Co-Cultural Theory: Performing Emotional Labor from a Position of Exclusion

Robert Razzante, M.A. | Sarah Tracy, Ph.D.

Earlier this week we met with the board of trustees, and I was the only African American woman in the room. There was an Ethiopian–African man in the room who was of color, but I was the only African American female. In the room was a White male here and another White male there. Basically, there were three little brown specks in a room of like 30. It is one of those things that I don't let bother me as much. Sometimes you feel like (audible sigh), but you just shake it off.

–Michelle

The quote above comes from an interview with Michelle, an academic administrator in a predominately White, private institution in Philadelphia. Michelle is a Black female who works with mostly White men. As demonstrated by her quote, Michelle sometimes suppresses her upset emotions at work due to being one of the only women of color in her work meetings and, instead, works to project a positive, unaffected demeanor. Co-Cultural Theory (Orbe, 1998) becomes a useful lens when seeking to understand the experiences of historically marginalized employees in a workplace. As demonstrated by Michelle's quote above, being a Black female in a predominantly White, male workplace may cause lots of distress. To deal with such distress, Michelle, and other co-cultural group members, may find themselves practicing emotional labor. In this chapter, we explore emotional labor literature as a foreground for describing ways that historically marginalized groups manage their communication while at work. More specifically, we explore how marginalized people manage their emotions in workplaces that seek to intentionally or unintentionally create division between those who have power and those who do not. In this chapter we use Co-Cultural Theory and emotional labor to explore how and why marginalized people communicate in similar ways as Michelle in the excerpt above.

Emotional Labor

Anyone who has ever pretended to adore a gift that they did not want, or who has suppressed their giggles when sternly reprimanding a pet for bad behavior, has engaged in *emotion management*. The experience of performing or suppressing emotions as part of a paid job for organizational benefit is called *emotional labor*. Sociologist Arlie Hochschild first coined the term "emotional labor" through her research on the ways that airline flight attendants were expected to put on a happy face and how bill collectors were taught to be angry and intimidating with delinquent clients (1983). Specifically, emotional labor refers to "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display" for commerce (Hochschild, 1983, p. 7). It is easy to see how this type of work is integral to many different types of jobs, including those in service, teaching, and human interaction. Firefighters act tough (Scott & Meyers, 2005), cruise ship employees smile (Tracy, 2000), nurses show compassion (Way & Tracy, 2012), judges suppress their amusement (Scarduzio, 2011), TSA agents absorb passenger irritation (Malvini Redden, 2013), 911 call-takers calm frightened citizens (Tracy & Tracy, 1998), and border patrol agents navigate the tensions of upholding the law while being kind to suffering border crossers (Rivera, 2015). Although some jobs require very specific types of emotional labor, typical emotional labor expectations mark almost all organizational settings, such as the norms that subordinates act respectful toward bosses and that frontline employees absorb irritation from customers without complaint.

Employees engage in emotional labor through suppressing, amplifying, and/or masking their emotions, or a combination thereof (Tracy, 2005). As Michelle explains in the excerpt at the beginning of this chapter, internally, she feels upset. However, she suppresses her distress, and does not voice the difficulty and sadness of feeling like a token Black woman in the sea of White faces. She, instead, "shakes it off," presumably through various bodily and facial displays. She may mask her distress by smiling at the other employees or by pretending to be engrossed in the meeting agenda.

Employees manipulate their emotions in two main ways. *Surface acting* is when employees transform (or fake) their outward emotional displays to fit the organizational expectation, while not authentically feeling what the organization expects (Hochschild, 1983). In this particular case, Michelle is surface acting because she is still clearly upset, but she is pretending not to be. However, faking emotion can go one step further to *deep acting*, which is when employees convince themselves to deeply and internally feel the expected organizational emotion. In such cases, employees no longer need to "fake" the expected emotional display because they have changed their real feelings, and the emotional expression follows suit

(Hochschild, 1983). Deep acting, in Michelle's case, could mean that she reframes her minority status so she can see it as normal, natural, or even evidence that, as a Black woman, she must be very lucky to be there. If Michelle convinced herself of this framing, she would be deep acting, and taking as her own the organizational expectations for not making a fuss about being among the only people of color in her organization's leadership.

