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Abstract

Background: Recently, studies have found that more and more teachers in Hong Kong express negative feelings toward their work, such as feelings of dissatisfaction, exhaustion, meaningless and powerless. These negative emotional experiences may affect both their well-being and the quality of their teaching. In order to have a better understanding of this phenomenon, researchers employ the sociological concept of emotion management. Therefore, this paper reviews different sociological perspectives on the phenomenon in order to give recommendations for educational reforms and policies and for further research on teachers’ emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong.

Aims or focus of discussion: This article considers two major sociological approaches to understanding emotion management in teaching: conflict theory and symbolic interactionism. At the end of the discussion, implications for educational reforms and policies and recommendations for further research are suggested respectively.

Arguments/comments/suggestions: The article argues that symbolic interactionism is a more appropriate approach to understanding emotion management of teaching than conflict theory because it considers the effects of both structural conditions and teachers’ agency on teachers’ emotions. Thus, it may provide a more comprehensive and realistic account and framework for our investigation.

Conclusion: The article suggests that we should study teachers’ emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong from a symbolic interactionist perspective of emotion management of teaching. Accordingly, we should try to answer the following questions: What are teachers’ expectations about their work? What are the conditions of their work? Are there gaps between their expectations and reality? What are the constraints that affect the realization of their expectations? What emotions do they actually experience at work? In order to answer these questions more effectively, this article recommends adopting in-depth qualitative methods of investigation.
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教學的情緒管理：衝突論和符號互動論

曾國權
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摘要

背景：近年，不少香港教師經常感到不開心、不愉快，這些負面情緒不但影響他們身心健康，而且還會影響他們的教學質量。為了更有效地了解這一現象，不少研究者運用了情緒管理此一社會學概念進行研究。所以，本文希望通過回顧和審視不同社會學理論對這一概念的理解，從而為日後的教育改革和政策的制定及未來有關香港教師的情緒經驗的研究提出一些提議。

目的或討論焦點：本文主要集中討論有關教師的情緒管理的兩大社會學理論：衝突論和符號互動論。在討論了這兩大理論對教師的情緒管理的理解後，本文提出有關於教育改革和政策及研究的建議。

論點／評論／建議：本文指出，相對於衝突論，符號互動論對教師的情緒管理的理解更為合當。原因是符號互動論同時考慮到教師的能動性和社會結構對教師在工作中的情緒經驗的影響，所以它更能為我們提供一個更為全面的分析架構及研究思路。

總結：本文建議，研究者在研究香港教師的情緒經驗時，應採用符號互動論而非衝突論作為分析架構。因此，我們需要考慮：教師對工作有什麼期望、教師的工作狀況是怎樣、教師的期望和現實有什麼差距、有什麼結構性的因素使教師難以實踐他們的期望、教師在工作中實際感受到什麼情緒等。為了更有效了解這些問題，本文認為日後的研究可以多採用質性研究方法。

關鍵詞：教師的情緒管理、衝突論、符號互動論
In recent decades, the Hong Kong education system has experienced a lot of reforms. These reforms have brought a variety of critical changes in the education system. One important consequence of these changes is that teaching seems to have become a less enjoyable and rewarding occupation. Many studies report that more and more teachers in Hong Kong express negative feelings toward their work, such as feelings of dissatisfaction, exhaustion, meaningfulness and powerlessness (Cheng, 2009; Choi & Tang, 2011; Ko, 2000; Lai & Lo, 2007; Sweeting, 2004). These negative emotional experiences are not only harmful to teachers’ psychological well-being (Cheng, 2009; Lee, Tsang & Kwok, 2007), but also affect the quality of their teaching (Day & Lee, 2011; Hargreaves, 1998a; Schutz & Zembylas, 2009). Thus, it is necessary for us to pay attention to this phenomenon.

Traditionally, educational research on teachers’ emotions has been dominated by the field of psychology (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003) because emotions have been regarded as being related to psychological factors such as personality, coping strategies, and emotional intelligence (Zembylas, 2003). However the large number of teachers who have been found to be unhappy and dissatisfied suggests that negative emotional experiences in teaching goes beyond individual factors and has become a social issue. In this sense, it is necessary to study teachers’ emotional experiences at work from sociological perspectives (Zembylas, 2003). In the sociological literature, the concept of emotion management is widely used to investigate the emotional lives and well-being of employees (Wharton, 2009). Therefore, this sociological concept may empower us to understand the pattern of Hong Kong teachers’ emotional experiences at work.

