

Acquiescence to Criticism: The Meaning of Emotions in the Multidimensional Evaluation of an Academic Teacher's Work

Beata Pawłowska

University of Lodz, Poland

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.22.3.03>

Keywords:

Academic Teachers;
Emotions;
Emotional Labour;
Acquiescence
to Criticism;
Assessment

Abstract: Emotions play a central role in the professional work of every employee, shaping interactions and cooperation. In the work of an academic teacher, they can build motivation to work and influence the perceived satisfaction and self-esteem (pride), although they can also strongly contribute to burnout and demotivation (shame, fear). Interactional situations in which an academic teacher finds themselves arouse certain emotions and create the need to manage them. The work of an academic teacher is constantly assessed, which influences self-assessment. Strong rivalry and competitiveness make it necessary to develop mechanisms for managing emotions to deal with criticism, work through failures, and adjust the level of one's own ambitions to institutional requirements. The article is based on qualitative research embedded in the interpretative paradigm, conducted with academic teachers. It presents their self-protection strategies developed in response to the continuous criticism and evaluation of their work, demonstrating that the idea that performance evaluation does not hold in contemporary realities. Employee evaluation, along with excessive bureaucratization and a neoliberal mode of management, contributes to the demotivation of academic staff.

© by the author, licensee Lodz University—Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Funding Information: This work was supported by the Interdisciplinary Research Grant, University of Lodz, under the "Initiative of Excellence—Research University" (IDUB-UŁ), Decision No. 3/IGB/2022, project "Engagement and Exhaustion as (Un)Expected Outcomes of the Emotional Labour of Academic Teachers," Project Code: B2311813000200.07. **Conflicts of interest:** None. **Ethical Considerations:** The author assures that no violations of publication ethics have occurred and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication. **The percentage share of the author in the preparation of the work is:** BP 100%. **Declaration regarding the use of GAI tools:** No GAI tools were used in the preparation of this work.

Received: 2026-02-06 Verified: 2026-04-20 Accepted: 2026-06-15



Beata Pawłowska is an Associate Professor of humanities science in the field of sociology. A sociology and psychology graduate (specializing in Human Resources Management [HRM]). She works at the Department of Sociology of Organization and Management, Institute of Sociology, Faculty of Economics and Sociology, University of Lodz. She is a member of many research teams and a post-graduate Lecturer in coaching, HRM, and Public Relations. A researcher of organizational culture currently focused on emotional behavior(s) within the professional context, including educational environment Her research interests focus on the sociology of emotions, the sociology of work, and the sociology of organization and management. Most of his research is conducted using qualitative methods, including grounded theory, within the interactionist paradigm. She has authored several books, among others, *Network marketing. Kulturowe i osobowościowe wyznaczniki uczestnictwa w Amway* [Network Marketing. Cultural and Personality Determinants of Participation in Amway] (2011, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Lodz, ISBN: 978-83-7525-600-0); *Emocje społeczne w pracy nauczyciela i przedstawiciela handlowego* [Social Emotions in the Work of Teachers and Salesmen] (2013, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Lodz, ISBN: 978-83-7525-312-2) and *Praca nauczyciela w perspektywie badacza jakościowego. Mity a rzeczywistość* [Teacher Work from a Qualitative Researcher's Perspective: Myths and Reality] (2020, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Lodz, ISBN: 978-83-8220-185-7; e-ISBN 978-83-8220-186-4).

@ beata.pawlowska@uni.lodz.pl

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8335-9040>

The work of an academic teacher is commonly recognized as highly demanding and embedded in a complex set of professional expectations. It demands a broad range of competencies, understood as a configuration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Król 2006:86). These competencies cover subject-specific and general knowledge; behavioral competencies concern effective conduct and communication; leadership competencies relate to managing staff or students. Emotional competencies are particularly wide-ranging, encompassing empathy, enthusiasm, forgiveness, optimism, self-confidence, educational authority, the ability to build interpersonal relationships, a sense of social justice, trust, and familiarity with student culture (Madalińska-Michalak and Górska 2012:124-135). Together, these define describes as the full competency profile of the academic role. Academic work additionally requires creativity, the ability to make swift decisions, manage

stress, withstand criticism, and effectively organize time, set goals, and pursue them.

Academic teachers in Poland, who are most often employed in combined research and teaching positions, are therefore expected to meet highly diverse and often competing criteria to function effectively. On the one hand, they act as educators who work with young adults and impart up-to-date knowledge. On the other hand, they function as researchers who pursue their own research agendas, engage in analytical work, publish research results and reflections, and contribute to the development of new theoretical and methodological concepts. All of this is undertaken in a context of relatively low societal recognition, frequently accompanied by remuneration that does not exceed the national average.

Academic work is also subject to continuous, multi-level evaluation. Academic teachers, like

most employees, undergo periodic performance assessments conducted at Polish universities every four years. In addition, both academics and the institutions in which they are employed are subject to a research audit, in which individual scholarly activities may directly influence the scientific category assigned to a given organizational unit. Within this framework, scientific and creative achievements, research potential, and the practical impact of research activities are taken into account (see Dz.U. 2018 poz. 1668 Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. – Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce [Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1668, Act of 20 July 2018 – Law on Higher Education and Science]).

Beyond formal procedures, academic teachers are also continuously evaluated by students, colleagues, and superiors. The products of their work—such as articles, books, and textbooks—are assessed and multiple peer reviewed. By disseminating their research, academics are additionally exposed to secondary forms of evaluation, as each publication made available online may generate further commentary. Conference presentations likewise involve not only the demands of public speaking but also critical feedback and assessment of their work. These evaluative pressures are further intensified during professional advancement, where a single review can decisively shape a career trajectory, all within a broader context of intensified competition and rivalry.

It is, therefore, unsurprising that repeated and multi-level evaluation can exert a strong influence on the looking glass self and, consequently, on self-evaluation. In order to deal with criticism, process both minor and major failures, and adjust their aspirations to institutional requirements, academic teachers are required to manage their emotions effectively, engaging in emotional labor and develop-

ing emotional competencies. Emotions experienced and aroused in the course of their professional work shape interactions and patterns of cooperation. While they may foster work motivation and influence perceived job satisfaction and self-esteem, including feelings of pride, they may also contribute to demotivation and burnout, evoking emotions such as shame, embarrassment, fear or anxiety¹.

Numerous studies emphasize the role of employees' emotions as a factor influencing job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, burnout, and turnover intentions (Pawłowska 2013, 2020a, 2020b; Cho et al. 2017; Edgerton et al. 2024). In recent decades, academics in Poland and elsewhere have experienced substantial changes in the nature of their work. These changes include an intensification of teaching and administrative duties, growing publication pressure, increased competition for research funding, and heightened job insecurity, particularly among those in the early stages of their academic careers (see Berlant 2011; Barcan 2013; Halfman and Radder 2015; Gill 2018). In the literature, these phenomena are commonly described as the intensification of academic work (Kinman 2014; Edgerton et al. 2024).

Moreover, engaging in invisible work may significantly impact an individual's emotional well-being, as while it is expected by university administrations, it is absent from formal employee evaluation systems and career advancement (Gordon, Willink and

1 Fear and anxiety are often treated as synonymous, but "fear is associated with a real, here-and-now threat, while anxiety is associated with one whose source lies in our mind" (Krzysztofowicz 2017:113). Fear is always triggered by a specific threat here and now, while anxiety is not specific; it is formless. When experiencing anxiety, we know we are afraid of something, but we cannot define their essence or pinpoint its exact cause. Because this state is long-lasting and does not dissipate quickly like fear. Anxiety can impact our daily life.

