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CHAPTER 24

Emotions in the Workplace

KATHRYN J. LIVELY

Over 20 years have passed since sociologists interested in emotion have turned their attention to the workplace. Often hierarchically ordered, the workplace setting offers a natural laboratory, of sorts, for exploring the roles that power and status (Kemper 1978) and cultural (Simon et al. 1992; Clark 1997) and organizational norms (Hochschild 1983; Pierce 1995; Sutton 1991) play in both the experience and expression of emotion.

The first truly sociological examination of emotion in the workplace was Hochschild’s (1983) *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Feeling*. In a provocative study of the airlines industry (that ranged from the “toe” and the “heel”), Hochschild introduced the workplace as a worthy site to study emotion. Building largely upon her earlier theoretical work (Hochschild 1979) regarding the relationship between emotion and social structure, Hochschild introduced sociologists to the concept of *emotional labor* and raised sociological consciousness of how something that is often thought of as being inherently individual—emotion—is shaped, sometimes to individuals’ detriment, by the very social structures and organizations in which they are embedded.

Arguably the most influential book regarding emotion, if not sociology more generally, Hochschild’s groundbreaking study challenged not only the way we view emotion but also the way we think about work. Additionally, for good or ill, it has set the agenda for almost every other inquiry of workplace emotion (also see Smith-Lovin 2004). In this chapter, I will revisit Hochschild’s *The Managed Heart* and review some of the specific lines of research that have developed as a response to some of her observations. I will also touch upon other related lines of research that have arisen as scholars attempt to more fully understand how emotion operates in the workplace. I will end by suggesting ways in which to enrich that understanding as well as to link the sociological study of emotion in the workplace with other developments within the sociology of emotion more broadly, as well as in social psychology.

KATHRYN J. LIVELY • Department of Sociology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755
THE MANAGED HEART

Drawing on numerous theoretical perspectives on emotion (Darwin 1955; Goffman 1959, 1961, 1967; Ekman 1971, 1973; Ekman and Friesen 1969; Ekman et al. 1972; James and Lange 1922; Schacter and Singer 1962), Hochschild (1983) posited that emotion, although culturally shaped, acts as a signal that tells an individual how he or she is faring in a particular social environment (also see Heise 1977; Thoits 1990). Instead of viewing emotion as something irrational or purely biological, Hochschild argued that emotions are subject to rules or norms, much in the same way as other forms of behavior. Drawing on examples collected from college student writing, Hochschild illustrated that individuals are aware of which situations or occurrences called for which emotional responses (i.e., we should be happy on our wedding day or sad at a funeral).

Not only did individuals know what feelings they should experience, many purposefully managed their emotions so that their emotions would be appropriate to a given situation if they believed that what they were feeling was not owed a particular occurrence. Moreover, those who believed that they had not experienced the proper emotion but yet were unable or unwilling to change it into a more appropriate feeling oftentimes reassessed the meaning that the event had (e.g., I suppose I didn’t love him all that much or I would be more upset than I am about his leaving).

Based on her own observations and Ekman’s (1973; also see Ekman and Frieson 1969) discussion of display rules, Hochschild (1983) introduced the idea of feeling rules. Feeling rules, by definition, are cultural norms that govern both the display and the experience of emotion. Feeling rules tell us not only what emotions we should feel but also for how long and how intensely we should feel them (Thoits 1990; also see Francis 1997). Drawing on data collected from a variety of sources, Hochschild revealed that people actively manage their emotions by controlling their display (i.e., through surface acting) and manipulating their thoughts and memories (i.e., through deep acting) to make their feelings correspond to social norms.

When individuals manage their emotions in their private lives (i.e., trying to feel sad at a funeral or happy at a wedding), emotions are said to have use value. Hochschild referred to this social process as emotion work or emotion management. When individuals manage their emotions as part of a job, however, their emotions are turned into commodities; in other words, when emotion management is sold for a wage, emotion management is transformed into emotional labor. Emotional labor refers to one’s ability to “induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others” (Hochschild 1983:7).1

Building upon arguments from labor scholars and Marxists alike, Hochschild (1983) shifted sociologists’ attention to the emotional labor that workers engage in as part of their participation in the increasing U.S. service economy. In this new economy, which is built on the promises of smiling faces and authentic feelings, emotions, perhaps more so than even thought or action, are up for sale. Given emotion’s unique relationship with identity (Burke and Harrod 2005; Heise 1977, 2002; Stets and Tsushima 2001; Stryker 2004), however, managing one’s emotions on or for the job might have implications for the self that are not as apparent or relevant when considering other forms of labor. When workers sell their emotions for a wage, they run the risk not only of being alienated from the physical products of their labor but also the emotional ones; they might even be alienated from their very selves (also see Cahill 1989; Smith and Kleinman 1989).

Given sociologists’ ongoing interest in the process of socialization, it is not surprising that Hochschild (1983) examined the systematic ways in which corporations socialize workers to engage in emotional labor (also see Leidner 1993; Van Maanen 1991). Focusing primarily on Delta Airlines, a corporation that employed a more Machiavellian approach than most, Hochschild
showed that the company had selected individuals whom they perceived as being amenable to constraints being placed not only upon one's physical appearance (i.e., makeup, clothing, and weight) but also one's emotional experiences. In other words, with higher standards for customer service than other airlines at the time and ready access to a mostly nonunionized Southern workforce, Delta carefully hired and retained young, attractive, single women (and to a lesser degree men) who could successfully embody the corporate image that the airlines employed in order to reach and hold a particular segment of an increasingly competitive market.

Although emotional expression can largely be achieved through surface acting, Delta, like many other corporations and organizations, preferred that their employees actually manage their feelings (also see Leidner 1993; Van Maanen 1991), because it is understood that displays of "authentic" emotions are easier to maintain if the feelings are actually present (Hochschild 1983). As a result, Delta and other airlines created guidelines to assist flight attendants' use of deep acting in order to change their emotional experiences and, thus, their subsequent expressions. Specifically, they developed sophisticated strategies through which they trained the flight attendants to produce corporately mandated feeling states, which they believed would create, in turn, feelings of happiness, comfort, safety, and, perhaps most important of all, loyalty in their passengers.

One of Hochschild's (1983) concerns about jobs that routinely require emotional labor is that when individuals are put in the position of continually readjusting their emotional reactions to situations as part of their paid employment, they might put the signal function of their emotional system at risk—a consequence that has negative implications for the self. Specifically, Hochschild warned that individuals who were required to engage in emotional labor for extended periods were at the risk for one of three potential outcomes: a fusion of the self and the work role that might eventually result in the experience of burnout (Maslach 1976; Maslach and Pines 1977), an estrangement between the self and the work role that occurs at the expense of the self and lends itself to feelings of inauthenticity directed toward the self, or a fusion of the self that occurs at the expense of the work role that lends itself to feelings of inauthenticity or cynicism directed toward one's job. Although Hochschild warned about the negative consequences of all three outcomes, Wharton (1999) pointed out that later scholars seem to view the third alternative (e.g., cynicism toward one job) as a rather healthy response to the demands of emotional labor.