Emotional labor is fundamental to organizational productivity, profitability, and easing employee interactions. However, engaging in emotional labor can be problematic for employees. This is intuitive for some employees, such as correctional officers, who are encouraged to amplify angry or jerk-like behaviors (Tracy, 2005), as these types of excessive, negative emotional expressions release harmful hormones and reduce immune functioning (Conrad & Witte, 1994). However, negative outcomes are also linked to *suppressing* negative emotion and faking positive emotion. Whenever there is a discrepancy between the performed and felt emotion, this creates *emotional dissonance*, or a clash between authentic feeling and expressed emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Emotive dissonance is especially painful when employees feel required to perform emotions that they do not agree they should have to perform, called *faking in bad faith* (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). The pain of emotional labor is also exacerbated when employees must perform emotions that mark them as a low status employee; for example, they have to act submissive or respectful (Tracy, 2005). Meanwhile, emotive dissonance is not nearly as difficult when employees believe that the emotional performance is useful and important, called *faking in good faith* (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), or when the performance aligns with their preferred identity and higher status (Tracy, 2005). Furthermore, when employees engage in deep acting and actually transform their internal feelings to align with organizational expectations, they can become alienated from the signals that emotions are designed to provide. Evolutionarily, emotions help human beings to survive. Fear triggers retreat. Love triggers connection. When people force themselves not to feel certain emotions due to organizational norms (i.e., firefighters are expected to be tough and mask their fear), employees may overlook emotion signals that provide important and lifesaving information (i.e., fear could be telling firefighters that a fire is so dangerous that they should retreat) (Tracy & Scott, 2006).

Michelle's comment at the opening of this chapter does not explicitly indicate whether or not she feels like she should be required to suppress her distress. However, as indicated by her deep sigh, she likely feels resigned and sad to be just one of the "brown specks" in the meeting. Resignation is different than endorsement and, therefore, indicates that Michelle does not fully buy into the idea that her emotional labor is justifiable. Furthermore, one could argue that by suppressing

distress, this indicates a lower status identity and unpreferred identity. Unlike some people, Michelle may feel as though she is not allowed to make a fuss or speak up. As such, the research on emotional labor would suggest that if Michelle continues to fake her emotions in bad faith, this will lead to burnout. Indeed, emotional dissonance can "lead to personal and work-related maladjustment, such as poor self-esteem, depression, cynicism, and alienation from work" (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, pp. 96–97). And, what if Michelle actually changes her viewpoint, deep acts, and convinces herself not to feel upset? This would be faking in good faith. However, faking in good faith might completely alienate Michelle from emotions of distress that usefully signal the fact that something problematic (like systematic racism) is going on here. By turning off these emotions, she turns off an important way of knowing, and potentially transforming, the world. A primary question to ask, too, is how her emotional labor is associated with her being a woman of color, a "co-cultural member," and, with that, we turn to a discussion of Co-Cultural Theory.

Communicating from Marginalization

Co-Cultural Theory attempts to understand and describe how historically marginalized groups of individuals communicate when interacting with dominant group members (Orbe, 1998). As seen below, historical marginalization and dominant group membership are characterized through the understanding that, in US society, there are some groups of people who have power and privilege, and others who do not. As such, Co-Cultural Theory sheds light on Michelle's communication patterns through exploring her positionality as a female administrator of color in a predominantly White institution. It is first valuable to understand the theoretical foundations on which Co-Cultural Theory was built.

Standpoint Theory

Standpoint Theory (Smith, 1987) works under the assumption that certain groups live life in the center, whiles other live on the margins. For example, in Michelle's example above, she works from a standpoint that lies on the margins in terms of being Black in a predominantly White institution. She is reminded about her marginality when interacting in an environment where her body is marked as an "other." Meanwhile, her White colleagues live life in the center, where they can choose to ignore the lack of diversity at work. Standpoint Theory offers a unique way of understanding how we may be in the center in terms of some identities (i.e., Michelle being an administrator), while on the margins in another (i.e., Black and female).