Consequently, the purpose of this article is to review two sociological perspectives on emotion management of teaching—conflict theory and symbolic interactionism—in order to put forward implications for educational reforms and policies and recommendations for further research on Hong Kong teachers’ emotional experiences at work. The reason to focus on these two perspectives rather than others is that they are primary perspectives influencing many sociological works of emotions (e.g., Burkitt, 1997; Collins, 1981, 1990; Fineman, 1993; Hochschild, 1983; Rosenberg, 1990; Scheff, 1990; Shott, 1979; Toh, 1990; Tolich, 1993; Turner, 2007). Therefore, studying these perspectives will be beneficial for us to understand and explore teachers’ emotional experiences at work. Although some researchers may prefer to examine teachers’ emotional experiences with other updated sociological theories such as post-structuralism (e.g., Zembylas, 2005, 2011), their central arguments actually are similar to, and even identical to, that of conflict theory, i.e., emotional activities of teachers are subject to external control resulting in teachers’ negative emotional experiences. Therefore, this article will incorporate these studies into conflict theory in order to make the structure of paper more coherent.

This article will first discuss the perspective of conflict theory on emotional management of teaching and then the perspective of symbolic interactionism. After the discussions, the implications for educational reforms and policies and the recommendations for further research will be addressed respectively in the conclusion.

### Conflict Theory

Conflict theories argue that a society is composed of distinct groups with conflicting interests pursing
scanty resources. In order to obtain the resources and maintain their privileges, the dominant groups will use both direct and indirect means to oppress the disadvantaged groups. According to this perspective, teachers are regarded as the disadvantaged group controlled by the dominant groups in the education system, such as the government, politicians, school administrators, and even parents (Apple, 1982; Ball, 1988; Harris, 1982). These dominant groups try to oppress or exploit teachers through controlling the labor process of teaching. For example, they may define what and how teachers should teach in schools by establishing a national curriculum and public examination, providing prepackaged curricular materials (e.g. textbook), developing an accountability system, and centralizing the decision-making process of educational policy or school-wide policy (Apple, 1982, 1986; Ball, 1994; Bowe, Ball, & Gold, 1992; Bray, 1999; Connell, 1995; Mok, 2003; Robertson, 1994). As a result, teachers may lose their control over their labor, including their emotional activities at work. In other words, they may be required, and even forced, to display or perform particular feelings in the workplace. This kind of emotion management is called emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983).

In fact, emotional labor is common for frontline service workers in post-industrial societies because they are often required by companies to manage and display particular emotions for profit making (Hochschild, 1983). For example, flight attendants are required by their employers to keep smiling and show warmth toward consumers since smiling and warmth are the selling points of the airlines (Hochschild, 1983). Under such conditions, workers are not able to exercise control over their emotional activities since their emotions are the commodities of the companies (Hochschild, 1983). As a result, workers’ genuine feelings and emotional displays may be separated (Hochschild, 1983). This separation of feelings from emotional displays can contribute to emotional exhaustion and self-estrangement, which are the sources of workers’ negative emotional experiences at work (Hochschild, 1983; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Lewig & Dollard, 2003; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Zerbe, 2000).

Recently, educational researchers have argued that teachers in Hong Kong have become similar to frontline service workers because of the educational reforms. Teachers have had to respond to the demands and needs of students and parents as educational consumers (Chan, 2010; Mok, Wilding, Chan, & Tse, 1998; Tse, 2005). Their subordinate position may force teachers to perform emotional labor (Hebson, Earnshaw & Marchington, 2007). Therefore, the conflict theory of emotion management has attracted the attention of educational researchers (Tsang, 2011).

From this perspective, the first question we need to ask is: who control teachers’ emotional activities? Although no supervisions or organizationally defined rules concerning teachers’ emotions are found in the literature (Tsang, 2011), it does not mean that teachers have the freedom and autonomy to feel and express their emotions in the workplace, because they are subject to certain feeling rules governing their emotions (Zembylas, 2002). Generally, these feeling rules require teachers to “control emotions of anger, anxiety, and vulnerability, and express empathy, calmness, and kindness” in schools (Zembylas, 2002, p.201). More specifically, Winograd (2003, p.1652) identifies five feeling rules of teaching:
1. to love and to show enthusiasm for students;
2. to be enthusiastic and passionate about subject matter;
3. to avoid the display of extreme emotions like
anger, joy and sadness;
4. to love their work; and
5. to have a sense of humor and laugh at their own mistakes and the peccadilloes of students.

