View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by ScholarWorks at WMU

ORIGINAL RESEARCH STUDIES

Journal of Communication Pedagogy
2019, Vol. 2, 63–75
© The Author(s) 2019
Reprints and permissions: http://www.csca-net.org
DOI:10.31446/JCP.2019.14
Central States Communication Association

"You Have to Cry Before You Teach This Class": Emotion with Work and Resistance in Teaching Intercultural Communication

Brandi Lawless and Yea-Wen Chen

Keywords: emotion with work; critical communication pedagogy; intercultural communication; critical intercultural communication pedagogy

Abstract: In this study, we explore the ways in which Intercultural Communication instructors uniquely experience emotion with work and how this influences their pedagogical approaches to this course. We collected and analyzed interviews with 21 intercultural communication educators across U.S. colleges and universities. We present findings related to the types of resistance present and/or emerging in the intercultural communication classroom, emotional responses to resistance, and strategies for managing and negotiating emotion with work in the Intercultural Communication classroom. We end with discussing implications for teacher training programs designed for the Intercultural Communication classroom.

Communication is a broad and multifaceted discipline, with 48 interest groups, seven sections, and six caucuses serving the National Communication Association in 2018. As much as studying human interaction is at the heart of communication scholarship across areas, instructor experiences teaching in this broad field can vary by more than just content. Rather, our realities inside the classroom can shift due to different expectations regarding emotions, (body) politics, and social taboos. These differences can present unique challenges for Intercultural Communication educators who must navigate the murky waters of teaching diversity, inclusion, and social justice in the current political climate (Chen & Lawless, 2018; Halualani, 2018). For instance, Goodman (1995) suggested teachers committed to inclusive curricula for social and cultural diversities will encounter heated discussions and emotional reactions to

Brandi Lawless, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Yea-Wen Chen, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA
CONTACT: bjlawless@usfca.edu

material and suggest we "encourage ways to channel anger and other emotions constructively" (p. 51). Hedley and Markowitz (2001) argued that an additional obstacle may be "everyday stress on emotional disposition" which results in student resistance (p. 196). Although "cultural diversities" and "controversial topics" are central to the Intercultural Communication course, the study of the emotions that emerge in relationships between Intercultural Communication instructors and their students has not been studied. The challenges of emotion with work specific to the Intercultural Communication course lead to increased stress on the body, pedagogical obstacles, fear, and burnout amongst instructors. Thus, emotions with work and related resistance are important yet understudied issues for (intercultural) communication education (Lawless, 2018).

Emotions in the workplace have been studied in various forms, with earlier articulations focusing on *emotional labor*—affective forms of work, including developing, managing, and performing emotion in the workplace (Hochschild, 1983). The "labor" that academics experience stretches much further than Hochschild's early conceptualizations, leading researchers to expand the term beyond task orientation toward relationship orientation, including expectations (e.g., teachers should be nurturers/caretakers) and the bodily consequences for emotional risk-taking (e.g., students created a vulnerable classroom space in which they shared personal traumas) (Lawless, 2018). Also, it is important to note the range of emotions that result in this additional labor (e.g., anger, fear, frustration, sadness, mania, disappointment, anxiety) that extend beyond simple "exhaustion" (Boler, 1999). These emotions emerge in the college classroom as (implicit) expectations of sympathy, development of personal relationships, attention to immediacy, and responses to resistance. Moreover, such expectations of emotions not only differ across instructors because of their salient identity positions, but also have material consequences for educators. The expectation that these forms of labor be included as part of instructors' duties in addition to their standard job responsibilities should be problematized and explored. Thus, further discussion of emotions with work, specifically in college classrooms, warrants further attention. This study highlights narratives of emotion with work and explores the particularities of how emotions emerge in relationships between instructors and students in teaching Intercultural Communication in hopes of better understanding how to navigate teaching this course.