Hunter 2024). Thus, these institutional shifts have adverse consequences for academic well-being, with the literature documenting rising levels of occupational stress, a deterioration of work–life balance, and an increased risk of burnout. Burnout is understood as a constellation of symptoms encompassing emotional exhaustion, cynicism (or depersonalization), and a reduced sense of professional accomplishment (Demerouti, Mostert and Bakker 2010:211).

The present article seeks to describe the emotional labor inherent in the work of academic teachers in the context of continuous and multifaceted evaluation of their professional activities. It shows how events interpreted by individuals as success or failure shape the emergence of specific emotions, such as pride, satisfaction, and joy, as well as embarrassment, shame, anger, frustration, fear, and anxiety. These emotions, in turn, may affect job satisfaction and the effectiveness of their work. The analysis also indicates that dealing with criticism is inherent to academic work, contributes to the construction of professional identity and self-identity, and is socialized during the early stages of academic careers. The article examines emotions elicited in response to institutional demands, systemic requirements, and organizational frameworks, focusing specifically on the role of emotions when working in academia. Emotional labor serves as the analytical backdrop for the discussion of coping strategies, including the circumvention of institutional requirements as a means of maintaining congruence with the self.

Research Methodology

The analysis presented below is based on research conducted as part of the IDUB Interdisciplinary Research Grant implemented at the University of Lodz, entitled *Engagement and Exhaustion as (Un)*

Expected Effects of the Emotional Labour of Academic Teachers (decision no. 3/IGB/2022, project code: B2311813000200.07). The project aimed to reconstruct the emotional experiences of academic teachers, including their emotional labor in individual, interactional, communal, and organizational contexts. Underlying this exploration is the premise that emotional labor carries significant consequences for the development of academic teachers' subjectivity, both positive (constructive) and negative (destructive and degrading). Thus, while such labor can foster self(trans)formation and (self)reflection, it can simultaneously drive the affective marginalization of the teacher's subjectivity and the erosion of their agency (see Górska 2022).

The research project was embedded within the tradition of interpretative and critical research (Konecki 2005; Urbaniak-Zajac 2008) and was primarily oriented towards the exploration and reconstruction of academic teachers' emotional experiences. The main empirical data collection technique involved in-depth, semi-structured interviews, also referred to as "in-depth ethnographic interviews" (see Konecki 2000:169). The study was conducted with 17 academic teachers from the social sciences, comprising ten women and seven men employed at eight Polish universities. The respondents' professional tenure varied, ranging from 10 to 37 years. The interviews were carried out between April and July 2025 by four researchers (project team members) in the form of online meetings via MS Teams. All interviews were recorded and transcribed, which enabled the "ordering of chaotic or overlapping statements" (Silverman 2012:187). Subsequently, initial coding, focused coding, and theoretical coding were applied (see Charmaz 2009:60-64), which revealed patterns that emerged directly from the empirical material (see Glaser and Strauss 1967).

The qualitative approach adopted in the study made it possible to “*address issues that go beyond what is objective and measurable, thus enabling engagement with problems related to evaluations, values, and lived experiences*” (Bauman 1997:56), which is highly relevant to this article. The semi-structured interview is characterized by a general and modifiable outline of thematic issues around which the conversation with the respondent is structured (cf. Przybyłowska 1978:63; Babbie 2004:327). The questions focused on areas of knowledge in which respondents felt at ease. Crucially, all interviews fell within the scope of qualitative “active interviews” (Holstein and Gubrium 1997), in which the participating teachers were active contributors who co-constructed the narrative. The interview was understood as a “*social event in which the interviewer is a participant observer*” (Hammersley and Atkinson 2000:161), creating an open atmosphere conducive to obtaining comprehensive, in-depth responses and accounts of emotional experiences (see Hammersley and Atkinson 2000; Konecki 2000; Pawłowska 2013). The average interview lasted 1 hour and 26 minutes.

The analysis revealed several categories, including job satisfaction, subordination, empowerment, engagement, emotional exhaustion, emotional competencies, authority, pseudo-relationships, emotion management, and—of particular relevance to this article—emotional labour, acquiescence to criticism, the employee as an instrument, and enforced competition. These categories were operationalized multidimensionally. With regard to the concept of receptivity to criticism examined in this article, four analytical dimensions were distinguished: acceptance of others’ legitimate right to express criticism, openness to receiving critical feedback, willingness to engage in reflexive consideration of critical remarks, and—most importantly—emotional toler-

ance of criticism, understood as the degree of emotional discomfort experienced in response to critical evaluation. More generally, acquiescence to criticism is conceptualized as the degree to which an individual accepts the possibility that their views, actions, or behaviors are being evaluated and critiqued by others, while remaining willing to listen to and reflect upon that feedback.

The second component of the research project was evocative autoethnography (Borowska-Beszta 2009; Bielecka-Prus 2014; Kacperczyk 2014). However, because this analysis is ongoing, this method was not utilized for this article.

The chosen data collection methods enabled access to the private, intimate, and often shielded emotional experiences of teachers related to their work and interpersonal relations within academic institutions. The semi-structured interviews proved to be the most appropriate technique for collecting data on emotions in the workplace. The only difficulty encountered lay in coordinating the interview schedules to ensure participants had sufficient time to provide detailed and in-depth accounts. These interviews not only provide participants with an opportunity to recount their own experiences but also enable researchers to capture the nuanced ways in which individuals construct meaning around their work and the emotions associated with it, integrating these experiences into their identities and everyday lives (see Bonfanti, Cannito and Naldini 2025).

Emotions in Professional Work

The study of emotions remains an important area of inquiry across many academic disciplines, including sociology. Aristotle defined emotions as “those things that bring about a change in the human con-

dition that impairs judgment" (2001); since then, they have been understood as states that regulate individuals' actions, behaviors, and decisions. Contemporary cognitive approaches view emotions as processes arising from a specific interaction between an individual and their environment (Lazarus 1991), triggered by rewards or punishments, and their accompanying context (Rolls 1999). Emotions are described as processes that "*establish, maintain, change, or interrupt the relationship between the individual and the environment in matters of importance to the individual*" (Campos et al. 1994:285), and they serve to create and sustain social relationships (Pawłowska 2013:14). In this article, emotions are understood as complex narrative structures comprising a story that includes somatic and affective events as well as plans of action (Shweder 2002:42).

To analyze emotions in professional work, it is important to examine how these emotions are interpreted and expressed through membership in the professional group of academic teachers. Consequently, emotions are defined from the perspective of the interactional paradigm, which conceptualizes feelings as emergent experiences shaped by social factors (see Pawłowska 2013:49). Within this paradigm, several theoretical approaches to emotions can be distinguished; for this analysis, the focus is restricted to three of them.

First, exchange theories conceptualize society not as a static structure, but as a dynamic network sustained through ongoing transactions. Each individual is driven by the pursuit of profit, understood as the acquisition of greater or more valuable resources than those relinquished. When individuals succeed in this pursuit, positive affective states emerge; when they fail, negative affective states arise. Positive emotions are associated with increased motiva-

tion and a greater willingness to participate in social life, whereas negative emotions are linked to frustration and apathy (see Pawłowska 2013:49, 2020a, 2020b).

Second, dramaturgical theories emphasize the metaphor of the individual as an actor, others as an audience, and the social world as a theatre. Actors perform roles in accordance with a given script, directing their behavior in ways that are shaped primarily by the emotions they evoke and/or experience (see Goffman 2006, 2008).