Muted Group Theory

Muted Group Theory (Kramarae, 1981) embraces the same critical lens as Standpoint Theory, but specifically focuses on gender dynamics at work. That is, the theory offers a framework for understanding how women in particular experience silence at work. The theory works under the assumption that, in a predominantly or historically male working environment, women may become silenced or their viewpoints will not hold as much power. In the case of Michelle, she recognized her positionality as not only African American, but an African American *female*. Muted Group Theory offers a lens to understand how Michelle might experience marginality not only due to her race, but also due to her gender.

Co-Cultural Theory

Taking into consideration Standpoint Theory and Muted Group Theory, Co-Cultural Theory attempts to localize discourses of marginalization within the field of intercultural communication. maintains the assumption that certain groups experience privilege based on race (Whites), class (upper- and middle-class), gender (cis-men), etc., whereas other groups experience marginalization (people of color, working-class, women and trans-folks). When communicating from a position of exclusion, marginalized groups (referred to as co-cultural groups) adapt their communication to fit the norms established by those with power and privilege. Working from this assumption, Orbe (1998) conducted a phenomenological study of stories from people who experienced marginalization in one way or another. He was interested in how marginalized group members (referred to as co-cultural group members) communicated across the power imbalance with dominant group members (those in the center, privileged group). Through the stories, Orbe identified 26 key communicative practices, and six influential factors, that informed the way co-cultural members communicated with dominant group members.

Co-cultural group members consciously choose communicative practices based on the following six factors: *preferred outcome, communication approach, field of experience, abilities, situational context,* and *perceived costs and rewards.* Of the six factors, preferred outcome and communication approach emerged as the two most influential factors that determined one's selection. As seen in Table 1, all 26 practices are listed within a grid between the two influential factors. While the other four factors are not explicitly present, they remain integral components to one's selection. In other words, a co-cultural member's use of a particular communication practice is influenced by his/her abilities, field of experience, situational context, and perceived costs/rewards. What follows is the in-depth exploration

Communication Approach	Preferred Outcome	Communication Practices
Nonassertive	Separation	Avoiding Maintaining Interpersonal Barriers
Nonassertive	Accommodation	Visibility Dispelling Stereotypes
Nonassertive	Assimilation	Emphasizing Commonalities Developing Positive Face Censoring Self Averting Controversy
Assertive	Separation	Communicating Self Intragroup Networking Exemplifying Strengths Embracing Stereotypes
Assertive	Accommodation	Communicating Self Intragroup Networking Utilizing Liaisons Educating Others
Assertive	Assimilation	Extensive Preparation Overcompensating Manipulating Stereotypes Bargaining
Aggressive	Separation	Attacking Sabotaging Others
Aggressive	Accommodation	Confronting Gaining Advantage
Aggressive	Assimilation	Dissociating Mirroring Strategic Distancing Ridiculing Self

Table 1. Co-Cultural Communication Orientations and Practices (Adapted from Orbe, 1998)

of *preferred outcome* and *communication approach*, specifically. We recommend having a copy of Table 1 easily accessible when reading through the subsequent paragraphs to help visualize how preferred outcome and communication approach relate to one another.

Preferred outcome articulates a co-cultural group member's aspired outcome of an interaction with a dominant group member. Preferred outcome, as demonstrated in Table 1, can be viewed as a continuum from assimilation to separation. *Assimilation* becomes a preferred outcome when the co-cultural group member wishes to reduce differences in order to lessen the power distance with dominant group members (i.e., censoring self, mirroring, ridiculing self) (Orbe, 1998).

Contrary to assimilation lies separation. Instead of reducing power distances, *separation* seeks to uphold such distance (i.e., avoiding, embracing stereotypes, attacking). Within the tension between assimilation and separation lies accommodation. *Accommodation* exhibits the desire to negotiate power distances between co-cultural group members and dominant group members (i.e., dispelling stereotypes, communicating self, confronting).

As explored through Co-Cultural Theory, depending on one's goals, a marginalized group member in a working environment may enact one of the practices listed under those headings. That is, using assimilation, accommodation, or separation becomes a strategic move among co-cultural group members seeking to navigate structures that privilege dominant group members and suppress co-cultural members. Depending on the context, one's abilities, their perceived costs and rewards, field of experience, and situational context, a co-cultural group member may choose one approach over the other. The effects of a particular approach depend on the situational context in which the communication approach occurs. There is no right or wrong way for a co-cultural group member to act. Rather, like all communication, decisions become contextually based. In addition to envisioning a preferred outcome, co-cultural group members may employ specific approaches to achieve their desired goal. What follows is an exploration of three communication approaches co-cultural group members might employ as a means to achieve their preferred outcome. When in a working environment, it becomes necessary to develop such communication skills to be able to advocate for oneself. As such, Co-Cultural Theory generally, and *communication approaches* specifically, provide a lens to understand how a co-cultural group member might be able to communicate to achieve his/her intended goal.