Although it might seem that the cost of emotional labor is purely individual, Hochschild (1983) argued that the social distribution of emotional labor is not equitable, thereby making emotional labor a social issue as well as an individual malady (Mills 1999). Despite the fact that emotional labor is necessary for the functioning of a service economy (and, indeed, society as a whole), jobs that Hochschild identified as requiring emotional labor are more commonly associated with service work, middle-class work, and women's work (see Hochschild's [1983] Appendix C for a complete list of so-called emotional labor jobs). To the degree that emotional labor is associated with poor psychosocial outcomes (e.g., feelings of burnout, alienation, or inauthenticity), middle-class women employed in the service industry stand at a greater risk of burnout and other forms of emotional dysfunction than other segments of the population.

Given the exploratory nature of Hochschild's (1983) study, several research agendas have arisen in response to the following questions: Who exactly engages in emotional labor in the workplace? How is emotional labor influenced by sociodemographic characteristics, such as occupational prestige, gender, and race? How does emotional socialization in the workplace or in preparation for a particular profession or occupation occur? What are the psychosocial and economic costs of engaging in emotional labor? In addition to those questions that stem directly from Hochschild's (1983) analysis of the airlines industry, others have also examined more tangential questions pertaining to emotion management, including, but not limited to, the likelihood of emotional expression and the role that others might play in managing emotions
both on and for the job and to what degree the workplace is similar to or dissimilar from other important domains (i.e., the family).

**Emotional Socialization**

Given Hochschild’s (1983) conclusions regarding the extent to which Delta socialized its employees to engage in emotional labor, it is not surprising that case studies of other corporations and professional schools were quick to follow. Perhaps the most elaborate of these was Leidner’s (1993) examination of the recruitment, training, and monitoring practices that occur in other types of service industry occupations. Unlike Hochschild’s single-minded focus on the airlines industry, Leidner compared two distinct interactive service occupations: fast-food handlers and insurance agents. Although these occupations are different in many ways (e.g., differing levels of training, prestige, client contact, autonomy), both are subject to more or less stringent training and monitoring regarding the way that their occupants should feel and express that feeling during interactions with clients. Specifically, food handlers, who received very little training, tended to be easily replaced and were subject to high levels of both routinization (e.g., greeting scripts, prompts for suggestive selling) and monitoring (e.g., surveillance equipment and line managers). The insurance agents, who were more highly trained and, therefore, not viewed as easily replaceable, were granted considerable latitude in their dealings with clients—dealings that typically took place in clients’ homes or businesses, away from the prying eyes of supervisors or other forms of surveillance.

In place of the highly routinized scripts typically utilized by counter and drive-thru window help that specified opening greetings, suggestive selling transitions, and words of appreciation and invitation, insurance agents, similar to Hochschild’s (1983) flight attendants, were granted sweeping guidelines that they could employ when necessary to gain the upper hand quickly and effectively at the beginning of each sales encounter (Leidner 1993). Many of the strategies crafted and supplied by the corporation assisted the insurance agents by enabling them to engage potential clients’ positive feelings of care and responsibility for family members, as well as their negative emotions of fear and guilt.

In addition to the formal and, in some cases, regimented socialization that occurs on the clock in a variety of corporations (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1993; VanMaanen 1991), others have also documented less tangible means of socialization that occur preemployment (Cahill 1989; Pierce 1995; Smith and Kleinman 1989). Turning their attention away from the workplace, per se, Smith and Kleinman (1989) and Cahill (1989) both illustrated the important role that professional schools play in emotional socialization (also see Pierce 1995). One of the things that set Smith and Kleinman (1989) and Cahill (1989) apart from other studies of the orchestrated efforts of corporations is the shared insight that educational institutions also facilitate informal methods of emotional socialization. In fact, it was often the case that the students themselves were active agents of their own socialization as they came to accept professional norms regarding emotion and to see themselves as members of their chosen profession (also see Lively 2001).

In particular, Smith and Kleinman’s (1989) study of medical schools and Cahill’s (1989) study of mortuary science students illustrated the processes through which students learn to manage their fear and disgust when handling the dead, as well as their embarrassment, repulsion, and, in some cases, attraction with dealing with live patients (Smith and Kleinman 1989). Although rarely mentioned by faculty or in textbooks, students nonetheless learned what emotions were appropriate and which ones were inappropriate by observing other students’ and teachers’ reactions to particular events and by participating in social interactions marked with jocular humor.
Who Engages in Emotional Labor?

The initial studies of socialization that occurred in professional schools aside, most of the initial research on emotion in the workplace centered on the emotional labor performed by what sociologists have come to label as relatively low-status service workers or interactive service workers (McHammon and Griffin 2000). Interactive service workers are those individuals whose jobs are organized around face-to-face or voice-to-voice interactions (Macdonald and Sirriani 1996). Following Hochschild's initial analysis of the airlines industry and her guidance as to the types of jobs that were most likely to require emotional labor (see Appendix C in Hochschild [1983]), researchers have produced numerous studies of the emotional labor performed by occupants in a variety of interactive service occupations ranging from relatively lower-status occupations (e.g., amusement park greeter [Van Maanen and Kunda 1989], nail salon attendant [Kang 2003], food handler [Leidner 1993], emergency operators [Whalen and Zimmerman 1998], and waitress [Gatta 2002]) to their higher-status counterparts (e.g., bill collector [Sutton 1991], detective [Steinross and Kleinman 1989], insurance agent [Leidner 1993], paralegal [Lively 2002; Pierce 1999], nurse [Smith 1992], and attorney [Pierce 1995]).

As noted, early studies of workplace emotion focused on the emotional labor performed by interactive service workers (Leidner 1993). Although these studies tended to focus on relatively low-status workers who engaged in emotional labor in their interactions with clients or customers (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1993; Rafaeli and Sutton 1990), later studies broadened the scope of what constitutes emotional labor jobs, as well as who constitutes a proper recipient of emotional labor. Both Pierce (1995) and Lively (2000) examined the emotional labor performed by paraprofessionals not strictly for the benefit of clients but also for the benefit of the professionals who employed them.

These two studies, which incorporated more fully than most the hierarchical nature of the settings investigated, revealed that, consistent with theoretical discussions of emotion and status (Hochschild 1979; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990) and experimental studies of small group interactions (Lovaglia and House 1996; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Ridgeway and Walker 1995), paralegals were typically expected to manage their own anger that arose from their interpersonal interactions with higher-status attorneys and the negative emotions of those same attorneys that might have arisen from either interactions with clients or other stressful events (also see Thoits 1984). Although not implicitly stated, these studies suggest that emotional labor might occur in any occupation in which the maintenance of a given status hierarchy is implicit within the "successful" enactment of an occupational role (also see Rollins 1985).