Third, theoretical approaches focused on the construction of individual identity and self-concepts conceptualize these as regulators of behavior. Through action, individuals strive to maintain a positive self-concept (Turner and Stets 2009:174-176). Emotions thus belong to social interaction and activate processes of emotional role-taking. A distinction can be made between emotions that require role-taking, that is, the adoption of another person's position and perspective, and emotions that do not require the presence of another (whether real or imagined, concrete or generalized). Emotions that do not involve role-taking include anger, fear, and joy, whereas emotions requiring the definition of another's role include embarrassment, shame, guilt, pride, and vanity (see Shott 1979:1321-1324; Scheff 1990, 2000).

The expression and suppression of emotions occur in culturally accepted and socially prescribed ways (see Wisecup, Robinson and Smith-Lovin 2006). As Kemper (2005:73; see also Kemper 1991) notes, it is the social setting of the individual that determines which emotions are expressed at a given time and place, on what basis and for what reasons, through which means of expression, and by whom. Emo-

tions, although generally considered subjective states experienced by individuals, should therefore be reconstructed in relation to the actions and social processes in which actors are involved (cf. Pawłowska 2013, 2020a, 2020b).

Emotional Labor

Originally introduced to sociological literature by Arlie Hochschild (1983, 2009), emotional labor functions here primarily as a contextual framework for the analysis. This labor is closely linked to professional roles and institutional emotion rules, which are the socially accepted norms and expectations governing employees' conduct. Individuals actively manage their emotions to align their demeanor with the demands of their professions. Emotional labor involves suppressing or evoking specific emotions to maintain the expressions and displays that elicit appropriate responses in others. As Turner and Stets note, "emotional labor will be most visible where people confront emotional ideologies that contradict their actual feelings and where social rules require them to express emotions they do not feel" (2009:53). Emotional labor encompasses not only displaying (or feigning) emotions adapted to workplace rules, but also altering emotional engagement, actions, and the management of experienced emotions, understood as working with emotions.

It occurs at two levels. The first is surface acting, defined as using facial expressions to convey the emotions deemed suitable for a given situation, regardless of the individual's actual feelings (see Hochschild 2009:7,41-42,54; Pawłowska 2013:68; Kępińska-Jasny 2014:54). This constitutes an external action where the individual modifies emotional expression while concealing their genuine emotions. The second level is deep acting, understood as in-

tentionally altering one's own feelings so that they become congruent with the appropriate emotional expression (see Hochschild 2009:7,42-47,54-56; Pawłowska 2013:68; Kępińska-Jasny 2014:54). Deep acting occurs when an individual seeks to alter the feeling itself, its cognitive interpretation, or the evaluative process that gave rise to the emotion, as well as basic physiological elements such as muscle tension or heart rate (Kemper 2005:80). Deep emotional work involves "changing experienced emotions by adopting a specific way of interpreting a situation. This is internal work, in which the individual ultimately comes to experience the desired emotions and expresses them. This expression is natural; it is not a mask worn for the purposes of a given interaction, but an internally experienced emotional state" (Pawłowska 2013:68).

When discussing emotional labor below, the term is used in its broader sense to encompass both *emotional labor* (within the organizational environment) and *emotional work* (relating to the private sphere) (Kępińska-Jasny 2014:54) and to work with emotions.

Evaluation as a Source of Affective Practices

As indicated in the introduction, academic teachers experience both successes and failures in their professional work. In managing their emotions, they engage in what are referred to here as affective practices (see Wetherell 2012; Nycz 2014:9-10). The concept of affective practice emphasizes human activity and negotiation, intertwining subjective experiences with the social organization of affect. It may be analyzed both in terms of individual feelings and emotions and as shared patterns of emotional action (Wetherell, McConville and McCreanor 2012:13-14).

An integral dimension of academic work is the experience of ubiquitous criticism, which the analysis identified across several distinct areas. Emotions experienced in response to criticism across different domains of academic activity form a continuum, shaping various defense mechanisms to protect the self. Acquiescence to criticism constitutes one of the analytical categories distinguished in this study. It is discussed here in relation to two areas of academic teachers' professional activity: the publication of scholarly articles and employee evaluation, together with the closely related parametric evaluation of universities. This acquiescence is a broader category that also encompasses the evaluation of conference presentations (with emotional labor beginning as early as conceptualizing the presentation and submitting a conference proposal), the evaluation of teaching by students (which is particularly salient given the relatively low weight accorded to teaching in employee assessment), and the evaluation to which academic teachers are subjected when deciding to undergo promotion procedures. In each of these cases, teachers—compelled by external regulations as well as by personal beliefs, desires, and ambitions—submit to criticism, knowingly consenting to the emotional and identity-related exposure of the self. A category closely related to this acquiescence and to the evaluation of academic teachers' actions is that of "consent to exploitation" (undertaking unpaid activities, heavy service workloads) (see Edgerton et al. 2024). Due to its complexity and its links to organizational-level practices, this issue is not addressed in this article.

Employee Evaluation – a Demotivating Motivator

In discussing the consent to criticism within the evaluation of academic work, it is necessary to refer to individual employee evaluation. In Polish uni-

versities, this assessment regime is closely linked to faculty publication output and institutional research audits. Like other forms of employee evaluation, it is intended to motivate action, intensify effort, and increase work efficiency. However, as one respondent noted:

The more they try to motivate us to act, the more they actually demotivate us. [R2]

The evaluation criteria, review procedures, and administrative instruments trigger intense emotions, prompt informal "corridor" discussions, and shape various publication strategies. Academic teachers in Poland are formally assessed every four years across three main areas: research, teaching, and organizational activity. Organizational activity includes service to the university, institutional promotion, committee participation, administrative roles, conference attendance, and outreach activities. The scope of these organizational criteria varies by university. Meanwhile, the primary criterion for teaching activity is fulfilling the minimum required teaching load². The most significant element of the evaluation concerns research activity, including high-scoring publications (a phenomenon commonly referred to in the Polish academic community as "punktoza" ("pointosis," "points-mania"), the management of research projects, and securing research grants.

The sharp imbalances between these evaluated areas create significant complications. In practice,

² The teaching load refers to the mandatory number of instructional hours a faculty member must deliver per academic year. At most Polish universities, these loads are tiered based on academic rank and title. For research assistants and assistant professors, the requirement is 230 hours per academic year, whereas for professors (associate professors and full professors), it is reduced to 200 hours.

teaching is barely evaluated; course preparation, delivery, and individual mentorship remain largely irrelevant within the system. Organizational activity is similarly marginalized. Consequently, teaching and education—one of the university's fundamental missions—is not reflected in the objectives and criteria of employee assessment. As one respondent observed:

Generally, this is precisely what is paradoxical. On the one hand, it's fine, because we are in a research and teaching position, so this is in a sense the most important thing. It's just that no one pays attention to the teaching aspect. It is also difficult to evaluate, and it is equally important. [R11]

The evaluation system shapes job satisfaction and entails emotional labor, while simultaneously generating opposition and provoking resistance among academic staff. It is not the evaluation itself that generates resistance, but rather the manner in which it is conducted and the criteria that govern it. The close connection between employee assessment and the requirement to produce publications valued at over 100 points³ leads to the perception of the regime as oppressive and unreliable. One experienced

academic with over 30 years of tenure described the current system as follows:

Well, when I started working at the university, there were three groups of employees: some focused primarily on teaching, others focused primarily on research—treating teaching as a necessary evil—and others focused primarily on organization, for example, on fulfilling their functions and so on. What has changed since then is that today, what is expected, especially from research and teaching staff—because here too we would have to differentiate—is the status of the individual groups and the resulting consequences. But I'll focus now only on the group of employees employed in research and teaching positions: that we are expected to be simultaneously excellent researchers, excellent teachers, and excellent organizers. And, of course, we are also expected to obtain funding for research activities. Yes, well, well, that's part of this scholarly evaluation. And now, what's easily observable is the greatest importance placed on research activities. That is, if you fill the slots, and those slots are still highly scored, then everything is fine. Yes, you can be there, I mean, you can meet the minimum requirements in terms of teaching and the minimum requirements in terms of organization. But what makes it okay is that there's a tilt, you know, towards an overemphasis on academic activity in this assessment, and I'm talking, of course, about the research and teaching staff. Because the assessment of teaching staff is different. But let's be clear: there are significantly fewer of those employees, right? Well, in Poland, we currently have probably 90% of people employed in research and teaching positions and 10% in teaching positions. This means, you know, it means that we immediately, you know, try to act rationally, that is, to put it briefly, we play the game according to the established rules, yes, and that, for example, is discouraging. And I'll also add that in

3 Journal articles published by Polish academic teachers are evaluated on the basis of a point system established by the Minister of Science in its list of academic journals and peer-reviewed international conference materials (Dz.U. 2020 poz. 349, Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego w sprawie sporządzania wykazów wydawnictw monografii naukowych oraz czasopism naukowych i recenzowanych materiałów z konferencji międzynarodowych [Journal of Laws of 2020: 349, Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education on the preparation of lists of scientific monograph publishers and scientific journals and peer-reviewed materials from international conferences]. A journal's rating ranges from 0 to 200 points, with articles published in journals carrying 100, 140, or 200 points considered the most desirable. The full annex to this list is available on the Ministry's website: <https://www.gov.pl/attachment/62739f3a-6a1d-4659-98ad-59dd63108ee7>).

this academic activity, again, not everything is, you know, equally important. For example, organizing a conference no longer counts at all. Yes, it doesn't matter anymore. Just like if you publish a slot for 100 points and organize a conference, even an international one, only those 100 points will count. However, this conference will be noted somewhere, of course, but it won't matter for the assessment, yes. In short, when we play this game, we act rationally, that is, we focus our efforts on what we are primarily assessed for. Of course, there are people—and I am one of them—who value teaching very much and will continue teaching regardless of whether it is appreciated or not. But when it comes to the mechanism itself, I see clearly that, you know, it doesn't reward this type of activity; on the contrary, it marginalizes it [...] So, you know, when I think about this assessment we are subjected to, I think it's bad that it has reached such a tipping point that the other two types of activity don't balance the first one. No. [R5]

This longer excerpt from the interview is included because, while addressing the lack of proportionality in the evaluation of academic staff, the respondent simultaneously points to numerous other activities undertaken by faculty members that shape their academic identity. The employee is expected to be an all-rounder with extensive knowledge in many areas, including accounting. When submitting grant and conference applications, academics are responsible for preparing cost estimates, settling received funds, and exercising financial oversight. At the same time, they are expected to fulfill the university's primary mission: educating future generations and imparting reliable knowledge. A growing body of scholarship has demonstrated that academics are required to undertake substantial amounts of unsatisfying and frequently invisible labor (Belas 1999; Gill 2018). Moreover, the distribution of

such tasks remains highly gendered, with women disproportionately responsible for what has been conceptualized as “academic housework”—forms of labor that tend to be accorded lower status and receive less institutional recognition and reward than other academic activities (Heijstra et al. 2017). These structural dynamics contribute to the reproduction and entrenchment of a neoliberal regime within higher education, characterized by the normative construction of the productive and competitive “ideal academic” as the dominant institutional subject (see Thornton 2014).

The aforementioned “*punktoza*” (“pointosis” or “points-mania”), although intended to be motivating, may in fact lead to stagnation and limited publishing, transforming research into an unpleasant obligation and fostering an attitude of simply “waiting for retirement”:

Especially since I'm starting to see [publishing – author's note] as increasingly forced. You have to accumulate these points somewhere, check them off, and so on. So, while a few years ago I could experience some excitement, let's say. Now, I sometimes feel happy that I've written something cool, but that's just a rare occurrence, and I treat it more as an unpleasant obligation than a joy, yes, and that's how it is. So, these are the main reasons why I probably won't stay on too long beyond the time I have to retire. [R2]

Employees experience regret, but also fear and uncertainty. Employee evaluation, which is intended to increase efficiency by emphasizing the importance of publishing valuable and reliable articles, does not translate into higher quality or enhance the university's standing. In fact, excessive pressure generates a strong emotional burden, including stress that may become chronic and lead to burnout:

Of course, I can't get used to this—with this “grant-oza” [“grantosis” or “grant-mania”] and “punktoza” [“pointosis” or “points-mania”]. And maybe it's not even a matter of the “grant-oza” or “punktoza”, but rather the importance assigned to these points, that some other activity, for example, is not important. Yes, it is, you know, it's so unpleasant for me, for example, you could say unpleasant. [R10]

Unlike the emotions experienced during the publication process, the emotions associated with employee evaluation do not concern the very fact of undergoing the evaluation procedure, but rather its course and the perceived unfairness of the redistribution of outcomes. Although the evaluation is formally individual, it takes on the character of a collective assessment. The evaluation involves more than two entities (the evaluated person and the evaluator); instead, the evaluating body is collective and spans multiple institutional layers. It ranges from the immediate superior up to the Rector, and includes separate evaluation committees at both the university and faculty levels. The evaluation also relies on administrative staff who oversee the submission of documents, signatures, and related procedures. Given this relatively complex and multi-layered framework in Poland, there is no chance for anonymity. This not only triggers the emotional processes accompanying employees in many organizations, but also, and perhaps above all, renders the evaluation public.

Written evaluations of academic performance pass through several organizational levels until they are approved by the Rector, and because they are communicated openly, each involved entity—including administrative units—has access to the documentation. Discretion is therefore difficult to maintain. Consequently, information about these assessments

circulates informally within the Institute, and sometimes even at the Faculty level, stripping the individual evaluation of privacy and giving it a distinctly public character.

Therefore, when an employee's evaluation is reviewed by dozens of individuals across these layers, the emotional impact is not limited to a private discussion of performance with the immediate superior, as it should be. Instead, it inflicts a complex and intense emotional burden, directly impacting the employee's scholarly identity. Many respondents pointed to the profound uncertainty and frustration associated with a total lack of control over an unpredictable final outcome. Furthermore, this public exposure can lead to severe social consequences, with some respondents referring to social ostracism and the stigmatization of those who do not publish or who publish less.

Emotional labor is closely linked here to Goffman's framework on facework, understood as actions undertaken to protect the self (see Goffman 2000). Two strategies are evident in this respect. The first involves presenting oneself as a victim who, for various reasons, was unable to obtain a positive evaluation. Such individuals appeal to external factors, accusing others of a lack of understanding, forbearance, or empathy. Although, as one interviewee notes, “it's practically impossible to receive a negative evaluation based on such criteria” [R11], there are individuals who have not been able to publish a single article for four years. These are the individuals who present themselves as victims of the system's actions. Emotional labor performed at a superficial level, in the case of the “I as a victim of the system” strategy, can quickly lead to emotional exhaustion and affective emptiness. The struggle to defend the self and the public enactment of such a

strategy involve a tremendous expenditure of energy in relation to the emotional costs incurred.

Work performed at a deeper level, in turn, may transform an individual's self-image. For those who are evaluated negatively, such an assessment can extend to all areas of their activity, including the self. Consequently, employees may begin to evaluate themselves negatively as a person. For those assessed positively, the underlying emotional mechanism may be similar, but the affective outcome is the opposite. Moreover, an employee receiving a positive evaluation does not need to engage in face-work practices, and the unintentional transparency of the assessment may further reinforce feelings of pride and satisfaction.