Employees can achieve their preferred outcome via a variety of communication approaches, which can range from nonassertive to aggressive. A *nonassertive* communication approach transpires when a co-cultural group member elevates the needs of the dominant group member before his/her own (Orbe, 1998). Contrarily, an *aggressive* communication approach occurs where co-cultural group members emphasize their own needs/desires while disregarding the needs/desires of dominant group member (Orbe, 1998). In between nonassertive and aggressive communication lies an *assertive* communication approach. An assertive approach manifests when the needs/desires of both co-cultural and dominant group members are considered when attempting to achieve a preferred outcome. Assertive communication approaches demonstrate one's ability to think about both him/herself in relation to another person. Such an approach demonstrates self-awareness, and awareness for others, in an interaction.

As previously mentioned, co-cultural members also consider four additional factors when choosing how to communicate with dominant members (Orbe, 1998). First, they consider their *field of experience*, which accounts for one's worldview based on their lived experiences. If they have had experiences where speaking out is rewarded, for example, they may be more likely to speak out. *Abilities* speak to one's ability to respond to a dominant group member in a particular situation. *Situational context* refers to the environment in which the conversation takes place (i.e., at work, in a coffee shop, at a sporting event); someone might feel more emboldened to speak in one context versus another. Finally, *perceived costs and rewards* are taken into consideration based on one's past experiences when employing a particular communicative behavior in effort to achieve his/her intended goal. When taken together, all six influential factors (abilities, field of experience, situational context, perceived costs and rewards, communication approach, and preferred outcome) help to inform why and how a marginalized individual speaks out to dominant group members. To better understand how Co-Cultural Theory can be applied, we turn to the previous example of Michelle.

Michelle Revisited

Together, Co-Cultural Theory and emotional labor offer lenses to understand the difficulties co-cultural members might face at work as they routinely manage their emotional displays and suppress upset feelings. Let us return to Michelle's reflection on being one of the few women of color in her predominantly White institution. While we cannot speak on behalf of Michelle, we can try to understand the emotional labor Michelle performs as a result of being one of few women of color in a predominantly White male work-environment. In reviewing Michelle's response, we use the six factors of Co-Cultural Theory to understand what might have been going through Michelle's mind while choosing to "just shake it off." Doing so may provide a heuristic device that highlights how emotional labor and Co-Cultural Theory manifest in daily practice.

We begin by reviewing Michelle's *field of experience*. Earlier in the interview with Michelle, she described her previous job at a predominantly White university in rural Appalachia. She spoke about the difficulties of living in the community as a Black female. For example, if she wanted to get her hair cut, braided, or styled, she would need to travel an hour and a half to the nearest city to do so. As such, the resources for a comfortable style of living were scarce. In moving to Philadelphia, she found the increase in diversity that she had been looking for. However, her work environment had not changed. Like her previous institution, her new workplace was also predominantly White and male. As such, the accumulative

experience of sitting on the margins added up for Michelle. As such, her communicative practices are heavily informed by being an outsider within.

As seen in Table 1, it appears Michelle had many practices to choose from when communicating with her colleagues. However, Michelle's *abilities* were hindered by organizational norms. As a new administrator, Michelle felt that she needed to listen more than speak. Whether or not she would have been allowed, by others, to speak up, Michelle had internalized the notion that she had to remain silent. As such, her abilities were influenced by the environment in which she worked. As seen here, *situational context* highly informs one's perceived abilities to employ a communicative practice in order to achieve a preferred outcome. If she was with her colleagues after work at happy hour, Michelle may have felt more comfortable speaking up and showing her distress. However the *perceived costs* of speaking up to her colleagues in that setting outweighed the *perceived rewards* of suppressing her feelings.