To some extent, these feeling rules relate to teacher professionalism. This is because if teachers cannot manage their emotions appropriately according to the rules, they will be treated as unprofessional (Zembylas, 2002, 2005). To avoid being seen as unprofessional, teachers need to regulate their emotions defined by the rules. Emotional labor may thus become an important component of teaching (Zembylas, 2002).

If teachers need to perform emotional labor, the second question we need to ask is: what are the consequences of emotional labor of teaching? According to the perspective of conflict theory, the nature of emotional labor is alienating. In other words, emotional labor of teaching tends to arouse teachers’ negative emotional experiences. The ethnographic studies of Zembylas and his colleagues (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2006; Zembylas, 2004a, 2004b, 2005) provide some evidence for the argument. According to them, emotional labor of teaching may result in teachers’ feelings of frustration, guilt, and shame, which in turn damage teachers’ identity, confidence and self-esteem. For example, a teacher may dislike or even hate a student whose academic performance is bad or whose misconduct is serious. However, the teacher needs not only to suppress the negative emotions, but also to show love and care to the student because of the feeling rules (Winograd, 2003; Zembylas, 2002). The suppression of negative emotions may create further negative emotions for teachers, such as guilt, regret, and shame, because they may think that it is inappropriate or even immoral for them as teachers to dislike or hate students (Hargreaves, 1994; Hebson et al., 2007; O’Connor, 2008). In addition, teachers may also feel emotionally uncomfortable or self-estranged, because their displayed emotions do not correspond to their true feelings (Hu”lsheger, Lang & Maier, 2010; Philipp & Schu”pbach, 2010). Both conditions may affect their professional identity and self-esteem, which in turn creates other intense negative emotions like depression (Hargreaves, 1998a; O’Connor, 2008). Other studies also suggest a similar conclusion regarding the relationship between emotional labor of teaching and the emotional outcomes of teachers at work (Çukur, 2009; Hu”lsheger, et al., 2010; Na¨ring, Bric”t & Brouwers, 2006; Philipp & Schu”pbach, 2010).

On the other hand, some recent studies have provided evidence against the conflict theory perspective on emotion management of teaching. For example, the studies conducted by Chen and Hsu (2011), Hebson, et al. (2007), O’Connor (2008), Oplatka (2007), Winograd (2003), and Yuu (2010) found that teachers may feel satisfaction, excitement, and even self-fulfillment when they successfully manage their emotions at work. The findings imply that conflict theory’s assumption that emotion management of teaching is alienating and self-estranging may be inaccurate (Hebson, et al., 2007). Hargreaves (1998a) notes that the mistake of conflict theory is that it overemphasizes the exchange-value of emotion management and overlooks its use-value, which is love and care. Because of the disregard of the use-value, conflict theorists have not recognized the positive functions of emotion management for teachers and teaching.

More importantly, conflict theory tends to neglect teachers’ agency. Helsby (1999) illustrates that teachers are reflexive agents, who can independently
and reflexively interpret, judge and decide what they should do and how they do their work in schools. In other words, emotion management of teaching may not be necessarily forced labor. Instead, it may be a voluntary practice (Oplatka, 2007). For instance, Yuu (2010) shows that Japanese teachers may choose to display anger to students, even though they are not angry, because they think such emotion management is an effective means to control students and help them concentrate on learning. Oplatka’s (2007) study on Israeli teachers’ emotional experiences also suggests that teachers may unconditionally express and show their love and care to students, because the emotional displays are meaningful and valuable for them to develop relationships with students and to foster students’ growth.

In other words, if we want to learn about teachers’ emotional experiences at work more accurately, we should recognize teachers’ agency: the capacity to interpret, evaluate, and make meaning of their work, and the capacity to take actions based on this interpretation, evaluation, and meaning-making. As a result, the perspective of symbolic interactionism on emotion management of teaching may be helpful to investigate teachers’ emotional experiences at work.