The situation is different regarding the institutional criticism leveled during the university's research audit. Because the audit operates at the macro level and applies directly to the institution rather than the individual, it does not immediately threaten the employee's self-image. Even if employees do not fill all their publication slots or if their publications receive low scores, their identity remains unthreatened because audit findings are typically presented at a high level of generality. Consequently, employees participate in the auditing process from the periphery, shielding them from direct negative consequences if their research outputs are insufficient. This structural distance is precisely what links the macro audit to the individual evaluation through the distinct category of acceptance of criticism; since the threat to the self is minimized, a baseline acceptance of institutional critique becomes possible.

However, this dynamic shifts when evaluation data is made public, moving the emotional focus from mitigating threats to generating collective or indi-

vidual validation. Feelings of satisfaction, pride, and contentment may emerge when superiors recognize an individual's contribution to achieving a high scholarly category for the research unit. In some institutes, the names of the most highly published employees are publicly disclosed, which may evoke personal pride and, at times, even hubris. Interestingly, even with a relatively small individual contribution to the audit, employees may experience pride simply by association, belonging to a university, faculty, or institute that holds the highest research category (A or A+).

As we have observed, the employee evaluation system in its current form does not increase productivity and may even exert a demotivating effect, as excessive pressure deprives individuals of scholarly creativity. At the same time, at many universities, the evaluation criteria do not differentiate among faculty members and are not linked to any incentive system. Consequently, while the evaluation triggers the wide range of emotions discussed here—including anger, frustration, envy, pride, and satisfaction—it fails to directly account for the emotional labor performed. The situation is different in the case of criticism of publications. Although publishing constitutes an element of the formal evaluation framework, the acceptance of criticism described here is distinct and internalized.

Criticism of Publications: Playing the Game of Status Defense

As indicated above, the category of "acquiescence of criticism" also applies to the formal criticism of publications. Every academic is obliged to publish research results, reflections, opinions, and analyses. When writing an academic article or book, academics strive to ensure that their work is compelling and

robust. From the perspective of the respondents, they view their completed manuscript as a polished, definitive contribution, although the review process often undermines this belief in their work's completeness and infallibility. Initially, this evokes frustration, anger, resentment, and even a desire for retaliation against the reviewer. Because peer reviews are anonymous, the desire for retaliation is redirected towards editors. However, the pressure to publish in top-tier journals makes acting on this resentment impossible; antagonizing editors—particularly those at journals valued at over 100 points—would be counter-productive and amount to “publication suicide.” With only a handful of journals in pedagogy or sociology offering top-tier scores, authors cannot afford to take offense at negative reviews or extensive revision demands. Securing these high-scoring publications thus becomes the primary objective for an academic teacher. As demonstrated above, these metrics constitute a key element of formal employee evaluation, the university's research audit, and promotional procedures.

Consequently, staff members have developed mechanisms aimed at reducing the level of negative emotions. Academic teachers have learned to protect the self and to separate the self-as-employee from the product of their work. As interviewees noted, receiving a review with comments is never pleasant; however, authors view these critiques as constructive, and revising the article is intended to bring them closer to the goal of publication. Emotion management is evident here, unfolding chronologically. The journey begins with initial fear and anxiety (“Should I submit it? Will it be accepted?”), which briefly gives way to euphoria (“I can share my research results”), uncertainty and anticipation (“When will the review arrive and what will it be like?”). If the review is negative and the article is

rejected, or when it contains numerous comments and suggestions for revision—especially those that the author disagrees with—it inevitably triggers anger and rage. Ultimately, however, this turmoil resolves into joy, satisfaction, and pride⁴ once the article is finally published. Pride may appear even earlier, when a fully positive review with few or no comments is received, although this is relatively rare. Interestingly, after publication, anger, frustration, stress, and shame subside, and the emotions accompanying the publication process are forgotten.

This raises the question of the extent to which the emotions described by respondents are actually experienced versus how much they constitute self-presentation. Do anger and shame indeed disappear, leaving the author with only satisfaction and pride? Is this merely a strategy of self-manipulation or self-deception? Does the academic teacher, experiencing joy after publication, truly no longer experience negative affective states, or are these emotions suppressed through surface acting as part of emotional labor aimed at protecting the self?

4 Pride is most often described as a type of attitude or motivation that emerges as an expression of self-evaluation. It is “a positive emotion that attunes individuals to one another's reactions (through role-taking)” (see Turner and Stets 2009:174). “The emergence of pride depends on the quality of social relationships” (Pawłowska 2020a:103). Pride, like other social emotions, is an element of the reflected self and constitutes a basis for social control. The consequence of experiencing pride is social conformity and a high degree of social stability (see, among others, Scheff 1990, 2000). Individuals experiencing pride focus on a specific behavior rather than on the self as a whole, evaluating their actions (behavior) as a success. The self remains separated from the object of evaluation (Lewis 2000). Pride is a relatively enduring emotion, centered on self-approval that inherently motivates individuals to experience it. By behaving in socially expected ways, individuals secure the approval of others, which in turn leads not only to the emergence of pride but also to group solidarity (Shott 1979). Ultimately, pride enhances professional efficacy and job satisfaction (see Pawłowska 2013, 2020a).

Furthermore, is criticism that is labeled as constructive always constructive? Does the management of emotions when receiving a review that contains critical comments actually shield individuals from feelings of frustration and anger? The participants accept the right of others to criticize, and agree that everyone is entitled to express critical opinions. They are also open to addressing critical comments, which constitutes an indispensable element of the process of working on a manuscript and adapting it to publication requirements. Although reading a review “may at times be painful” [R5], and even at this stage requires emotional work, it nevertheless represents an internalized practice.

The next stage involves reflecting upon criticism, manifested in a declared willingness to analyze and consider the critical feedback received. This is a crucial juncture, as reflection gives rise to emotional tolerance. Depending on how the author evaluates the feedback and on whether the reviewer's comments are recognized as constructive and legitimate, different levels of discomfort emerge following exposure to critical evaluation. The less accepting the author is of criticism at each of the preceding stages, the more intense and enduring the negatively valenced emotions become. Such emotions may subsequently evolve into a mood state that inhibits further action.

Let us examine the transformation of frustration and anger into pride. Shame is deliberately omitted here—although it may emerge in specific circumstances—because the rejection of an article or the receipt of numerous critical comments remains hidden from public view. Rejection usually remains unknown to others, as academics rarely share such information. This professional isolation may have negative consequences, as individuals are often

unable to process negative affective states independently and internally. Typically, as noted above, reviews are anonymous: the author of the article does not know the identity of the reviewer, and vice versa. This arrangement partially prevents the emergence of shame (see Scheff 1990), understood as a social emotion arising in externalized interactions. A negative evaluation of the manuscript initially evokes anger, which is most often redirected outward. More experienced researchers have, therefore, developed self-protective mechanisms. They seek to prevent self-endangering cognitions, adopting the strategy: “It doesn't matter, I'll send it somewhere else.” This does not mean that the author of a rejected article does not experience negative emotions; rather, it indicates the use of self-corrective (protective) strategies:

Recently, I had an article rejected by a journal I would say is highly ranked. I thought it was quite well written, so it came as a surprise. I do not entirely agree with the review, but it was a rejection, [yet] there was no point in tearing up the manuscript [...]. So I somehow got through it. I really trusted that it was well written [...]. I have already moved on, and now I am trying elsewhere [...]. I hope everything will be all right, but, but it was just so unexpected. [R2]

Accustomed to criticism in many areas, and in order to achieve the ultimate goal of publication, academics transform anger into creative action by taking reviewers' comments into account. This also constitutes a deliberate action strategy: “achieve the goal.” The author and the reviewer engage in an interactional game, which I term the “status defense game”. It is generally accepted in academic circles that “the reviewer's role is to point out imperfections even where they do not exist” [R15]. Therefore, to protect their status, reviewers must demonstrate supe-

riority and formulate critical remarks accordingly. The author is aware that addressing the reviewer's comments ensures that the text will be published sooner and their status will increase relative to their colleagues. Consequently, the criticism received in this manner evokes emotions but does not lead to negative self-assessment. Only the author is aware of this emotional labor. They experience anger, sadness, or even shame⁵, but in the privacy of their office, in front of their computer screen. Success in the form of publication, however, is public. Colleagues may become jealous, which can indirectly serve as a source of satisfaction for the author of multiple publications or as a source of fear and uncertainty.