Literature Review

The unique difficulties in teaching diversity have been well documented (Boler, 2004; Broome, 1991; Chen, Simmons, & Kang, 2015; Duffy, Mowatt, Fuchs, & Salisbury, 2014; Goodman, 1995; Johnson & Bhatt, 2003; Simpson, Causey, & Williams, 2007; Smith, 1982). Student resistance to issues of diversity, equity, and social justice may manifest as overt challenges to the instructor, verbal/nonverbal aggression, and reinforcement of problematic normative ideologies (e.g., heteronormativity, colorblindness; Hedley & Markowitz, 2001). Moreover, a common resistance strategy by students from privileged identity positions is "uncritical sharing of experiences" to demonstrate authority of a subject matter (Davis & Steyn, 2012, p. 32). Watt (2007) argued that these resistive behaviors can intermingle with student perceptions of the instructor, especially those instructors from marginalized groups that students may or may not have been exposed to prior to the course. The overt political nature of intercultural communication makes it a hotbed for resistance, guilt, and anger (Lawless & Chen, 2018). Whereas skill-based classes such as math and biology have a seemingly fixed curriculum, students enter an Intercultural Communication course with competing ideologies that are individually fixed, yet socially constructed (Hedley & Markowitz). Instructors must be skilled in creating dialogues across differences in addition to simple dissemination of material. In addition, foundational intercultural concepts such as "empathy" are misperceived as skill-based variables that can be taught through transmissional modes of communication, rather than fluid,

culturally contingent, and relationally produced phenomena (Broome, 1991). Hence, there is a lack of perceived tangibility in this course, making it difficult to define and measure course learning outcomes.

The "affective component" of intercultural communication requires students to undergo a process of self-assessment that can call attention to prejudice and (implicit) bias (Kim & Gudykunst, 1999). Through consistent practices of self-reflection, emotions that typically are not central to course content (e.g., anger, guilt, and frustration) take center stage, requiring the instructor's navigation, attention, and intervention. Acknowledging the frequency of these challenges requires that Intercultural Communication instructors be prepared to discuss content and manage the emotional climate in the classroom; for instance, by preparing a repertoire of responses that might produce any number of uncomfortable and/or unproductive emotional responses.

Since Hochschild's (1983) work on emotional labor as unwritten emotional expectations, the terrain of literature on emotions and work has become more nuanced. Miller, Considine, and Garner (2007) documented five types of emotion in organizations: emotional labor, emotional work, emotion with work, emotion at work, and emotion toward work. This study focuses on *emotion with work*, described by Miller and colleagues as involving "emotion that emerges through relationships and interactions with other employees in the workplace" (p. 233). Given that academia is a unique workplace, this study adds students to the list of "coworkers" with whom instructors interact on a daily basis. Thus, emotion with work in the college classroom explains the emotions and affective work that emerge in interactions between instructors and his/her/their students. While Miller and her colleagues noted emotional support and emotional abuse as two types of interactions that manifest as emotions with work, this study highlights emotional resistance as an additional form of emotion with work.

An understanding of emotion with work is extended to include aspects of worry, trauma, emotional exhaustion, and self-defeat that also take a toll on the body. These extensions are offered as other important forms of work that emerge in interaction with students, as is a hallmark of emotion with work. When these become expectations or "part of the job," they should be labeled as work. Given this, there is a need to better understand such forms of work. The voices represented in this study describe their affective responses to resistance and challenges that are particular to teaching the Intercultural Communication course, helping answer the questions:

> *How do Intercultural Communication instructors experience emotions with work, and how does this influence their pedagogical approaches to this course?*

Method

Participants

This article is part of a larger study conducted on intercultural communication pedagogy in which we interviewed 21 self-identified Intercultural Communication educators, teachers, and/or trainers across the United States (U.S.) who were recruited using purposeful sampling. The interviewees represented multiple positions in academia including 1 consultant, 2 graduate teaching assistants who taught stand-alone classes, 1 lecturer, 3 assistant professors, 4 associate professors, and 10 full professors (including 1 teaching at 2-year community colleges and 1 retired professor). Collectively, the participants were 10 men and 11 women; 7 people of color (1 Latinx, 2 Blacks, and 4 Asians) and 14 Whites; and 3 identified as gay or queer. In terms of immigration status, 19 of the participants were U.S. citizens, including 1 U.S. American working as an immigrant in another country and 1 naturalized citizen; 1 green card

holder; and 1 F-1 international student. One educator was teaching abroad, but previously held faculty positions in the U.S. Teaching experience ranged from 5 years to over 40 years of teaching Intercultural Communication. U.S.-based educators were chosen as part of a convenience sample, subsequently highlighting the unique experience of teaching within the current political climate. Because of the sample size, participants have been de-identified to maintain confidentiality.