### Symbolic Interactionism

The general concern of symbolic interactionism is how social actors interpret social interactions and make meanings of self and social context. Accordingly, sociologists view social actors as reflexively and actively regulating their feelings and displays based on their understanding about the self and situation (Charon, 2010). This means that social actors will try to regulate their emotional activities in order to confirm their expectations about their roles and behaviors in a given social context, or to fulfill their perceived requirements of the social context and interaction which they participate in (Turner & Stets, 2006). Therefore, emotion management is viewed as a social practice referred to as emotional practice (Denzin, 1984). From this perspective, researchers suggest that emotion management of teaching is emotional practice rather than labor (Hargreaves, 1998a, 1998b).

If teaching is an emotional practice, how does this practice affect teachers’ emotional experiences at work? According to Turner (2007), a basic principle is the convergence/divergence between expectations and reality. According to symbolic interactionism, social actors will reflexively interpret and define a situation where they locate and thus form certain situational expectations about: with whom they will interact, in which position in the situation they are placed, what expected behaviors they and others need to perform, and what they have to give and what they can gain (Turner, 1999). Generally, if they think their expectations are realized in reality, it is likely that they will probably feel positively or at least not negatively; otherwise, they may feel negatively (Turner, 2007). In this sense, if managing emotions helps teachers to achieve what they expect or value at work, emotion management of teaching may contribute to positive emotional experiences; otherwise, it may arouse negative emotional experiences.

Accordingly, we need to know what expectations teachers have about their work. Many studies have found that teachers regard teaching as an occupation in which they can develop a good relationship with students and facilitate students’ learning, development and growth (Hargreaves, 1998b; Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2006; Lortie, 1975;
Such expectations make them willing to carry out instructional and educational tasks, such as class preparation, classroom teaching, and interaction and communication with students (Hargreaves, 2003). Teachers may also unconditionally show their love, care, passion, and humor while carrying out the tasks (Oplatka, 2007; Yuu, 2010). This is because such emotional expressions may not only help them to develop relationships with their students, but also motivate their students to learn or enjoy learning.

Moreover, teachers may also expect a professional status or authority from teaching. In his classical study, Waller (1932) demonstrates that teachers, through the authority of the school and classroom, generally expect students to be subordinate to them. Lortie’s (1975) ethnographic study also indicates that some teachers choose to teach because they think of teaching as a profession like law and medicine. Recently, Hargreaves (2001) finds that many teachers hope to maintain their professional status and power in their social relations with students, colleagues, and communities. To achieve these kinds of expectations, teachers may display anger and resentment to students in order to make the students afraid of them and respect them (Waller, 1932); they may also be emotionally neutral, or suppress strong emotional expressions, especially negative ones, in front of colleagues and parents in order to maintain their professional status and image (Hargreaves, 2001).

However, it may be becoming difficult for teachers to achieve these expectations because of educational reforms (Kelchtermans, 1996, 2005). First, the educational reforms tend to reduce teachers’ autonomy and control over their work through bureaucratization of school administration. For example, Pang (2002) found that, in Hong Kong, the schools which implement School Based Management (SBM) exhibit more bureaucratic values like rationality, goal orientation and formality. Such bureaucratization of school administration implies an increase in administrative control over teachers’ work on the one hand, and a decrease in teachers’ autonomy on the other (Ingersoll, 2003). As a result, it may be difficult for teachers to design and decide what they should do and how they should teach in schools.

In this situation, they may become vulnerable and powerless to refuse to do extra and unexpected non-teaching or administrative duties like documentation, report writing, paperwork, after-school activities, and school public relations, which they do not value (Apple, 1986; Ball, 2003; Harris, 1994; Smyth, Dow, Hattam, Reid & Shacklock, 2000). At the same time, the time available for instructional and educational duties, which they prefer and value, may be reduced by non-teaching and administrative duties (Ball, 2003; Hargreaves, 2003; Smyth, et al., 2000). In such a situation, teachers may experience a divergence between their expectations and the reality. Consequently, they may feel dissatisfaction, frustration, guilt, shame, exhaustion and self-blame because they may perceive themselves as bad teachers who are incapable of taking care of students (Hargreaves, 1994, 2003), or because they think they spend too much time on meaningless and purposeless duties (Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; O’Brien & Down, 2002).