In addition to these studies of paraprofessionals who engage in emotional labor for the benefit of clients and for higher-status colleagues, Pierce (1995), Harlow (2003), and Bellas (1999) pushed the scope of who does emotional labor even further by studying the emotional labor of relatively high-status professionals (e.g., attorneys and college professors). In conjunction with her examination of the emotional labor performed by paralegals, Pierce (1995) also found that litigation attorneys engaged in significant amounts of emotional labor. However, unlike the paralegals, who were predominantly female and who were required to display caretaking emotions...
and stifle feelings of agitation (Erickson and Ritter 2001), the attorneys, who were predominantly male, were supposed to evoke agitated feelings. Reminiscent of the earlier studies on emotional socialization (see above), Pierce (1995) reported that litigation attorneys were trained to view all interactions, including those with their paralegals, as interrogations and were taught how to use strong negative emotions such as anger and rage as a way to achieve influence over noncooperative clients and opposing counsel (see Clark’s, 1990, 1997, theoretical discussions regarding the micropolitical uses of emotion). Although attorneys were typically rewarded for “destroying” witnesses or “tearing down” the opposing side’s arguments in the courtroom, they were also taught to take advantage of role-taking emotions (Shott 1979), such as empathy, so as not to alienate jurors by inadvertently bullying a sympathetic witness (i.e., a child, a widow, or an invalid) as well as to engage in “strategic friendliness” in order to reach and retain clients (also see Hochschild 1983; Kang 2003).

Moving even further from what are typically viewed as emotional labor and service-oriented jobs, Bellas (1999) examined the emotional labor of college professors. Expanding upon the client-contact only model, Bellas argued that all four major aspects of an academic career—teaching, service, administration, and research—require emotional labor. Her analysis suggests, however, that the two aspects that openly require emotional labor and its concomitant interpersonal skills (e.g., teaching and service) are less valued, whereas the two evaluated more for their intellectual, technical, or leadership skills and less for the emotional ones are more highly rewarded. Although the emotional labor associated with research and administrative duties might be less time-consuming or obvious as that associated with teaching and service, these activities as sites of emotional labor should not be overlooked in future studies of academic life (Harlow 2003; also see Steinberg and Figart 1999).

The need to study a wide range of occupations in order to understand how emotional labor is utilized and the concomitant consequences has been verified further through the utilization of nationally representative data (Sloan 2003). Using combined data from the General Social Survey’s Emotions Module (GSS emotions module; Davis and Smith 1996) and the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT; England and Kilbourne 1988), Sloan (2003) illustrated that individuals in professional jobs were just as likely, if not more so, to perform emotional labor than individuals who were in so-called nonprofessional jobs (Becker 1970). Indeed, other studies using the GSS emotions module also revealed that relative status (e.g., the status difference between two or more actors) might be a better predictor of emotional expression than absolute status in hierarchical settings, of which the workplace is one (Lively and Powell 2006).

**Gender.** As noted, Hochschild (1983) argued that women were more likely to engage in emotional labor than men. Her observations about gender differences arose from two sources: by comparing the experiences of male and female flight attendants and by comparing the emotional labor performed by flight attendants (who were disproportionately female) and bill collectors (who were disproportionately male). Even among flight attendants, Hochschild found that women were more likely to be subjected to the negative emotions of others as well as to be held to higher expectations regarding positive emotions, leading her to argue that women have weaker “status shields” than men, which place them at an interactional disadvantage. What this meant, empirically, was that female flight attendants were at a greater risk of being dumped upon by angry customers and that customers expected them to be more emotionally engaged, more caring, and friendlier than their male counterparts (also see Bellas 1999; Martin 1999; Pierce 1995). Hochschild suggested that women’s reduced status shields are a function of normative expectations about women and emotion as well as broader structural considerations (e.g., women’s lower status compared to that of men).
Emotions in the Workplace

Following Hochschild's (1983) perspective, other scholars examined gender differences within single occupations and, for the most part, replicated her findings (Martin 1999; Pierce 1995). Unfortunately, the bulk of these studies were centered on occupations that were either disproportionately male (e.g., police, detectives, or litigation attorneys) or those that were disproportionately female (e.g., paralegals, nurses, beauticians). Without exception, these studies confirmed that women were, indeed, held to both a quantitatively and qualitatively different standard of emotional labor than their counterparts. In other words, not only were women expected to engage in more emotional labor than men but also in different types (but see Steinberg and Figart 1999).

For example, whereas Pierce's female paralegals were expected to engage in caretaking or emotional cheerleading for the benefit of their attorneys, the male paralegals in her study were expected to remain emotionally neutral, but politically savvy, "yes men," a role that often garnered higher rewards than those experienced by their female counterparts (also see Heikes 1991; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992). Similarly, Martin's (1999) female police officers were often required to comfort and console witnesses, whereas their male counterparts were more likely required to bully or capture potential suspects (also see Steinross and Kleinman 1989; Sutton 1991). In both cases, the caretaking work that these female occupants provided was typically recognized as part of women's unpaid work and was, perhaps not surprising, among the most despised and devalued aspects of the job (also see Bellas 1999).

Despite what qualitative studies suggest regarding distinct and persisting gender differences in emotional labor in the workplace, the results have been somewhat less conclusive when turning to studies using survey data, whether of specific service organizations (Bulan et al. 1997; Erickson and Wharton 1997), communities (Erickson and Ritter 2001), or societies as a whole (Sloan 2004; Lively and Powell 2006). Although survey data tapping into the experience of emotion in the workplace reveal some subtle and nuanced differences in women's and men's experience, expression, and management of emotions, the findings suggest that the absolute effects of gender on emotion in the workplace or otherwise might, in fact, be overstated—a conclusion that mirrors Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin's (1999) comprehensive review of the literature on gender and face-to-face interaction in small groups.

Moreover, survey data of emotion, more broadly, also report few significant absolute differences between men and women (Lively and Powell 2006; Schieman 2000; Simon and Lively 2005; Simon and Nath 2004; Stets and Tsushima 2001). Looking less at absolute differences in occurrence and frequency, Lively and Heise (2004) revealed slight and subtle gender differences in both the structure of felt emotion as well as the shortest paths between emotion states (e.g., the shortest path between distress and tranquility or between anger and joy). Further analyses (Lively 2004) suggest that the shortest path between positive and negative emotions differs in substantial ways for women in men. In particular, the shortest path between opposing emotions, for women, seems to be more complicated, to be less efficacious, and to utilize more stereotypically female emotions (Simon and Nath 2004). Although these models have not been tested in naturalistic settings, of which the workplace would be ideal (see below), these findings imply that the strategies that individuals might use in order to successfully manage their emotions on the job or for the job might, in fact, be qualitatively different, even if their outcomes (e.g., actual feeling and expression) are not.