To reemphasize, Michelle's situational context, abilities, perceived costs/rewards, and field of experience inform the enactment of a particular communicative practice. To revisit, a *nonassertive* communication approach is one where co-cultural group members downgrade their own needs in order to focus on the needs/desires of the dominant group members. *Assimilation* occurs when the goal of the interaction is to reduce power differences between the dominant group members and oneself. In this case, Michelle chose nonassertive assimilation via emotional suppression and masking as a means to "fit in" and "play nice" with her White, male colleagues. By "shaking it off," Michelle reproduced the status quo while biting her tongue.

To review, emotional labor occurs when someone performs a façade that misaligns with his/her authentic feelings. Although Michelle may have desired to speak up, she chose to keep quiet instead. More specifically, Michelle engaged in *developing positive face, self-censorship*, and *averting controversy*. In doing so, Michelle averted controversy by censoring her emotional state as a means to save face for both herself and her colleagues. If she had refused to engage in this emotional labor, her meeting might have unfolded in a much different manner. For example, she may have decided to engage in aggressive accommodation to confront her colleagues and the unwelcoming environment they create. It is tough to speculate what would have happened had Michelle used this approach. However, her past experiences may have told her that this was not a good idea. Ideally, workplaces would exist where individuals can express their concerns without having to think about the threat of being looked down upon by their peers. Taking all of these theoretical applications into mind, we end this chapter with implications for practice.

Implications for Practice

Co-Cultural Theory provides a framework for understanding and describing why co-cultural group members communicate the way they do. When considered within the framework of organizational literature generally, and emotional labor specifically, Co-Cultural Theory provides a critical-cultural lens for understanding the challenges faced by marginalized employees, and the power dynamics at play when they interact with dominant members at work. Considering the many influential factors at play, there exist practical implications for both co-cultural group members and dominant group members.

First, many people who are marginalized at work feel alone and wonder, "is it just me who feels these challenges?" Simply having the language provided by emotional labor and Co-Cultural Theory provides a framework to map onto their lived experiences (Barge, 2001). That is, the theories become useful resources in order to understand the factors behind workplace challenges and provide a vocabulary for different communication options. In understanding these factors, one can critically reflect on challenging workplace situations in different ways as a means to take control of one's communication. When used this way, Co-Cultural Theory can become used as a means for liberatory praxis (hooks, 1994). That is, one can use theory and practice as a means to understand how larger discourses influence one's daily communicative practices. In understanding these larger discourses, one can then reclaim a lost sense of perceived agency.

Second, these theories are also important for dominant group members to understand, as they highlight the specific challenges faced by their co-cultural colleagues, and how, as dominant members, they might intervene or communicate to transform these challenges. Dominant group members have a significant role to play in disrupting or reinforcing structures that allow for privilege and marginalization in the first place (Razzante & Orbe, 2018; Razzante, Tracy, Orbe, In Press). Through their talk and interaction, dominant group members communicatively coconstitute organizational norms open to the challenging abuses of power and privilege. For example, in Michelle's case above, White colleagues could affirm Michelle's concern that the workplace is unwelcoming to herself and her colleagues of color. Furthermore, Michelle's White colleagues could even move themselves to create the space where racial minorities feel free to talk honestly without being labeled as "angry people of color." With roots in Co-Cultural Theory, Dominant Group Theory (Razzante & Orbe 2018) becomes a useful theory to understand communicative practices of those who maintain positions of power and privilege. When considered together, Co-Cultural Theory and Dominant Group Theory provide a useful framework for understanding how interpersonal/intercultural interactions inform organizational culture around difference in social identities.

Third, this analysis suggests that employees consider the variety of intersectional ways that employees might feel marginalized or the factors that contribute to the mal-effects of performing emotional labor. That is, rather than essentializing someone as only a co-cultural group member or a dominant group member, we recommend considering how a single individual may be both a co-cultural member and a dominant group member. For example, although Michelle is a co-cultural group member in terms of race and gender, she is a dominant group member in terms of class, educational level, and ability. As seen in Dominant Group Theory, most dominant group members, especially if they live long enough to be considered "old" (itself a marginalized identity category), will eventually become a co-cultural group member (Razzante & Orbe, 2018). In taking an intersectional approach, readers can develop a more nuanced and holistic understanding of privilege and marginalization as it manifests in the workplace.