Procedures

We utilized a semi-structured interview guide, allowing us to identify shared experiences and remain flexible in addressing individual narratives (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). IRB approval was received for this study. Interviews were conducted in neutral, quiet locations and lasted between 40 and 75 minutes each. Interviews were recorded, resulting in 287 pages of single-spaced transcriptions.

Data Analysis

Following Owen's (1984) criteria for thematic analysis (i.e., recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness), codes were identified through open coding and later grouped into larger themes regarding emotion with work. In the first stage of open coding, each author coded the interviews independently noting "impressions, thoughts, and initial analysis" (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1279). We then compared and contrasted our open coding to identify recurring, repeated, and forceful themes embedded in the interview discourses. In the second stage of closed coding, both consistencies and inconsistencies in our open coding were interrogated until reaching consensus on categories. As a White woman and an immigrant faculty woman of color, we relied heavily on our shared and unshared identity positions to constantly ensure that we interpreted the participants' words on their terms. Furthermore, due to the sensitive nature of one participant's interview, we submitted an earlier version of this manuscript with that person for member checking. This participant agreed with our interpretation and offered consent for publication.

Results

Overwhelmingly, many participants experienced some form of emotion with work when teaching the Intercultural Communication course, with several expressing that they felt the amount of this labor was incomparable to other subjects. Our findings also revealed that the experiences of, and struggles with, emotion with work were disproportionately felt by women (of color). In our interviews, every woman except one referred to the emotion with work they experienced in teaching the Intercultural Communication course, whereas only three men offered comments that were coded as emotion with work. We also found that much of the emotion with work when teaching this course occurred in response to unique forms of resistance in the classroom. Three key themes emerged from the interviews: (a) resistance in the Intercultural Communication classroom as emotion with work, (b) emotional responses to resistance, and (c) support and strategies for managing emotion with work.

Resistance in the Intercultural Communication Classroom

While any instructor can experience resistive behavior in the classroom, participants described the Intercultural Communication classroom as a hotbed for resistance due to the political nature of the topic, the taboo course content, and the ways in which individual identities become highlighted in classroom discussion. The types of resistance experienced by our participants were: (a) resistance based

on preconceived notions of course content; (b) resistance that manifests as inappropriate or offensive communication; and (c) resistance to student/instructor positionalities.

When using the lens of emotion with work (Miller et al., 2007), resistance in the Intercultural Communication classroom highlighted challenging relationships between instructors and students with conflicting views. As one male full professor of color articulated, "I think that teaching any course that deals with power normativities will encounter different pockets of resistance." Another White male full professor explained three types of resistance unique to the Intercultural Communication classroom:

> One form is the student who already believes they know it all and needs to fulfill requirements—that's why they're there. Another is the student who in some way believes that their worldview is superior to any and all others and they're true believers. And I've often said I fear true believers of any sort because sooner or later they're coming after me always, always, always . . . And the third kind of person is the one who builds emotional walls to keep the discomfort at bay.

The second and third types of resistance that this participant identified were echoed by several other participants across a variety of positionalities. This identification highlights many of the challenges that intercultural instructors face, be it combativeness, defensiveness, or ignorance. Moreover, the "discomfort" being described points to the difficulty in evoking honest yet respectful conversations about race, gender, sexuality, immigration, and difference, among other topics covered in the course.

In explaining where the additional resistance in this class emerges, one male full professor of color proffered:

> On the first day, I tell them that this course is not about intercultural cookbooks. A lot of people kind of look at me like they don't know what that means and I say, "Well, this is not like this is the 10 things that you do to get along with this other cultural group. Instead, it is a different kind of approach." And there's some resistance to that because some people, particularly when they're looking at their own culture and if their own culture is unmarked in that process. For them to understand that a lot of times they'll say "well but I thought this was intercultural and I want to know more about other cultures and you're telling me to kind of look at my own.

This particular explanation echoes many of the participants who believe that the resistance they see and experience when teaching about diversity and social justice stems from the preconceived notions that students bring into the classroom regarding what should be taught and how instructors should teach it. When those expectations are not realized, students may become defensive, especially when it requires them to participate in processes of self-reflexivity and introspection, rather than learning about the Other from a safe distance. As one assistant professor pointed out, much of the work to push students beyond the "emotional walls" they build would happen early in the semester. He explained, "In the first three or four weeks, it's a lot of emotional labor to push them to think critically," adding that it made him "not want to do that" because of resulting emotional exhaustion.