RACE AND ETHNICITY. Unlike its closely studied counterpart, gender, the relationships between race and emotion and ethnicity and emotion within the workplace have been virtually ignored. Although some scholars have commented on the racialized nature of many of Hochschild's (1983) examples within The Managed Heart, there has been very little examination of how race
or ethnicity affects workers' emotional experiences on the job (but see Gee and DeCastro 2001; Harlow 2003).

Drawing on Feagin's (1991) qualitative work regarding the experiences of middle-class blacks in public spaces and Hochschild's (1983) own examples of racial epithets tossed at flight attendants as dual starting points, Gee and DeCastro (2001) noted the need to consider race as a complicating factor when considering emotional labor specifically, if not emotion and emotion management more generally, on the basis that racial and ethnic minorities might be required to engage in additional emotion management or emotional labor as a result of their devalued minority status. Despite the inherent logic in their argument—an argument that, in many ways, mirrors Hochschild's (1983) discussion of women's reduced status shields vis-à-vis men and Thoits's (1985) consideration of "normative double binds" (also see Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Ridgeway and Walker 1995)—few have attempted to investigate this claim empirically.5

One noteworthy example, however, is Harlow's (2003) recent comparison of the experiences of black and white college professors employed in a predominantly white university. In her inquiry into the ways in which race affects emotion management in the classroom, Harlow found that the emotional experiences of black professors are different and more complex than those of their white counterparts.6 Focusing specifically on professor-student interactions, Harlow reported that professors, regardless of race, routinely managed their own emotions in the classroom in an attempt to draw a desired response from their students (also see Bellas 1999). However, whereas all professors are often required to manage their emotions in response to behavioral or classroom management issues, Harlow's study found that black professors were more likely to have to further school their emotional reactions due to challenges to their competency, credentials, and ability to teach and assess student's work. In their attempt to protect themselves from the debilitating effects of day-to-day racism, Harlow argued, black professors are required to manage their emotions by "staying cognizant of macro-level racial barriers while diminishing the importance of those barriers on the micro-level" (p. 362).

Focusing on the experiences of Korean-immigrant nail salon owners, Kang (2003) also examined the influence of race and, in doing so, expanded upon traditional understandings of emotional labor, with the introduction of what she called, "bodily labor." Bodily labor designates a type of gendered work that involves the management of emotion in body-related service provision (also see Cahill 1989; Smith and Kleinman 1988) that is shaped not only by characteristics of the service workers (Hochschild 1983; Martin 1999; Pierce 1995) but also by the race, class, and expectations of the recipients. Specifically, she found that Korean-immigrant salon owners tend to provide high service bodily labor (e.g., physical pampering and emotional attentiveness) for middle- and upper-class white women. In contrast, they offered expressive bodily labor (e.g., artistry in technical skills and communication of respect and fairness) and routinized bodily labor (e.g., efficient, competent physical labor and courteous but minimal emotional labor) to working- and middle-class African American and Caribbean women and mostly lower-middle- and middle-class racially mixed female customers, respectively. Consistent with studies of gender inequality that have been linked to larger patterns of social stratification (Pierce 1995), Kang's findings illustrate how the gendered processes of bodily labor in nail salon work are "steeped with race and class meanings that reinforce broader structures of inequality and ideologies of difference among women" (p. 821).

Similar to investigations of gender that reveal qualitative, but not necessarily quantitative, differences in men's and women's emotional experiences (again, see Simon and Nath 2004), recent investigations of racial differences in emotional experience more generally also exhibit few significant variations. Using combined data from the GSS emotions module and the Chicago Crowding Study (Gove and Galle 1973), Mabry and Kiecolt (2005) found that African Americans
generally neither feel nor express more anger than whites, when models control for age and gender, despite African American’s lower average sense of control and higher levels of mistrust.

Unfortunately, scholars interested in pursuing racial and ethnic differences in the experience and expression of emotion in the workplace, or even more generally, are limited in their selection of representative data. Although obviously more recent than the Crowding Study, which is now over three decades old, the GSS emotions module was administered to a disappointingly small number of nonwhites. Moreover, the inadequate inclusion of groups other than black-white prevents much, if any, analysis.

Social Consequences of Emotional Labor

One of the most compelling questions that continues to plague researchers who study emotion in the workplace is whether individuals are, in fact, negatively affected by engaging in emotional labor (Hochschild 1983). As noted previously, Hochschild viewed feeling as a signal function that is related to identity, a view that led her to raise the dual specters of burnout (Maslach 1976; Maslach and Pines 1977) and alienation for those who were required to perform emotional labor for extended periods of time (also see Smith and Kleinman 1988).

Despite the intuitiveness of Hochschild’s (1983) argument, qualitative studies of food handlers (Gatta 2002; Leidner 1993; Paules 1991) and insurance agents (Leidner 1993) have failed to corroborate her findings. Leidner’s (1993) two-pronged study of fast-food workers and sales insurance agents, in particular, revealed fundamental contradictions to Hochschild’s predictions regarding the psychosocial costs of emotional labor. Indeed, Leidner reported that both sets of workers actually benefited from emotional labor, albeit for different reasons. The fast-food workers, who, as noted, were typically low skilled, highly regulated, easily replaceable, and usually trapped behind counters or in drive-thru windows, enjoyed the anonymity afforded by the scripts that the corporation provided and the ease with which these routines allowed them to sidestep interactions with difficult or disgruntled customers (also see Rafaeli and Sutton 1990). The insurance agents, who, in contrast to their lower-skilled counterparts, were highly trained, granted a tremendous amount of job autonomy, and often tied to the company through lengthy associations with particular clients or customers, also reported favorably when asked about the emotional labor components of their jobs (Leidner 1993). The insurance agents, in particular, found that the training that they had received provided them with the tools necessary not only to manage their interactions with customers and potential clients but also to meet their professional goals (also see Lively 2001).

Further, other qualitative studies also showcase the ways in which workers resist the demands of emotional labor rather than simply give in to their proposed consequences (Gatta 2002; Lively 2000; Pierce 1995). In fact, building upon Burawoy’s (1979) ethnography of factory workers’ resistance to the demands of management, Pierce (1995) introduced the notion of emotional resistance. Lively (2000) also illustrated how workers who have access to backstage regions (Goffman 1959) might in fact engage in reciprocal emotion management strategies that allow them to resist the costs of engaging in emotional labor.