One strategy employed by authors is "publication silence." Faculty members do not discuss planned publications with one another, nor do they discuss those that have already appeared. On the one hand, this strategy aligns with the previously described defense mechanism against shame, for instance in the case of article rejection. On the other hand, it serves to protect against colleagues' envy:

5 Shame is an emotion, a feeling that is linked to thinking and, above all, to recognizing this emotion as one's own. It operates through one's belonging to a given social group, and its emergence requires an audience or the thought of one. The feeling may arise even when an individual merely thinks that they might be evaluated. Because it is an exceptionally strong and uncomfortable feeling, it makes it more difficult to violate certain norms and injunctions. Consequently, this emotion possesses remarkable power in social relations (see Krzysztofowicz 2017:155-156). Shame is also a signal of a bond that is threatened or in some way violated. If the idea of the social bond is suppressed, the emotion will likewise be suppressed (Scheff 1990:15). As a social emotion, it is therefore dependent on the reflected self. However, individuals do not always need to be consciously aware of the process of self-evaluation for it to arise, as self-evaluation may occur outside of awareness (see Lewis 2000). Finally, the experience involves the evaluation of the self as a whole; a person experiencing this evaluates themselves negatively as such—"I am a bad person" (Tangney 2002).

However, when it comes to peer relations, I know that our achievements would irritate some people. So, if there were no need to boast, we would not boast. And there is this evaluation, yes, —sometimes you apply for an award, so like it or not, there is some form of boasting. But I never boast about my publications because I have learned that it makes other people angry, irritated, jealous, and envious, so no, I definitely do not engage in talking about a published article worth 100 points. [R11]

Consequently, publications in high-scoring journals are automatically considered excellent, and polemics, discussions, or critical debate within the academic community occur only rarely. Theorizing and engagement with theoretical thought are not required, nor is the scholarly rigor of the text subject to verification (see Banaszak 2025). There is a tacit assumption that if articles are published in journals valued at 100 points or more, they must be of high quality.

We are bidding on those proverbial points, and someone who publishes a paper worth 140 points feels better than someone who publishes for 70—or twice as good—although... well, that does not necessarily mean that the published paper is more valuable. [R5]

However, the moment of publication does not mark the end of the emotional process. Authors fear the subsequent evaluation of their publication. The uncertainty accompanying the beginning of the publication process (whether to submit or not) and the period of waiting for the review continues as they await feedback from the academic community. This continuum of uncertainty can only be interrupted by comments from colleagues and the broader community, expressed face-to-face or through social media. When feedback is positive, uncertainty

dissipates and is replaced by pride and satisfaction. When feedback is unfavorable, uncertainty gives way to frustration, anger, despondency, and even shame. Fear fueled by shame may lead to even greater resistance to writing and submitting further articles:

I just broke down. For a year and a half, I did nothing; I conducted no research. I decided that I was stupid and not fit to continue, and I did not know what would truly become of me. I felt blocked—blocked from moving on. [R11]

Such experiences may subsequently lead not only to inhibiting further publication activity but also to significant consequences for the development of the author's academic career. As the quotation above demonstrates, a single negative evaluation may come to encompass the individual's sense of self as a whole. Intense negative emotions that remained unresolved had a clear impact on the participant's self-concept and self-evaluation. Consequently, diminished self-esteem became a source of creative inhibition and constrained the participant's ability to engage actively in academic work.

Summary

While the interviews were situated in the Polish context, the issues raised can be described as global in scope. Similar observations were made by Heiden-Rootes, SmithBattle, and Hankins (2024), who point out that although universities formally highlight goals related to their social mission and educational values, the everyday work practices of academic teachers are strongly shaped by neoliberal pressures in which efficiency, profitability, and competitive practices take precedence (Gill 2018; Lund 2025; Bonfanti Cannito and Naldini 2025).

This results in a discrepancy between institutional declarations and actual practices. As a product of neoliberalism, service workload constitutes a responsibility that is frequently not adequately reflected in evaluation and promotion criteria, despite consuming substantial amounts of time and energy. Such organizational practices contribute to the production of work that remains invisible and undervalued yet is essential to the functioning of the university. The imperative to produce high-scoring publications compels academic staff to act in a rationalized manner, directing their energy and commitment towards activities that generate tangible returns, such as financial bonuses, faster promotion trajectories, or prestige within the academic community.

Academic teachers thus participate in the "game" according to predefined neoliberal rules. For some, this generates resentment and frustration; for others, it becomes a source of emotional energy accumulation. In the latter case, this accumulation fosters pride, which translates into a positive self-image and increased job satisfaction. Some academics build their emotional capital through what I referred to in earlier publications as "sticking (attaching) oneself to success" (see Pawłowska 2020).

As Rosalind Gill observes, academics' growing complicity in the neoliberalization of the profession is troubling, particularly when manifested through the public display of affiliation with institutions associated with "success": "I am always surprised when I see that otherwise apparently sane, critical, and smart colleagues have added little statements to the bottom of their emails, informing people how (well) their department scored in the Research Excellence Framework, or where they are located in some league table or other" (Gill 2018:206).

Academics frequently experience pride derived from their affiliation with an organization that occupies a high position in rankings or holds an excellent institutional rating, despite having made no individual contribution to the institution's success. In such cases, employees symbolically "stick themselves" to the organization's success, becoming "infected" with positive emotions, including pride.

The undervaluation of teaching and organizational activities by universities remains a source of concern, particularly in relation to the mission of higher education institutions. A potential consequence is a decline in the quality of teaching, which in the long term may result in lower levels of education not only among future academic staff but also among the workforce in general.

The juxtaposition of employee evaluation and publication activity in the analysis of evaluation practices is not accidental but reflects the coexistence and intersection of these processes. Academic evaluation is primarily based on publication output, which entails the management of emotions from the very early stages of selecting a research topic, choosing a journal, and adapting a manuscript to editorial requirements.

The cyclical nature of the publication process—writing an article → submitting it to a journal (sending the manuscript to a journal) → waiting for a review → receiving reviews → rejection or critical comments → revising the text → resubmitting it either to the same or a different journal—can lead to emotional exhaustion. This exhaustion often manifests as somatic symptoms, detachment from their own research, cynicism towards the publishing system, a decline in engagement, or even complete withdrawal. What is visible here is the concept of exchange, as well as

the construction of identity and selfhood as regulators of the participants' actions.