In addition to the expectations that students bring into the classroom, several participants expressed their frustration, discomfort, and confusion regarding inappropriate and offensive communication about diverse others. As one White full professor woman stated, "The worst teaching and difficult scenarios are the ones where students would say really hurtful, racist, xenophobic, ethnocentric, [and]

homophobic things, and I didn't know how to handle it." This example demonstrates the painstaking emotion with work instructors can experience when balancing free speech with honoring marginalized voices in the classroom. The types of communication behaviors expressed by this participant articulate two challenges: (a) facilitating a process of unlearning problematic ways of knowing that marginalize, demonize, and criminalize the Other and (b) the emotional caretaking of students who may be the target of such "hurtful" communication. One associate male professor of color shared the following example:

> One [student] was doing a facilitation of an article that had something to do with whiteness in the classroom . . . she was talking about whiteness in a way that was sarcastic. That as if "all white people are white supremacists apparently." And that's just one overt example but I certainly felt that the whole class atmosphere was just full of resistance even from a nonverbal perspective. I just felt very uncomfortable going in there every single time.

Likewise, a White associate professor lamented in her interview about a similar scenario in which a male student, who self-identified as a "neonazi," made disparaging comments about an African American woman in class discussion. She asked, "How do I protect her and her vulnerability and shut him up?" Together, the comments suggest some validity to the statement that intercultural instructors might not "know how to handle it," because such challenges are not as prevalent across the discipline and are not necessarily discussed in teacher training. Thus, the instructor is left on his/her/their own agonizing over the best way to manage these unique disagreements in the classroom.

Also, one's positionality can complicate an understanding of how to handle resistance, especially when an instructor's race, sex, gender, nationality, or sexuality become the target of negative communication. One White female full professor, who served as a supervisor for graduate teaching assistants teaching Intercultural Communication, argued that the magnitude of resistance has increased in recent years, especially for graduate students of color. She shared a scenario in which the positionality of the instructor was highlighted in a collective resistance in the Intercultural Communication classroom:

> There is quite a resurgence [of resistance] in my observations of the intercultural TAs. Two TAs in our department who are persons of color were targeted by white male students in their classrooms and white female students. In both cases, it was groups of White students. In one case the resistance was so strong that they started a movement in the classroom to say, "We should not be talking about Black Lives Matter. We shouldn't even name that organization in class. We don't want any of these faculty, these negro, NEGRO faculty members coming in and giving guest presentations. I'm so surprised she's even a professor!" I mean it's that level of resistance . . . So, I do think it's extraordinarily difficult for a first-year TA to handle this.

This scenario demonstrates a similar notion that instructors of Intercultural Communication may (at least initially) lack the training needed to manage difficult dialogues that arise due to the sensitive nature of subjects discussed, the political nature of intercultural course content, and the inherent interpellation of vulnerable identities in classroom discussions. This scenario also highlights the unique challenges of instructors who are women, international, people of color, and/or occupy other marginalized positions who take on the challenge of negotiating dialogue, protecting the identities of subjugated students, and coping with the vulnerability of protecting themselves. While other communication courses might present one of these challenges, instructors of Intercultural Communication often find themselves navigating all these challenges simultaneously.

The forms of resistance embedded in Intercultural Communication courses were described as "emotionally exhausting" by about half of the participants interviewed. The undue burden of *feeling* exhausted exists on top of the task of building and articulating an agenda in the classroom. As one full female professor of color noted, "I didn't want to spend time justifying or defending [what I was teaching]." Another full professor woman explained, "It is very exhausting to always feel like you're fighting in class. I don't want to fight in class; I want to bring them to an awareness in class so I want them to get there. How can I help them get there without trying to pretty much force it down their throat?" Another White graduate instructor added, "there was a lot of tension in that class that I wasn't prepared to handle and I think now I would handle it much differently." Such comments would suggest that Intercultural Communication instructors must have a repertoire of responses for such resistance. A White associate professor explained that this emotional exhaustion is not common in other classes she teaches:

> [When teaching research methods] it's in some ways so much more straightforward that it's more relaxing to teach. I don't feel like I have to be on my toes as much and so I welcome those off semesters when I'm not teaching intercultural for that reason. Just to kind of get a break. It's having to be on my toes and having to be responding all the time.