In order to reconcile the inconsistencies brought about by the various ethnographic case studies, Wharton and her colleagues (Bulan et al. 1997; Erickson and Wharton 1997; Wharton 1993, 1999) undertook a systematic examination of the psychosocial costs of emotional labor using quantitative data collected from bank and hospital workers. Unlike ethnographic studies, where specific conditions or dimensions of meaning might be difficult to isolate or control, Wharton and her colleagues were able to tease apart not only the aspects of emotional labor that could
potentially be damaging to workers but also to draw attention to the characteristics of both the jobs and the workers themselves that might have the potential to mediate or moderate the costs of emotional labor (Erickson and Wharton 1997; Wharton 1999; Wharton and Erickson 1995).

In the first of these studies, Wharton (1993) turned her attention to burnout—the predicted consequence of over identification or the fusion of the self to the work role (Hochschild 1983). Controlling for a variety of individual and job characteristics, Wharton (1993) reported that workers in jobs that required emotional labor were no more likely than other workers to experience job-related burnout (also see Wharton and Erickson 1995). In general, she found that burnout was better explained by more general job characteristics (e.g., autonomy and number of hours worked) than by emotional labor. Moreover, and perhaps even more surprising, she also found that workers who performed emotional labor were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than were workers who did not—a finding that suggests that there are, indeed, benefits associated with jobs that require emotional labor (Wharton 1993).

Shifting their focus to inauthenticity, the predicted result of an estrangement between the work role and the self, usually at the expense of the self (Hochschild 1983), Erickson and Wharton (1997) also examined the relationship between inauthentic feelings and emotional labor by comparing the experiences of workers who engaged in emotional labor and those who did not. Unlike qualitative studies where, perhaps out of methodological necessity, researchers tend to treat emotional labor as a one-dimensional outcome (Hochschild 1983; Lively 2002), Erickson and Wharton (1997) measured emotional labor by tapping into three separate dimensions: contact with the public, the amount of time spent working with people on the job, and the degree to which “handling people well” is an important aspect of their job (also see Wharton 1999). Whereas other studies have focused almost exclusively on client contact (e.g., literally the presence or absence of clients; Hochschild 1983; Lively 2002; Sloan 2004), Erickson and Wharton found that “handling people well” was the only dimension of emotional labor positively related to feelings of inauthenticity (also see Wharton 1999).9

In another set of analyses, Wharton (1993) also examined whether different aspects of the work itself contribute to burnout and job satisfaction, once again by comparing the experiences of service workers who do and do not engage in emotional labor. Here, she found that high levels of job involvement were associated with lower levels of burnout among nonperformers of emotional labor, but that this was not the case with emotional laborers—a finding that supports Hochschild’s (1983) original proposition that overidentifying might be problematic for individuals whose jobs require emotional labor (Wharton 1999). Another interesting difference was revealed when considering the factors that produce job satisfaction among performers and nonperformers of emotional labor. Wharton (1993) found that job autonomy affects job satisfaction more so for those who perform emotional labor than those who do not. However, job involvement seems to contribute more to the satisfaction levels of those who do not sell their emotions for a wage.

Finally, turning her attention to individual resources, Wharton (1993) also found evidence that suggests that performers and nonperformers of emotional labor differ in terms of the role that their interpersonal skills play in protecting them from or enhancing their susceptibility to burnout at work (also see Wharton 1999). Specifically, emotional laborers who score high on self-monitoring (e.g., the ability to monitor and react to the social environment) are better able to avoid burnout than workers who do not. Self-monitoring skills, however, contributed to burnout among those whose jobs do not require emotional labor.

Taken together, these studies offer support for some of Hochschild’s (1983) broader claims while pointing to the need to be more systematic in the operationalization of concepts that are often vague or hard to measure in more naturalistic settings. Wharton and her colleagues’ work furthers our understanding as to how complex and nuanced the effects of emotional
labor can be and the ways in which these consequences might be mediated not only by the characteristics of the job but also by the psychological characteristics of the occupants themselves. Unfortunately, however, all of these studies were based on relatively small samples of particular organizations, raising important questions about the generalizability of their exact findings.

Using a much larger, community-based sample, but in the same tradition, Erickson and Ritter (2001) also utilized survey methods to tease apart the more potentially damaging dimensions of emotional labor and then tested whether there were differences for men and women. This work improves upon previous studies in important ways. First, Erickson and Ritter's analyses are not limited to data collected from workers in the service industry only, but, rather, from a random selection of workers more generally. This advance alone allows for a much needed assessment of the prevalence of particular emotions, as well as emotional labor and its resulting consequences in a variety of jobs. Second, instead of treating emotional labor as the management of emotions, broadly defined (Hochschild 1983; Lively 2000; Pierce 1995), Erickson and Ritter examined the management of three types of emotion: positive, negative, and agitated (also see Pugliesi and Shook 1997) and their distinctive effects. Third, because they were using a fairly representative sample Erickson and Ritter's results are not a function of skewed gender ratios (Kanter 1977), a problem too often associated with studies of interactive service work (see Hochschild 1983; Lively 2000; Martin 1999; Pierce 1995) given that most occupations remain stubbornly segregated by sex.

Drawing on a wide breadth of research on emotions and mental health, Erickson and Ritter (2001) posited that the management of agitation (i.e., anger, irritation, and frustration) is a form of emotional labor that is likely to be associated with increased feelings of burnout and inauthenticity. Taking into consideration research on gender and emotion and gender and mental health, they conjectured that this negative effect of agitation on well-being will be more pronounced for women than men, given that women are more likely to be subjected to the anger of others (Hochschild 1983; Thoits 1985), are placed in anger-eliciting interactions (Kemper 1978), and are expected to mask or manage those types of feeling (also Ridgeway and Johnson 1990).

Consistent with their expectations, Erickson and Ritter (2001) found that managing feelings of agitation (e.g., hiding feelings of anger) is significantly related to feelings of burnout and inauthenticity. Moreover, they found that the severity of one’s feelings of inauthenticity corresponds with one’s level of agitation. Contrary to their hypotheses regarding gender, however, the effects of managing agitation were not significantly different for women and men. Because women do, in fact, report higher levels of agitation than men, as well as other negative emotions (also see Simon and Nath 2004), Erickson and Ritter proposed that the meaning associated with hiding one’s angry feelings might be different for women and men, a supposition that is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of their community-based survey data.

What Are the Economic Costs of Emotional Labor?

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, given sociologists long-standing love affair with labor and capital, the economic costs of emotional labor have been less studied than the psychosocial costs, despite several qualitative studies that suggest that emotional labor—particularly the emotional labor performed by women—is, for the most part, undervalued and underpaid, if not unpaid. Much in the way that carework in the home is viewed as women’s work and, therefore, devalued (Cancian 1987; Hochschild 1989), traditional forms of emotional labor (e.g., carework and other forms of on-the-job nurturing) are typically not recognized as skills that need to be compensated (Bellas
1999; Pierce 1995; Steinberg 1999; Steinberg and Figart 1999), especially when performed by women.