At each stage of this process, authors can experience different emotions. For example, during the preparation and submission phase, hope and excitement might emerge in connection with the possibility of disseminating research results, expectations of recognition and acceptance within the scientific community, and prospects for career development. At the same time, however, anxiety and fear can also arise, particularly among those who have experienced repeated failures, including the rejection of manuscripts. The period of waiting for peer review is often accompanied by uncertainty and a sense of helplessness⁶, linked to the perception that nothing can be done. This helplessness results from a lack of control over the review process and, although often experienced unconsciously, contributes to the formation of academic identity. A specific form of fear—referred to here as evaluation anxiety—also appears. It is associated with the arbitrariness of assessments and the unpredictability of editorial decisions, which can result in the manuscript being. This anxiety is particularly salient within the context of the university evaluation system, where publication productivity constitutes the primary criterion for assessing academic staff.

6 Helplessness is also linked to anger, which may emerge in response to the experience of powerlessness. The energy generated by anger is often wasted. In the initial stage of helplessness, an intense desire appears, aimed at satisfying a particular need. This is followed by a stage in which signals of impending obstacles become apparent. In the third phase, when the need cannot be fulfilled, anger arises and decisions are taken that result in subsequent actions failing to produce positive outcomes. Frustration then emerges, prompting further actions undertaken in the belief that success will be achieved this time. Ultimately, helplessness signals the necessity of coming to terms with a fact that can no longer be changed (Krzysztofowicz 2017:196-197). Experiencing helplessness over a prolonged period may lead to stagnation and withdrawal.

Immediately after receiving a positive review, authors typically experience relief and joy, with relief often outweighing joy, especially when the review process has been prolonged. This feeling is indicative of the oppressive character of the publishing system. Subsequently, satisfaction and pride emerge. A positive review accompanied by comments can strengthen commitment to refining the manuscript and motivate authors to pursue further publication, thereby reinforcing a sense of empowerment.

In contrast, the rejection of a paper is associated with disappointment, sadness, frustration, and sometimes a sense of injustice, particularly when reviews are perceived as inadequate, lacking substantive merit, biased, or contradictory. These emotions—especially during the early stages of academic socialization—are often suppressed due to prevailing norms and asymmetric power relations within the academic field. The resulting shame can, in turn, undermine self-esteem as a researcher. A negative review might also trigger anger and frustration, potentially leading to anxiety, decreased motivation, and a blockage of further actions.

In sum, the publication process and the associated employee evaluation cannot be reduced to a merely technical procedure. By submitting their work to assessment, academic authors consciously subject themselves to criticism, implicitly accepting evaluative anxiety and emotional labor. They expose their well-being and self to risk, which points to a deeply

affective process in which emotions fulfill regulatory, motivational, and identity-forming functions.

The acquiescence to criticism referred to in the title is inherent in academic work. At the beginning of their careers, academics quickly internalize patterns of criticism while developing their professional identities. This occurs not only through accepting critique but also through criticizing others, for example, in reviews or during conference discussions. Regardless of whether the criticism is constructive, it remains criticism, and the mechanisms for managing emotions remain the same.

Although individuals generally dislike being criticized, academic teachers consciously engage in practices that expose them to criticism, including publishing the results of research, giving presentations at conferences, making media appearances, and conducting their teaching activities. Academic work requires accepting assessment and criticism and necessitates the use of self-protective strategies such as denial, “game of status defense,” “I as a victim of the system,” “it will be sent elsewhere,” and publication silence. In processing criticism, external support from significant others like family members and, above all, colleagues, plays a crucial role. Mutual understanding, seeking sources of satisfaction beyond professional work, engaging in hobbies, slowing down the pace of work, withdrawing from competition, and coming to terms with their position and status are also of importance.

References

Arystoteles. 1953/2001. *Retoryka*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Babbie, Earl. 2004. *Badania społeczne w praktyce*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Banaszak, Sławomir. 2025. “O teorii i współczesnym teoretyzowaniu w naukach społecznych [On Theory and Contemporary Theorising in Social Sciences].” *Nauki o Wychowaniu. Studia Interdyscyplinarne* 20(1):14-24.

- Bauman, Teresa. 1998. "O możliwości zastosowania metod jakościowych w badaniach pedagogicznych [On the Possibility of Using Qualitative Methods in Educational Research]." Pp. 54-75 in *Zasady badań pedagogicznych [Principles of Educational Research]*, edited by T. Pilch. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.
- Barcan, Ruth. 2013. *Academic Life and Labour in the New University: Hope and Other Choices*. London: Ashgate.
- Bellas, Marcia L. 1999. "Emotional Labor in Academia: The Case of Professors." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561(1):96-110.
- Berlant, Lauren G. 2011. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bielecka-Prus, Joanna. 2014. "Po co nam autoetnografia? Krytyczna analiza autoetnografii jako metody badawczej [What Is Autoethnography Good For? Critical Analysis of Autoethnography as Research Method]." *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 10(3):76-95.
- Bonfanti, Sara, Maddalena Cannito and Manuela Naldini. 2025. "Emotions at Work: The Case of Chronic Illnesses in Academia." *Sociologica* 19(2):155-173.
- Borowska-Beszta, Beata. 2009. "W tym cieniu jest tyle słońca. Autoetnografia [There Is So Much Sunshine in This Shadow: An Autoethnography]." *Pedagogika Kultury* 5:81-96.
- Campos, Joseph J., Donna L. Mumme, Rosanne Kermoian et al. 1994. "A Functionalist Perspective on the Nature of Emotion." *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 2-3(59):284-303.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2009. *Teoria ugruntowana. Praktyczny przewodnik po analizie jakościowej [Constructing Grounded Theory A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Cho, Yoon-Na, Brian N. Rutherford, Scott B. Friend et al. 2017. "The role of emotions on frontline employee turnover intentions." *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 25(1):57-68.
- Demerouti, Evangelia, Karina Mostert and Arnold B. Bakker. 2010. "Burnout and work engagement: A Thorough Investigation of the Independency of Both Constructs." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 15(3): 209-222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019408>
- Edgerton, Jason D., Jeff D. Biegun, Sandra Kouritzin et al. 2024. "Burnout among Canadian university faculty: applying a job demands-resources lens." *Academia Mental Health and Well-Being* 1(3):1-10. <https://doi.org/10.20935/MHealthWellB7458>
- Gill, Rosalind. 2010. "Breaking the Silence: The Hidden Injuries of the Neoliberal University." Pp. 228-244 in *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist Reflections*, edited by R. Ryan-Flood and R. Gill. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2018. "The psychosocial life of the neoliberal university." Pp. 193-216 in *Dissident knowledge in higher education*, edited by M. Spooner and J. McNinch. Regina, Saskatchewan: University of Regina Press.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Adline Publishing Company.
- Goffman, Erving. 2000. *Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego [The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Aletheia.
- Goffman, Erving. 2006. *Rytuał interakcyjny [Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Goffman, Erving. 2008. *Zachowanie w miejscach publicznych, o społecznej organizacji zgromadzeń [Behavior in Public Places. Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Gordon, Hava R., Kate Willink and Keeley Hunter. 2024. "Invisible labor and the associate professor: identity and workload inequity." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 17(3):285-296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000414>
- Górska, Renata. 2022. *Zaangażowanie i wyczerpanie jako (nie) oczekiwane efekty pracy emocjonalnej nauczyciela akademickiego [Engagement and Burnout as (Un)Expected Effects of the Emotional Labour of Academic Teachers]*. Interdyscyplinarne granty badawcze – niepublikowany wniosek grantowy [interdisciplinary research grants – unpublished grant proposal].
- Hammersley, Martyn and Paul Atkinson. 2000. *Metody badań terenowych [Ethnography. Principles in Practice]*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zys i S-ka.
- Heiden-Rootes, Katie M., Lee SmithBattle and Michael Hankins. 2024. "Describing values in tension and neoliberalism at a missiondriven, private university: a qualitative case

study of faculty service workload." *Studies in Higher Education* 50(1):1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2347560>

Heijstra, Tamar M., Þorgerður Einarsdóttir, Gyða M. Petursdóttir et al. 2017. "Testing the Concept of Academic Housework in a European Setting: Part of Academic Career-Making or Gendered Barrier to the Top?" *European Educational Research Journal* 16(2-3):200-214.