In addition, as we have mentioned above, educational reforms tend to transform teaching into service-like work (Mok et al., 1998; Tse, 2005). This may make it difficult for teachers to receive and maintain professional status and autonomy at work because the public tends to devalue and
disregard teachers’ professionalism (Apple, 1982). For example, parents often complain about and criticize the teaching approaches or methods that teachers employ, but teachers cannot express their feelings of unhappiness and dissatisfaction regarding these complaints and criticisms since the parents are their consumers (Bowe et al., 1992; Lasky, 2000). Therefore, many teachers feel they are deprofessionalized in this way and dislike interacting with parents (Lasky, 2000). Moreover, teachers may feel their professionalism is being questioned and demeaned by the public because they are blamed for many things and many inspections are imposed upon them (Apple, 1982, 1986; Ball, 1994). The sense of being distrusted may lead to teachers experiencing certain negative emotions like frustration and disappointment (Hargreaves, 2003; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996). Furthermore, more and more students do not respect or recognize teachers’ school and classroom status and authority (Chang, 2009). If teachers try to regain the status and authority in the teacher-student relationship, the confrontation and conflict between them and students may increase, which in turn may affect the teacher-student relationship. This dilemma may cause teachers to feel dissatisfied and exhausted.

To summarize, from the perspective of symbolic interactionism, emotion management of teaching is not forced labor. Rather, it is an emotional practice that creates emotional experiences for both teachers and those with whom they interact. Teachers engage in emotional practice because they believe the practice may help them to achieve what they value and expect from their work, such as good relationships with students, taking care of students’ learning and growth, and professional status and autonomy. However, the current educational reforms create certain structural conditions (e.g. bureaucratization of school administration and intensification and devaluation of teachers’ work) constraining the achievement of the expectations. This may become the source of teachers’ negative emotional experiences at work.

Conclusion

In this article, we have discussed two major sociological perspectives on emotion management of teaching. On the one hand, conflict theory portrays teachers as the disadvantaged groups exploited and oppressed by the dominant groups in the education system, as a result of which they lose their control over their labor process, including emotion management at work. Therefore, they are forced to display particular feelings and emotions in the workplace. Accordingly, emotion management of teaching per se is alienated labor, so performing the labor will bring negative emotional outcomes.

On the other hand, symbolic interactionism argues that emotion management of teaching may not necessarily be alienating because teachers have the capacity to choose how to feel and how to display their emotions at work based on their interpretations and expectations concerning their work. In other words, they may engage in emotion management when they think managing emotions will help them to achieve what they expect from work. If their efforts help them to achieve their expectations, they will feel positively about their teaching; if not, they will feel negatively. However, the current education reforms tend to create many constraints upon the expectation fulfillment. This should be the source of teachers’ negative emotional experiences at work.

According to the above discussion, it is argued that from the symbolic interactionism on emotion management of teaching, it may be more
appropriate for us to study teachers’ emotional experiences at work. This is because the perspective recognizes the effects of both structural conditions and teachers’ agency on teachers’ emotions. As a result, this perspective allows us to explore teachers’ expectations and interpretations about their work, the structural conditions of teachers’ work, and the effects of teachers’ expectations and the structural condition on their emotions. To some extent, this perspective may provide us with a more comprehensive and realistic account and framework to study teachers’ emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong.

**Implications for Educational Reform and Policy**

In the light of symbolic interactionism, the major reason for teachers’ negative emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong may be that the current working condition of teachers is unfavorable for teachers to fulfill their expectations because of the recent educational reforms. For example, more and more teachers in Hong Kong feel that they have to spend more times on administrative duties like documentations and paperwork and thus fewer times on instructional and educational duties during the educational reform period (Brown, 1997; Cheung & Kan, 2009). Some teachers also perceive that their professional status and authority are being threatened by educational reforms and policies such as Quality Assurance Inspection and Language Benchmark Assessment (Lai & Lo, 2007; Tse, 2005). Thus, if we want to improve teachers’ emotional experiences at work, our educational reforms and policies need consider the “soul and heart” of teachers (Ball, 1999; Hargreaves, 1997). That means they should create a situation that increases, or not decreases at least, the opportunities for teachers to achieve their expectations. It is not to say that the education system has to unconditionally accommodate to teachers’ will, especially those unreasonable expectations, such as high salary but no responsibility. However, if our teachers expect more time and space for instructional and educational works, it is reasonable to facilitate them to achieve the expectations. For instances, the Hong Kong educational policy-makers may minimize teachers’ administrative duties through increasing school administrative staff who are responsible for administrative works and reducing the administrative and bureaucratic procedure of school internal and external reviews and inspections.