Perhaps the most comprehensive studies of the hidden costs of emotional labor comes not from those who would identify as scholars of emotion per se, but, rather, from scholars of inequality, labor, and stratification. The first of these studies was actually a comparable-worth investigation conducted for the state of New York. Here, Steinberg et al. (1985) found that several of 112 questions regarding job content, in fact, clustered around 2 factors associated with emotional labor (Hochschild 1983): “contact with difficult clients” and “communication with the public.” When examining the effects of emotional labor on wages, the authors found that both factors were significantly related to the gender (female) composition of the job. However, only “communication with the public” produced a negative effect on earnings. This finding might be attributable to the fact that high-status service workers who deal primarily with clients (as opposed to customers) also engage in emotional labor (e.g., physicians, attorneys, investment bankers).

In a similar attempt, England, Kilbourne, and their colleagues also conducted a series of studies to test the effects of “nurturant social skills” on wages (England et al. 1994; Kilbourne et al. 1994). Like Steinberg et al., these scholars, too, found that nurturance is more likely to occur in historically female jobs than in historically male jobs. However, perhaps because of their operationalization of “nurturant skills” as involving interactions with both clients and customers, they also found that those occupations that require nurturance, be they historically male or female, are less compensated than occupations that do not. Although few have followed up on these studies, they, like Wharton’s (1999) careful consideration of the psychosocial costs, point to the importance of teasing apart, using survey data, the observations documented in ethnographic studies. Having said that, however, it might be useful to turn to qualitative studies of domestic work to provide some insight on why “nurturant skills” are so devalued in an economy that remains based largely on service.

Not typically recognized as “emotional labor” or even “the workplace,” ethnographic studies of Latina domestic workers reveal that employers are likely to pay less or to forgo other forms of monetary compensation (e.g., raises, overtime, or bonuses) once emotional ties are established, not only out of their desire to save money but to foster the belief that the domestic worker, particularly if she is a full-time caregiver, is caring for the employee’s children out of love and not money (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001). Although the nurturing work done at home—even if it is done by someone other than the “wife” or “mother”—is rarely recognized as work (Romero 1992, 1996, 1997), paid domestic labor might be a potential site through which to better understand, exactly, why emotions and care are not recognized as salable commodities.

**The Role of Co-workers**

Virtually absent in Hochschild’s (1983) discussion of emotional labor, co-workers have nonetheless emerged as a topic of interest among those interested in how emotion operates in the workplace. Part of the reason why Hochschild’s analyses purposefully excluded the role of co-workers in emotion management or emotional labor is that Delta instructed flight attendants not to turn to their flight partners when fearful, angry, or frustrated in part because most in-air interaction would be visible or audible to the customers themselves. Moreover, airline officials also believed that if flight attendants complained about a customer to a co-worker, it could potentially create an us-versus-them dichotomy that would interfere with the flight attendants’ portrayal of the cabin as a living room (e.g., the proper setting for a party) and of the customers as guests.

Although co-workers can, in some cases, be more anger-producing or frustrating than clients or supervisors (Pugliesi and Shook 1997; also see Lively and Powell 2006), most view co-worker
interaction as vital to emotional laborers' ability to manage their own emotions (Lively and Powell 2006; Sloan 2004) or engage in emotional labor for the benefit of others (Lively 2000). One source of data that holds insights as to the role that co-workers play in the emotional lives of workers is the GSS emotions module (1996). Examining a subset of questions that ask individuals to identify an anger-producing event within the last month, the target at whom the anger was directed, and a coping strategy they used in order to manage their negative feelings, scholars were able to determine how individuals report managing their emotions within a representative sample.

Focusing exclusively on those individuals who were angered at work, Sloan (2004) found that individuals were more likely to seek social support than they were to try to manage their emotions on their own (also see Lively and Powell 2006). Comparing the experiences of those who were angered by individuals in the workplace with those who were angered by family members, Lively and Powell (2006) also found that individuals who were angered with someone at work were significantly more likely to speak to someone other than the target of their anger compared to those individuals angered by someone at home. Although these two studies, in tandem, reveal the importance of considering the role that others play when managing emotion on the workplace, the data themselves mask important information as to the exact role that others play in managing emotions in the workplace. In order to grasp some of the details that are necessarily hidden when using quantitative data, it might be useful, once again, to consult qualitative studies of similar phenomena (see Lively 2000).

Another conceptual difficulty plaguing the emotions in the workplace genre is the distinction between emotion management that individuals do "voluntarily" for friends and co-workers and emotional labor that they are required to do for customers, clients, and status superiors. Is the voluntary emotion management that individuals perform to reach their professional goals, to maintain their sense of self, or simply because they want to perform emotional labor (Erickson 1997; Lively 2001)? Is the interpersonal emotion management that workers engage in strictly for the benefit of others (e.g., social support and coping assistance) (Francis 1997; Thoits 1985, 1995)? Conversely, is it ever the case that individuals voluntarily manage the emotions of higher-status others without necessarily feeling that it is part of their job? Finally, are there consequences to emotion management done voluntarily at work? If so, to what end?

Although most studies focus on emotion management (Smith and Kleinman 1989; Van Maanen and Kunda 1989) or emotional labor (Hochschild 1983; Kang 2003; Pierce 1995), a handful of studies show that individuals, perhaps not surprisingly, do both (Lively and Powell 2006; Sloan 2004; Lively 2000, 2001). Although it is clear from studies of emotional labor that there are rewards and punishments for emotional labor (be it increased sales and positive performance evaluations on the one hand and terminations on the other), there might also be informal rewards and punishments for those who either participate, or fail to participate in a less formally regimented emotional economy (Cahiill 1989; Clark 1987, 1990; Lively 2000, 2001; Smith and Kleinman 1989).

Although individuals report that they benefit, both directly and indirectly, from engaging voluntarily in emotion management with others, Lively (2000) has suggested that workers' reciprocal emotion management comes at an individual cost, in that it can exact a heavy toll on one's own emotional and personal resources. Moreover, at a social level, workers' engagement in reciprocal emotion management becomes the safety valve that allows them to engage in emotional labor for the benefit of higher-status others. Finally, although reciprocal emotion management is viewed as strictly voluntary (yet is subject to the adherence of certain rules, much like sympathy [Clark 1997]), it does, ironically, lend itself to the reification of the existing status hierarchy and all of its emotional ramifications (Lively 2000; also see Pierce 1995). In fact, many of the paralegals in
Lively’s (2000) study reported that they would not be able to manage consistently their emotions with regard to their interactions with clients and with attorneys if it were not for the emotion management assistance that they received from similar others.

Comparative Studies Between Work and Family

Despite the workplace being as good a place as any to study emotion, perhaps one of the reasons why researchers are so fascinated by the workplace is the natural comparison that it makes to one of the other most important life domains: the family. Unlike the workplace, family life has historically been characterized as emotionally authentic or as a refuge from the demands of the outside world (Stearns 1999; Stearns and Stearns 1986).