Multiple interviewees compared their experiences teaching Intercultural Communication with other communication courses, agreeing that the excessive emotion with work described above is unique to the Intercultural Communication course.

Emotional Responses to Resistance

In describing resistance that takes place in the Intercultural Communication classroom, we have begun to articulate what it *feels* like to navigate these waters. Many participants explained that they feel "nervous," "shocked," "vulnerable," "worried," "overwhelmed," and "angry" on a day-to-day basis. More than reactions, these feelings can be viewed as emotion with work that complicates the academic lives of these instructors. Participants offered many examples of the emotional responses to resistance and the impact that it had on their personal lives and their pedagogies. Here, the range of emotional responses the participants experience in the Intercultural Communication classroom is explained, including (a) vulnerability; (b) concern for emotional well-being; and (c) fear of risk-taking.

One of the most poignant explanations of emotions in the Intercultural Communication classroom came from a White professor at a community college who simply stated, "You have to cry before you teach this class." This comment explains the material effect the course has on the body as well as the vulnerability that instructors may experience in this course in particular. Vulnerability was noted by another faculty member who mentioned, "[A challenge is] being vulnerable, showing them my vulnerability . . . Because I know for a lot of them, they're worried about making mistakes." In addition to vulnerability, the level of responsibility that instructors have over the emotional well-being for themselves and their students was articulated by several participants. A White graduate student instructor shared the following reflection:

> I always reevaluate that pretty much every time we leave a classroom and that I think also teaching in this way there's a lot of emotional labor . . . It's flipping exhausting because you don't go in there with your lecture notes and your script. You take on a lot of things. I think, "Did this student say too much or go too far?" It's not just walk into the classroom, teach for an hour and 15 minutes and leave and move on with your day. I think it's a struggle. That's why I

> think it's harder than other classes. Although I am always concerned about all my students in all of my classes and balance and what is fair, but in intercultural it's because there is so much emotion to it that I don't want people to leave there wounded. But I want people to also leave there knowing that this is what a racist looks like.

Here, the instructor is affected by the constant worry of whether her students are taken care of, which, perhaps ironically, has a more identifiable impact on her own self-care. She also decisively differentiates this experience from the other communication courses she teaches.

Similarly, in consideration of balancing well-being for all involved, a White assistant professor explained, "I probably spend more emotional energy just being worried about how my students will react to this and I don't want someone to feel singled out . . . I want everyone to feel comfortable. I don't want anyone to be offended." In response to her own emotional well-being, this instructor continued, "It is emotionally exhausting on some days. On some days it's not. Some days I leave and I feel more fulfilled than when I started, but there are other days that I leave and I'm like, 'I need three glasses of wine.'" This binary of responsibility for students' education and well-being and the caretaking of oneself was complicated further by a White female associate professor who was pushed by administration to teach about gay conversion therapy. She recalled:

> I was told when I talk about sexuality in the intercultural class I also need to be teaching that reparative therapy is also an option . . . that they can go to counseling to basically remove the queer from their psyche. I just remember, this is probably within the first couple years of teaching [Intercultural Communication], I left the campus and cried because I thought, where am I?

This faculty member's narrative demonstrates how the political nature of the course can interfere with the emotional well-being of all parties involved. The micromanaging of content for a tenured faculty member seemingly challenges the intellectual freedom that tenure is supposed to protect, but presents itself due to the content of the course and the current political climate. Such an example showcases the fine balance to which most instructors of Intercultural Communication attune and their emotional response to the hidden aspects of their work. One full male professor explained that this challenge is due to "managing the dynamics and relationships" as they relate to course content in a way that other courses such as "research methods" do not necessitate. He thus argued that the Intercultural Communication classroom requires a "different type of teaching."

In realizing that the Intercultural Communication course differed from other classes in the field, one White full professor articulated a need to "let go" and move away from the comparisons that so many of our respondents offered. She explained:

> Part of the emotional labor is letting go of feeling like, "I taught Interpersonal, and everybody said 'Wow this is so fun! I learned about my friend, and I learned more about what I want in a partner and, this is great!'" Then you come into Intercultural and it is the world of critique and difficulty, and challenge and struggle. So, letting go of that sense of "I just want to give them something that is going to make them feel better about themselves, about the field, about the class because then I'll get decent evals. I'm worried about my evals. That's important because I have to share those when I go on the job market." That's another big part of emotional labor in

> dealing with the riskiness and taking risks in the classroom that you probably never thought you would before.