In fact, the above suggestions are general rather than specific, because we lack enough understandings about the pattern of teachers’ emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong. Thus, we need to enhance our understandings about the teachers’ expectations and interpretations about their work and working contexts, the structural conditions of their work, and the effects of the expectations, interpretations, and structural conditions to their emotional experiences through empirical studies. As a result, some research recommendations are going to be proposed as the follows.

**Research Recommendations**

Accordingly, investigation into teachers’ emotional experiences at work needs to consider the questions: (1) Why do teachers choose to teach? (2) What do teachers value and expect to achieve from teaching? (3) What are the expected working conditions and teaching duties among teachers? (4) What is the reality concerning the work and working conditions of teachers in the eyes of the teachers themselves? (5) What are the structural conditions
of teachers’ work? (6) Do teachers perceive their expectations about their work as convergent or divergent from the reality? (7) Which emotions do teachers often experience at work and why?

In-depth qualitative studies will be particularly helpful in answering these questions because qualitative methods allow us to have a deeper understanding about teachers’ mindsets, values and expectations as well as the contents and contexts of teachers’ work. Such research may help us to learn what teachers are doing in schools, what they expect from their work, how they interpret their working conditions, and which emotions they experience at work and why. Indeed, various qualitative methods can be employed depending on the research purposes. For example, if researchers want to understand the pattern of teachers’ emotional experiences at work throughout their careers, they may use the life history method (Goodson & Sikes, 2001); if researchers want to learn in detail how teachers feel in particular school settings, they may use participant observation or the case study method (Merriam, 1998); if researchers want to access teachers’ emotional experiences at work in a broad range of settings (e.g. different types of schools), they may interview teachers who come from different school settings (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1995). Nevertheless, it does not mean that quantitative data is irrelevant for investigation. This type of data will be valuable if it is used to determine the distribution of the expectations, working conditions, and feelings among the teaching population in order to assist in the exploration and interpretation of the qualitative findings (Creswell, 2009).

It is worth noting that research on teachers’ emotional experiences at work needs to consider teachers’ age, gender, and teaching experience, because the literature demonstrates that these factors are the mediators of teachers’ emotions (Kelchtermans, 2005). Teachers of different ages, genders, and teaching experience may have different duties and positions in schools and different expectations and interpretations about their work (Choi & Tang, 2009; Hargreaves, 2005; Lortie, 1975; Sikes, 1985). Moreover, we should also consider the effects of school demographics. In Hong Kong, teachers may teach in very different types of schools (e.g. government schools, aided schools, private or direct subsidy scheme (DSS) schools; schools with different religious backgrounds - Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Taoism, no religion or others; schools ranging from band 1 to band 3 - band 1 schools are the best while band 3 schools are the worst) (Adamson & Pang, 1999). To some extent, the working conditions of each school type may be different. The differences may also influence teachers’ emotional experiences at work. As a result, research should select informants or cases for investigation with purposive sampling technique. This sampling technique may help in maximizing variation of cases and in identifying the information-rich cases for study in depth (Patton, 1990). In this way, it will be possible to develop a better sense of the phenomenon.

To summarize, we should inductively and qualitatively study teachers’ emotional experiences at work in Hong Kong. This kind of investigation will provide us with thick descriptions about teachers’ school lives and experiences. Through these thick descriptions, we will not only obtain a relatively clear and comprehensive understanding about what teachers’ work and school lives should be, but also develop propositions and identify the patterns of teachers’ emotional experiences at work. Such findings will contribute to our understanding.
and further investigation into the phenomenon of teachers' emotional experiences at works.

References


Acknowledgement
I wish to thank Dr. Dan Wang, my supervisor, because she gave me many insightful and meaningful advices when I was writing this paper.

Author
Kwok Kuen TSANG, Ph.D. candidate
Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong
Room 102, Hoi Oi Chow Science Building, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
[gkk1212@hku.hk]

Funding source of article: HKU

Received: 26.6.12, accepted 5.8.12, revised 15.8.12.