Hochschild’s (1983) analysis of the airline industry underscores this difference, as one of the ways that corporations engineered emotional cultures was by convincing employees to treat customers as if they were family and the work space as a home. Pierce’s (1995) study of law firms also highlighted differences between work and family to the degree that the disproportionately female paralegals were expected to engage in “mothering” behaviors (i.e., nurturing, cheering, or caring) for the benefit of their disproportionately male attorneys (also see Pierce 1999).

Although most researchers assume that there is a difference in the ways that emotions operate between work and family, there have been very few systematic studies that successfully compare the two. Instead, with the exception of a handful of studies (Hochschild 1997; Lively and Powell 2006; Wharton and Erickson 1995), we are left with examinations of work or family (but see Schieman 2000; Stets and Tsushima 2001). Justifications for a work-family dichotomy extend as far back as early discussions of professions (Becker 1970; Friedson 1970) and professionalism (Larson 1977; Ritzer 1971). Initial studies of the medical profession have historically stressed the importance of emotional neutrality as crucial to professional relationships, and more recent studies of professionalism have focused on the emotional component, almost to the exclusion of traditional markers of a professional career (Lively 2001; also see Pogrebin and Poole 1995).

Although most scholars assume that the workplace and the family hold emotionally distinct cultures, some have recently suggested a blurring of the emotional boundaries between work and family life. Hochschild (1997), for example, suggested that many workplaces have succeeded in creating an environment that is more emotionally welcoming and, consequently, rewarding for working parents, especially mothers. Similarly, Stearns (1999) has posited that norms regarding behavior, emotion, and self-control that once made the family a safe haven from the competitive ills of the workplace have been extended to public life, therefore obscuring important differences between the two spheres.

To date, there have been few studies that have systematically compared emotional experiences within the workplace and home. Moreover, because the majority of these studies have used the same dataset, all of the direct comparisons focus on one emotion: anger (see above).10 Once again relying on the GSS emotions module, Schieman (2000), examining the relationship between education and anger, reported that education increased the likelihood of experiencing anger at work (compared to within the family)—a difference, however, that fell to nonsignificance when controlling for income and sense of control. Stets and Tsushima (2001), examining the experience of anger as it relates to particular types of identity, found that anger experienced as a result of one’s worker identity is typically of longer duration than anger experienced as a result of one’s family identity.
Focusing on the expression of anger, as opposed to its experience, Lively and Powell (2006) found that despite claims of the blurring boundaries between work and family, individuals are significantly more likely to express anger directly toward family members than they are to express anger directly toward people at work (e.g., customers, bosses, co-workers, subordinates). When examining the effects of status (both within and across the domains of work and family), however, Lively and Powell also found that individuals were less likely to express anger directly to individuals of higher status (e.g., customers or bosses) than they were to either equals (e.g., co-workers) or those of lower status (e.g., subordinates). Individuals angered by status equals were just as likely, if not slightly more so, to express their anger directly to co-workers than they were to those with lower status. Moreover, the patterns generated by considerations of status were not significantly different when considering work or family, which suggests that the difference between emotional expression at home and that at work might be more a matter of degree than substance.

**CONCLUSION**

The past two decades have spawned a tremendous amount of research regarding the role that emotion plays in the workplace. As noted, much of this early work was founded on overly descriptive studies of how emotions operate within particular occupations—first concentrated in relatively low-status service occupations and then extended to include professional schools and other higher-status professions. As part of their careful consideration of emotion norms and emotional cultures, these studies also documented the observable effects of personal characteristics on emotional experience, expression, and management—most notably those of gender and occupational prestige—suggesting that women and lower-status workers were required to engage in more caretaking behaviors and provide more care for men and individuals of higher status.

Because each workplace culture is different, as are the interdependent goals of workers, customers, and management (Leidner 1996; Lively 2002), it is not surprising that inconsistencies arose, the most controversial being the reported discrepancy surrounding the psychosocial costs of emotional labor (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1993; Smith and Kleinman 1989). In order to reconcile empirical and, potentially, theoretical differences, scholars began collecting different types of data. Among these were survey data that, although not necessarily representative in scope, allowed for a greater specification of concepts and set up the tradition of multimethod investigation that has rapidly, and rightly so, become the norm in an area once dominated by qualitative methods (Erickson and Ritter 2001; Pugliesi and Shook 1997; Wharton 1999). This trend has escalated further with the release and utilization of the GSS (1996) module on emotion (Lively and Powell 2006; Schieman 2000; Sloan 2004; Stets and Tsushima 2001). The incorporation of both qualitative and quantitative methods to answer complementary questions has resulted not only in more generalizable conclusions but also in richer understandings of the problems at hand. This dual approach has also lent itself to a greater appreciation of statistically significant patterns that might require additional exploration using a more ethnographic or even experimental approach (see Lively and Powell 2006).

Although those studying emotion in the workplace have been receptive to the incorporation of new methodologies in order to answer their empirical questions, they typically have remained remarkably fixed in terms of their theoretical choices, a fact that might stem, in part, from the obdurate hold that Hochschild’s (1983) legacy has retained over what seems to legitimately constitute the sociological inquiry of emotion in the workplace (but see Stets and Tsushima 2001). Historically, scholars of workplace emotion have limited their use of theory to what could
rightfully be referred to as the cultural-normative perspective (Clark 1997; Heise and Calhan 1995; Hochschild 1975, 1983) and the structural perspective (Clark 1990, 1997; Collins 1990; Kemper 1978; Kemper and Collins 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; for recent reviews see Lawler and Thye 2001, Smith-Lovin 1995; Stets 2003b). Often treated as mutually exclusive, a recent test of the relative effects of norms and status within hierarchically ordered domains illustrates that not only do culture and structure operate in tandem but that the relative effects are roughly the same (Lively and Powell 2006).

Despite scholars’ overreliance on these two theoretical perspectives when addressing questions set in the workplace, social psychologists are beginning to theorize and specify the emotional implications of other, more middle-range theories. For example, in several recent theoretical and empirical pieces, affect control theory (Lively and Heise 2004; MacKinnon 1994; Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988), identity theory (Stryker 2004), identity control theory (Stets 2005; Stets and Tsushima 2001), exchange theory (Lawler and Thye 1999), and equity theory (Burke and Harrod 2005; Lively et al. 2004; Sprecher 1986, 1992; Stets 2003a) have been linked to the experience and expression of emotion. To date, however, the empirical tests of these theories have generally not been conducted in the workplace, despite the characteristics of the workplace that would make such an enterprise ideal (but see Stets and Tsushima 2001). Unlike laboratory settings, where groups of strangers are brought together for a short length of time to engage in tasks that might or might not be self-relevant or hold significant outcomes, tasks in the workplace are often highly self-relevant and tied to real outcomes (e.g., a wage or a promotion). Moreover, work-based tasks are routinely subject to both formal and informal evaluations that are embedded in real, if not significant, relationships that are clearly marked by both organizational norms and social status hierarchies.