In asserting that teaching this course is "risky," this comment complicates the notion that faculty are on an even playing field when applying for jobs or moving through the tenure track. When a course becomes more difficult to teach, partly due to emotions with work, it puts other parts of academic realities at risk and feeds into the cycle of worry and emotional exhaustion that seems to be a hallmark in the Intercultural Communication course.

The emotional exhaustion that participants described does not dissipate over time, but seems to become more navigable with experience. Some participants argued that new instructors in communication studies either are not prepared to teach the course or need additional support:

> There was a new colleague who came up after I retired. She called me and said, "I'm going to be teaching the course. Can we please meet?" And so we did. I could see she was a little overwhelmed . . . I saw her recently and she said, "I'm never teaching that class again. I don't have the stamina. It's not my class."

In the repetition and forcefulness of the notion that teaching this course takes additional labor and effort in order to be successful, necessary strategies for managing emotion with work must be reconsidered for the field of intercultural communication to continue growing in size, scope, and recognition.

Support and Strategies for Managing Emotion With Work

Participants offered three overarching strategies for managing emotion with work: (1) preparation for resistance, (2) developing intercultural commitments, and (3) seeking support. The primary recommendation from respondents for how to manage emotion with work is "be prepared for pushback." Some explanations included:

> **Assistant Professor**: My experience of resistance has been very nonlinear because I anticipate it. Part of it is that I anticipate that I will get resistance, so I go in there with little tools, like a mental cushion that I know it's going to come up.
>
> **Associate Professor**: Especially doing it from a critical perspective, be prepared for the kind of resistance you may face, but ultimately you have to still be true to yourself of what you believe in, how you teach Intercultural Communication, but at the same time be wary of the kinds of resistance that can be hurtful, that can be emotionally draining.
>
> **Full Professor**: I'm going to meet with the TAs and say, "Let's talk this through and let's share strategies." I think you need to think about it in advance. You need to recognize when it's happening and then come to those for additional support whether it's a classroom observation or bringing in strategies.

While these sentiments echo each other, the motto of "be prepared" is easier said than done. Instructors can only "anticipate" what is coming if they have experienced it before. Therefore, new and emerging instructors of Intercultural Communication are at the greatest risk for experiencing this content-based resistance in the classroom and are the most ill prepared for handling it. Moreover, it is difficult to assess how resistance can change from semester to semester, as the political atmosphere and other social

contexts quickly shift as well. Retooling must happen every semester and there must be systems of mentorship and support in place.

Still, long-time instructors of Intercultural Communication argue that the ship cannot be abandoned simply because of the additional emotion with work. As one White associate professor explained, "I think that it takes a lot of emotional, physical, mental labor to be teaching the course. So what advice would I give? I think it's important to be true to your philosophies, to your intercultural commitments as an intercultural pedagogue." Likewise, a White assistant professor who identifies as a critical intercultural communication scholar stated:

> If you're going to teach intercultural in the way that I think intercultural should be taught, which is this embodied way, not memorization, and regurgitation, but an embodied physical, mental, emotional experience, don't be afraid to take risks. Do take risks, but when you take risks be aware that you will get pushback. Just like everything else in academia, you have to develop a thick skin. You cannot let every setback put you in the corner because you won't survive. And never read your rate my professor reviews.

Both comments demonstrate an acquired balance of expecting resistance and forging forward with a commitment to social justice. Extending this position, one White full professor argued that she has the "responsibility" to confront White students stating, "When I talked to my colleagues who weren't White, or who weren't U.S. Americans, they had to deal with a lot more resistance. So, I kind of thought it was my responsibility to really talk to White students." Whatever the commitments of the intercultural instructor, the participants agreed that the combination of preparation and a commitment to one's own teaching philosophy work together in successfully navigating emotion with work.