Finally, while this chapter provides a conceptual overview of Co-Cultural Theory and emotional labor, we recommend using this knowledge to transform one's life as lived. That is, we encourage readers to take this knowledge to engage in critical self-reflexivity to challenge one's own assumptions about him/herself and others (Cunliffe, 2004). Questions to ask oneself include the following:

1. How am I a dominant or marginalized group member at work?

2. In what ways might I be intentionally or unintentionally be making it difficult for marginalized people to speak up?

3. How might I consider issues like organizational context or experience so as to provide an environment where all organizational members have the opportunity to be self-expressed?

Indeed, critically questioning the factors behind one's own, and others', communication can lead to more competent and effective dialogue and interaction at work. Moreover, readers are left to imagine and create workplaces that thrive through difference by embodying Co-Cultural Theory, Dominant Group Theory, and emotional labor literature through their everyday interactions. When this happens, Michelle and others like her may be released from an unjust burden of emotional labor.

Discussion Questions

1. What previous jobs of yours required you to perform surface level and/or deep level acting?

2. What ways can workplaces come to create a workplace environment where emotional labor ceases to exist?

3. Think back to a time when you performed emotional labor. Did you suppress, amplify, or mask emotion? Did you agree with performing it? Did you find the performance easy or difficult, and why?

4. In what ways do you identify as a co-cultural group member? Identify a time when you performed emotional labor as a result of your co-cultural group membership.

5. How might you interact at work so as to encourage an environment where co-cultural group members are as likely to speak up as dominant group members?

6. How might you personally use what you now know about emotional labor and co-cultural theory to inform your communication at work?

7. What are some of co-cultural theory's limitations? How might the theory be extended?

REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R.H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review 18(1),* 88–115. doi:10.5465/AMR.1993.3997508

Barge, J. K. (2001). Practical theory as mapping, engaged reflection, and transformative practice. *Communication Theory, 11(1),* 5–13.

Conrad, C. & Witte, K. (1994). Is emotional expression repression oppression? Myths of organizational affective regulation. *Annals of the International Communication Association 17(1),* 417–428. doi:10.1080/23808985.1994.11678895

Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management Education, 28(4),* 407–426.

Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and men speaking.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House. doi: 10.2307/413973

Malvini Redden, S. (2013). How lines organize compulsory interaction, emotion management, and "emotional taxes": The implications of passenger emotion and expression in airport security lines. *Management Communication Quarterly 27(1),* 121–149. doi:10.1177/0893318912458213

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2017). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts.* 7th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Orbe, M. P. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rafaeli, A, & Sutton, R. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review 12(1),* 23–37. doi:10.5465/AMR.1987.4306444

Razzante, R. J., & Orbe, M. P. (2018). Two sides of the same coin. Conceptualizing dominant group theory in the context of co-cultural theory. *Communication Theory 28(1),* 1–22. doi: 10.1093/ct/qtx008

Rivera, K. D. (2015). Emotional taint: Making sense of emotional dirty work at the US Border Patrol. *Management Communication Quarterly 29(2),* 198–228. doi:10.1177/0893318914554090

Scarduzio, J. A. (2011). Maintaining order through deviance? The emotional deviance, power, and professional work of municipal court judges. *Management Communication Quarterly 25(2),* 283–310. doi:10.1177/0893318910386446

Scott, C. & Myers, K. (2005). The socialization of emotion: Learning emotion management at the fire station. *Journal of Applied Communication Research 33*(1), 67–92. doi:10.1080/0090988042000318521

Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology of knowledge.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self-subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly 14(1),* 90–128. doi:10.1177/0893318900141004

Tracy, S. J. (2005). Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs 72(3),* 261–283. doi:10.1080/03637750500206474

Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (1998). Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research 26(4),* 390–411. doi:10.1080/00909889809365516

Tracy, S. J. & Scott, C. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers: Getting down and dirty with "America's heroes" and the "scum of law enforcement." *Management Communication Quarterly, 20,* 6–38.

Way, D., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Conceptualizing compassion as recognizing, relating and (re)acting: An ethnographic study of compassionate communication at hospice. *Communication Monographs, 79(1),* 292–315.