Similar to the family (Steelman and Powell 1996), which has emerged as the critical site in which to test and enrich social psychological theory and to specify the scope conditions under which certain social psychological theories might offer the greatest explanations (Burke and Harrod 2005; Glass and Fujimoto 1994; Lennon and Rosenfield 1994; Lively et al. 2004 for recent empirical examples), the workplace holds the necessarily elements that would benefit both the testing and specification of theory as it pertains to the study of emotion. Moreover, because of the qualitative differences between the relationships within work and family, it is not at all clear that the emotional reactions associated with social psychological processes (say, perceptions of justice or inequity) would be the same in both settings; Stets and Tsushima’s (2001) investigation of identity confirmation/disconfirmation suggests not.

In addition to simply providing a natural laboratory to test social psychological theory (and therefore play host to a series of questions outside of Hochschild’s [1983] original considerations of emotion management and emotional labor), the empirical work being done in the workplace would benefit from a greater consideration of social psychological theory, particularly theories of identity (Burke 1991; Heise 1977; Lively and Heise 2004; Stets and Tsushima 2001; Stryker 2004). One assumption that is implicit in most studies of emotion management and emotional labor is that emotions are linked to the self. Although rarely acknowledged in workplace studies of emotion, this is also the underlying logic beneath most theories of identity, particularly control theories (Burke 1991; Heise 1977, 2002; Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988; Stets 2003a, 2005). In fact, when one reads descriptions of the emotion management strategies provided to workers (e.g., trying to see the irritating customer as a frightened child or a airplane as a living room), they read eerily like predictions straight from affect control theory (Heise 2002). Furthermore, Lively and Heise (2004), using multidimensional scaling and structural equation modeling, have illustrated that emotion management strategies (e.g., moving from anger to tranquility) can actually be derived using postulates from affect control theory (also see Francis 1997).
Like all new subfields or inquiries of study, the study of emotion in the workplace is in an ongoing process of maturation. Hochschild (1983) provided the necessary building blocks to pique sociological interest in a relatively unknown or little considered arena and created one of the most prolific legacies within sociology today (Smith-Lovin 2004). Scholars have expanded their methodological practices in order to create a fertile dialogue between the empirical richness of ethnography and methodological specification associated with quantitative analyses, allowing them to create more complete understandings of emotion, the workplace, and the relationship between them.

Just as the inclusion of more diverse methods has resulted in a surge of research and knowledge, an infusion of theory, above and beyond the broad theoretical perspectives upon which Hochschild and others have based their work, might have a similar influence. Specifically, a greater use of middle-range and, therefore, more testable social psychological theories could provide scholars with a unique opportunity to enrich their ongoing efforts to understand emotion management and emotional labor. Perhaps even more important, for the future of the line of inquiry, the incorporation of more testable theories might open up new research agendas and, subsequently, make the study of workplace emotion more relevant for social psychology, as well as sociology as a whole.

NOTES

1. Although Hochschild’s (1983) definitions of emotion management and emotional labor remain the most used, several scholars have introduced their own definitions that are more or less consistent with Hochschild’s original statements. Rosenberg (1990:4), for example, used emotion management to refer to the “self-regulation of emotional exhibition for the purpose of producing intended effects on others’ minds.” Focusing more on emotional expression than the misuse of perception and memory that Hochschild was concerned with, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993:90) defined emotional labor as “the act of displaying the appropriate emotion.” In an attempt to be more inclusive, while keeping the focus on service workers, Wharton (1999:160) defined emotional labor as “the effort involved in displaying organizationally sanctioned emotions by those whose jobs require interaction with clients or customers and for whom these interactions are an important component of the work.”

2. Cahill (1989) also noted that students learned to manage their emotions via associations with other students outside of the classroom (i.e., the fact that mortaray students tend to live and socialize together) and through talk (i.e., the incorporation of occupational rhetoric and esoteric language, speaking of “cases,” not “bodies”).

3. Pierce (1995) argued that to the degree that paralegals and attorneys were successful in fulfilling their occupational roles and their emotional concomitants, they were also implicitly reproducing the larger gender hierarchy within society as a whole.

4. In particular, Hochschild (1983) argued that women were more suited to engage in emotional labor at work, because women are trained from childhood to be more in touch with their own and others’ emotions than are men, and that as adults they learn to trade emotion (i.e., love and nurturing) for financial support from men.

5. Although not typically classed as studies within the sociology of emotion, other sources of information on the racialized nature of emotional labor and carework more generally come from an unlikely source (e.g., the growing literature on domestic workers), particularly foreign-born nannies employed not in traditional workplaces but, rather, in private homes throughout the United States (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Romero 1992, 1996, 1997; also see Rollins 1985).

6. Although Harlow (2003) referred to her topic exclusively as emotion management (and not, necessarily, labor), Bellas (1999) has argued that the emotion management that professors engage in during the course of teaching is done so as to elicit particular emotional responses from their students. This study, like others that focus on emotion management, but not labor per se (e.g., Lively 2000), might in fact obscure the relationship between emotion management that individuals engage in voluntarily and the emotional labor they do in order to achieve the goals of the organizations within which they are embedded.

7. Although both sets of workers in Leidner’s (1993) study seem to benefit from engaging in emotional labor to the degree that their own goals match those of the corporations, she cautioned that when there is a discrepancy between goals, the workers’ interests are the one’s most likely sacrificed.
8. Erickson and Wharton (1997) captured inauthentic feelings with a two-item scale assessing how often respondents felt that they could not be themselves while at work or that they had to fake how they really felt at work.
9. In addition to Erickson and Wharton’s (1997) careful analyses, Erickson and Ritter (2001), Morris and Feldman (1996), Steinberg and Figart (1999), and others all provided compelling theoretical arguments and empirical evidence for the need to consider multiple dimensions of emotional labor.

Combining qualitative and quantitative analyses, Steinberg and Figart (1999) evaluated dimensions of emotional labor of three historically gender-specific jobs: nurses, police officers, and managers. Creating two indexes that measure a range of emotional skills and demands, they found that the emotional labor required of police officers and nurses is comparable despite the cultural ideology that portrays these jobs as requiring gender-specific skills, causing the authors to abandon their reliance on preconceived stereotypes of femininity when studying emotional labor, especially in service-sector jobs, and, instead, adopt an augmented conceptualization of emotional labor that takes into consideration what employees actually do in the course of performing their jobs.

10. Fewer, still, have examined the relationships between the emotional labor performed at work and the emotion management performed at home (but see Erickson and Wharton 1997).
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