Finally, one participant argued that instructors must have greater support on all levels: interpersonal, organizational, and institutional. She explained, "I think it's great to have the national forum, a support group, but I think the challenge is more in the everyday within our institution and I think not having that support system, that's where it's hard to keep up the fight." Her comment acts as a reminder that, while instructors can maintain their own pedagogies and seek supportive colleagues in developing successful responses to classroom resistance, they are always already part of larger institutions and structures that will define what is appropriate classroom content, how they should communicate in the classroom, and what forms of teaching will be rewarded. Lest instructors wish to contend with administrators telling them to teach within a particular paradigm, conversations about resistance and emotion with work beyond the classroom and throughout the campus community must be extended.

Discussion

The findings obtained in this study demonstrate glaring deficiencies in teacher training, both in communication studies as a whole, and more specifically for Intercultural Communication educators. Some graduate students find themselves thrown into the classroom with little or no training, whereas other students are required to take some version of a communication pedagogy course before their first semester as a stand-alone instructor. Focusing initial teacher training on "the basic course" or Public Speaking makes sense because of its wide offering as a general education requirement. However, graduate programs lack teacher training that is specific to the Intercultural Communication course. Basic teacher training does not attend to the nuances needed to prepare instructors to teach Intercultural Communication, given the unique forms of resistance reported above.

This study extends the literature on emotion with work to discuss the classroom as a work site in which students become a case study for "coworker" interactions. In organizational literature, emotion with work takes the form of emotional management, emotional support, and treating coworkers with respect. In the Intercultural Communication classroom, emotional resistance becomes a unique component of the interactions that fuel "the relational dimension of emotions in work life" (Miller et al., 2007, p. 236). Indeed, emotion with work stems from the challenging interactions these instructors have with students, rather than the work (e.g., lecturing or grading) itself.

In light of this, the comments and narratives presented in this study offer a fuller scope of realities inside the Intercultural Communication classroom and bring several questions to the surface: What should teacher training for Intercultural Communication that attends to emotion with work look like? Given the political commitments of the course, how can instructors better prepare for the types of resistance most often experienced in the Intercultural Communication classroom? How are teacher-student relationships in the Intercultural Communication classroom approached in a way that keeps the focus on learning in an increasingly divisive world?

Implications

Our findings imply that adequate teacher education in communication studies can be more subject specific and take into account differential experiences across gender, race, ethnicity, and immigration status (Chen & Lawless, 2018). Though no systematic teacher training for this course in particular is known, it would be worthwhile to invest in the training of instructors who staff one of the more commonly offered courses in communication studies across the U.S. (Bertelsen & Goodboy, 2009). These trainings could be offered in-house at graduate degree granting institutions, or as a training institute series sponsored by the National Communication Association, International Communication Association, or regional associations. Teacher preparation for Intercultural Communication must address all of the following:

Developing an Intercultural Communication teaching philosophy. While most communication studies instructors will develop a teaching philosophy at some point in their careers, we suggest that systematically thinking through one's commitments in the Intercultural Communication course will strengthen instructors' pedagogical practices while balancing their philosophies and managing emotion with work. Rather than having to "defend" one's course materials, instructors can make course commitments and expectations transparent at the beginning of the semester, helping to challenge preconceived notions about what the course should look like and create a reference point for students, should challenges arise. A teaching philosophy for Intercultural Communication would include considerations of paradigmatic commitments relating to one's positionality, content that one feels/thinks is consistent with those commitments, and relationship building with students, including how to respond to harmful communication while still promoting dialogue.

How to navigate difficult terrains in Intercultural Communication. Basic instructor training can rely on strategies for transmission of materials. Intercultural communication teacher training must move beyond such linear modes of communication to promote dialogue across differences. This movement includes discussions of what to anticipate, scenarios of resistive communication, and successful responses for engagement and promotion of well-being. Moreover, it is important to discuss the changing political, social, and cultural contexts that inevitably influence the Intercultural Communication classroom. In doing so, new intercultural educators can work through potential resistance scenarios and develop a repertoire of responses to questions, comments, and challenges.

Protecting individual positionalities in the Intercultural Communication classroom. Many of our participants' emotions with work are in response to the targeting of marginalized or subjected identities of their students or themselves. Articulating best practices for promoting vulnerability and self-care in the classroom can create an environment that recognizes the unwritten expectations of emotion with work for these instructors and matches those expectations with coping mechanisms. For instance, Yep (2014) promoted a pedagogy of cultural wealth that embraces strengths rather than deficits in approaching marginalized positions and perspectives. Individual positionalities can be protected by highlighting the lived experiences of instructors and students of color and fostering inclusivity (e.g., drawing the line between the terms "illegal" and "undocumented immigrants").