Hochschild, Arlie R. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, Arlie R. 2009. *Zarządzanie emocjami. Komercjalizacja ludzkich uczuć* [*The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Halfman, Willem and Hans Radder. 2015. "The Academic Manifesto: From an Occupied to a Public University." *Minerva* 53(2):165-187.

Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. 1997. "Active Interviewing." Pp. 113-129 in *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, edited by D. Silverman. London: Sage.

Kacperczyk, Anna. 2014. "Autoetnografia – technika, metoda, nowy paradygmat? O metodologicznym statusie autoetnografii [Autoethnography – Technique, Method, or New Paradigm? On Methodological Status of Autoethnography]." *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 10(3):32-74.

Kemper, Theodore D. 1991. "Predicting Emotions from Social Relations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54:330-342.

Kemper, Theodore D. 2005. "Modele społeczne w wyjaśnianiu emocji [Social Models in the Explanation of Emotions]." Pp. 72-87 in *Psychologia emocji [Psychology of Emotions]*, edited by M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland-Jones. Gdansk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Kępińska-Jasny, Magdalena. 2014. „Zarządzanie emocjami w miejscu pracy [Managing Emotions in the Workplace]." Pp. 53-66 in *Emocje w życiu codziennym. Analiza kulturowych, społecznych i organizacyjnych uwarunkowań ujawniania i kierowania emocjami [Emotions in Everyday Life: An Analysis of the Cultural, Social, and Organizational Determinants of Emotional Expression and Emotion Management]*, edited by K. Konecki and B. Pawłowska. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Kinman, Gail. 2014. "Doing more with less? Work and wellbeing in academics." *Somatechnics* 4(2):219-235.

Konecki, Krzysztof, T. 2000. *Studia z metodologii badań jakościowych. Teoria ugruntowana [Studies in Qualitative Research Methodology: Grounded Theory]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Konecki, Krzysztof T. 2005. "Jakościowe rozumienie innych a socjologia jakościowa [Qualitative Understanding of Others and Qualitative Sociology]." *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 1(1):1-3.

Król, Henryk. 2006. "Podstawy koncepcji zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi [Foundations of Human Resource Management Concepts]" Pp. 50-91 in *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi [Human Resource Management]*, edited by H. Król and A. Ludwiczynski. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Krzysztofowicz, Jacek. 2017. *Czasem trudne, zawsze dobre. Jak rozumieć i pokochać własne emocje [Sometimes Difficult, Always Good: How to Understand and Love Your Own Emotions]*. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Charaktery.

Lazarus, Richard S. 1991. *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Michael. 2000. "Self-Conscious Emotions. Embarrassment, Pride, Shame and Guilt." Pp. 742-756 in *Handbook of Emotion*, edited by M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones. New York: Guilford Press.

Lund, Rebecca. 2025. "Feminist Theories of Agency and Emotion in Academia: A Feminist Historical Materialist Reading." *Sociologica – International Journal for Sociological Debate* 19(2):139-154.

Madalińska-Michalak, Joanna and Renata Góralska. 2012. *Kompetencje emocjonalne nauczyciela [Teachers' Emotional Competencies]*. Warsaw: ABC a Wolters Kluwer business.

Nycz, Ryszard. 2014. "Afektywne manifesty. Wstęp [Affective Manifestos: Introduction]." *Teksty Drugie* 1:9-13.

Pawłowska, Beata. 2013. *Emocje społeczne w pracy nauczyciela i przedstawiciela handlowego [Social Emotions in the Work of Teachers and Sales Representatives]*. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Pawłowska, Beata. 2020a. "Pride in Teachers' Everyday Work. Conditions and Contexts." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 16(1):28-48. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.16.1.03>

Pawłowska, Beata. 2020b. "The Work of Sales Representatives in the Context of Interactions and Work with Emotions." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 16(4):64-88. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.16.4.05>

Przybyłowska, Ilona. 1978. "Wywiad swobodny ze standaryzowaną listą poszukiwanych informacji i możliwości jego zastosowania w badaniach socjologicznych [The Open-Ended Interview with a Standardized List of Information and Its Application in Sociological Research]." *Przegląd Socjologiczny* 30:53-63.

Rolls, Edmund T. 1999. *The Brain and Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scheff, Thomas J. 1990. *Microsociology. Discourse, emotion, and social structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scheff, Thomas J. 2000. *Shame and the social bond, and human reality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shott, Susan. 1979. "Emotion and Social Life: A Symbolic Interactionist Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:1317-1334.

Shweder, Richard A. 2002. "'Nie jesteś chory, tylko się zakochałeś' – emocja jako system interpretacji ['You're Not Sick', You're Just in Love' – Emotion as an Interpretive System]." Pp. 36-46 in *Natura emocji. Podstawowe zagadnienia [The Nature of Emotions: Basic Issues]*, edited by P. Ekman and R.J. Davidson. Gdansk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Silverman, David. 2012. *Interpretacja danych jakościowych: metody analizy rozmowy, tekstu i interakcji [Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods of Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Tangney, June P. 2002. "Self-relevant emotions." Pp. 384-400 in *Handbook of self and identity*, edited by M. Leary and J. Tangney. New York: Guilford Press.

Thornton, Margaret. 2014. "The Mirage of Merit: Reconstituting the 'Ideal Academic'." *Australian Feminist Studies* 28(76):127-143.

Turner, Jonathan H. and Jan E. Stets. 2009. *Socjologia emocji [The Sociology of Emotions]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Urbaniak-Zajac, Danuta. 2008. "Rzeczywistość pedagogiczna a sposoby jej poznawania – perspektywa interpretacyjna [Educational Reality and Approaches to Its Study: An Interpretive Perspective]." Pp. 185-200 in *Konceptualizacje przedmiotu badań pedagogiki [Conceptualizing the Subject Matter of Pedagogy]*, edited by K. Rubacha. Cracow: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.

Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wetherell, Margaret, Alex McConville and Tim McCreanor. 2020. "Defrosting the Freezer and Other Acts of Quiet Resistance: Affective Practice Theory, Everyday Activism and Affective Dilemmas." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 17(1):13-35.

Wisecup, Allison K., Dawn T. Robinson and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2006. "Sociology of Emotions." Pp. 106-115 in *The Handbook of the 21st Century Sociology*, edited by C. D. Bryant and D. L. Peck. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce. Dz. U. z 2023 r. poz. 742, 1088, 1234, 1672, 1872 i 2005 [Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1668, Act of 20 July 2018 – Law on Higher Education and Science].

Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego w sprawie sporządzania wykazów wydawnictw monografii naukowych oraz czasopism naukowych i recenzowanych materiałów z konferencji międzynarodowych. Dz.U. 2020 poz. 349 [Journal of Laws of 2020: 349, Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education on the preparation of lists of scientific monograph publishers and scientific journals and peer-reviewed materials from international conferences].

Citation

Pawłowska, Beata. 2026. "Acquiescence to Criticism: The Meaning of Emotions in the Multidimensional Evaluation of an Academic Teacher's Work." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 22(3):28-48. Retrieved Month, Year (http://www.qualitativesociologyreview.org/ENG/archive_eng.php). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.22.3.03>