constitute forms of gender and racial inequality.

A key issue in studies of emotional labor and deception in service provision is the successful construction of a false emotional reality. A good work product may require convincing deep or surface acting. There are many occupations for which convincing lying as one's emotional labor is vital. Undercover police officers must dupe suspects. Professional wrestlers are deeply engaged in the project of crafting collaborative convincing emotional displays as heels or heroes and in expressing pain and righteous revenge without seriously harming one another, if they can avoid doing so (Smith, 2008).

Patwardhan, Noble, and Nishihara (2009) researched emotional labor by workers at call centers based in India that was outright deceptive. They found that employees in many Indian call centers are trained to use Western names and accents because Western customers accord more trust to identities that seem familiar. For scholars interested in exposing techniques of deceptive emotional labor, this study is an informative read. As a start, Patwardhan et al. (2009, p. 321) noted that all agents use pseudonyms for names. They identified four types of deceiving in these call centers. Two were subtle, such as asking customers about whether they were baking cookies around the holidays and pronouncing words consistent with existing practice in the country in question (Patwardhan et al., 2009, p. 322). The company's goal, considered crucial to success, was to convince clients that service agents were not calling from India. Legitimizing that deception meant that the employer had to actively support employees lying as a normal part of their work.

The call center example is a deceptive one that involves surface acting and "appearing American." Yet many companies depend on a more benevolent form of Trojan wholesomeness, in which a self-interested profit motive obscures itself within a sweetened facade. Projecting the innocent wide-eyed wonder of a Disney princess or the emotions of a character in the park is an example. Other professions are intended to serve up plates of compassion as their main course of work. Those displays need not be fake and may well be felt sincerely. However, acting authentic still means that the resulting emotion is a product built up and shaped to best serve clients.