Conclusion

The stories presented here document the impact of emotion with work on the well-being of instructors of this course, particularly for women, international instructors, people of color, and graduate student instructors. Moreover, the findings create an impetus for us to respond to as a field. It is clear that emotion with work creates an undue burden for instructors of this course. We can address this burden by creating initiatives for mentorship and support at an institutional and organizational level. In addition, we can come together as a community of teacher-scholars to prepare the next generation of Intercultural Communication instructors through adequate teacher training. If our respondents are correct in saying that this work gets better over time and with experience, then that experience should be coalesced into a proper educational program.

References

Bertelsen, D. A., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Curriculum planning: Trends in communication studies, workplace competencies, and current programs at 4-year colleges and universities. *Communication Education*, *58*, 262–275. doi:10.1080/03634520902755458

Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Boler, M. (2004). All speech is not free: The ethics of 'affirmative action pedagogy.' *Counterpoints*, *240*, 321–339.

Broome, B. J. (1991). Building shared meaning: Implications of a relational approach to empathy for teaching Intercultural Communication. *Communication Education*, *40*, 235–249. doi:10.1080/03634529109378847

Chen, Y.-W., & Lawless, B. (2018). Rethinking "difficult" conversations in communication instruction from an intercultural lens: Pedagogical strategies for "SWAP-ping" the communication classroom. *Communication Studies, 69*, 371–388. doi:10.1080/10510974.2018.1472117

Chen, Y.-W., Simmons, N., & Kang, D. (2015). "My family isn't racist—however…": Multiracial/Multicultural Obama-ism as an ideological barrier to teaching Intercultural Communication. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 8*, 167–186. doi:10.1080/17513057.2015.1025331

Davis, D., & Steyn, M. (2012). Teaching social justice: Reframing some common pedagogical assumptions. *Perspectives in Education*, *30*(4), 29–38.

Duffy, L. N., Mowatt, R. A., Fuchs, M., & Salisbury, M. A. (2014). Making diversity tangible: Assessing the role of service learning in teaching diversity and social justice. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 5*(2), 54–75.

Goodman, D. J. (1995). Difficult dialogues. *College Teaching, 43*(2), 47–52.

Halualani, R. T. (2018). Demarcating the "critical" in critical intercultural communication studies. In A. Atay & S. Toyosaki (Eds.), *Critical intercultural communication pedagogy* (pp. 3–9). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Hedley, M., & Markowitz, L. (2001). Avoiding moral dichotomies: Teaching controversial topics to resistant students. *Teaching Sociology, 29*, 195–208.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*, 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687

Kim, Y. Y., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1999). Teaching Intercultural Communication. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 171–180). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johnson, J. R., & Bhatt, A. J. (2003). Gendered and racialized identities and alliances in the classroom: Formations in/of resistive space. *Communication Education*, *52*, 230–244. doi:10.1080/0363452032000156217

Lawless, B. (2018). Documenting a labor of love: Emotional labor as academic labor. *Review of Communication*, *18*(2), 85–97. doi:10.1080/15358593.2018.1438644

Lawless, B., & Chen, Y-W. (2018). *Playing with a 'sensitive' subject: Assessing the strengths and struggles of intercultural communication pedagogy*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Salt Lake City, UT.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Miller, K. I., Considine, J., & Garner, J. (2007). 'Let me tell you about my job': Exploring the terrain of emotion in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*, 231–260. doi:10.1177/0893318906293589

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *70*, 274–287.

Simpson, J. S., Causey, A., & Williams, L. (2007). "I would want you to understand it": Students' perceptions on addressing race in the classroom. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *36*, 33–50. doi:10.1080/17475750701265274

Smith, A. G. (1982). Content decisions in Intercultural Communication. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, *47*, 252–262. doi:10.1080/10417948209372531

Watt, S. K. (2007). Difficult dialogues, privilege and social justice: Uses of the privileged identity exploration (PIE) model in student affairs practice. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *26*(2), 114–126.

Yep, G. A. (2014). Talking back: Shifting the discourse of deficit to a pedagogy of cultural wealth of international instructors in US classrooms. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 138*, 83–91.