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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an increased interest in emotions in sociology. The reemergence of emotions into sociological theory has demonstrated the usefulness in both theorizing and explaining behavior (Franks 1985; Kemper 1990; Boyns 2006; Stets and Turner 2007; Stryker 2004; Simon 2007). Emotions are at the heart of our understanding of social interaction. In the past thirty years development in emotions research has grown exponentially. In this dissertation I respond to the invitation of Stryker (2004) for investigation into the relationship between emotions and Identity Theory. Specifically, I addresses a subset of propositions related to the inclusion of affect in Identity Theory on which research within Structural Identity Theory has yet to be carried out.

While relatively new as a sub-discipline within sociology, the sociology of emotions (The American Sociological Association Section was formed in 1986) has developed an enthusiastic following both from micro and macro oriented sociologists (Simon 2007). Research related to the sociology of emotions has emerged not only in sociological social psychology, but substantive sub-disciplines of sociology related to race, gender, work, family, health, organizations and social movements. Although relatively ‘young’ as a sub-discipline, sociologists working within the sociology of emotions have discovered the centrality of emotion in the social realms. Research in emotions is one of the most productive areas of theory and research in sociology (Turner and Stets 2005). There are a number of approaches to the study of emotions in sociology
including; dramaturgical theories (Hochschild 1979; Rosenberg 1990; Thoits 1985, 1989), symbolic interactionist theories (Burke 1991, Heise 1989; Scheff 1988; Stryker 1980), interaction ritual theories (Collins 2004), power and status theories (Kemper 1981, 1991; Ridgeway 1994) and exchange theories (Lawler and Thye 1999; Lawler 2001). Each of these approaches are involved in growing research programs examining emotion, its motivation, impact and process upon the self and/or social behavior.

In 2001, American Sociological Association president Douglas Massey in his presidential address emphasized that emotion is central to social life and that sociologists should turn their attention to feeling and affect (Massey 2002). “Emotionality remains a strong and independent force in human affairs, influencing perceptions, coloring memories, binding people together through attraction, keeping them apart through hatred, and regulating their behavior through guilt, shame, and pride” (Massey 2002:20).

Emotions are created and recreated through the dynamic process of social interaction. Emotions are assumed to be both the cause and consequence of behavior (Rosenberg 1990; Stryker 2004). Rosenberg (1990:4) recognizes that for the individual, emotions are both “ends in themselves and means for an attainment of other ends.” Emotions are involved in social control, role performance, and interpersonal interaction. Rosenberg (1990:4) stresses, “Emotions are matters of profound concern for everyone”.

The driving objective of this dissertation is to contribute to our understanding of how emotions shape commitment and identity salience and how commitment and identity salience shape emotions. According to Stryker (2004), sociology must focus upon the
experiences of emotion. It is in the experience of emotions that meanings can be located and assessed. Stryker (2004) encourages research to explore the relationship between emotion, commitment and identity salience. According to Stryker, “Identity Theory invites consideration of affect... as it may alter the probability of networks of relationships being formed, maintained, or dissolved; insofar as affect impacts directly on commitment to networks; insofar as affect impacts directly or indirectly the salience of identities and insofar as affect alters the ways in which commitment and identity salience relate to role choices,” (Stryker 2004:10). In this dissertation I respond to this call to explore the relationship between emotion and Identity Theory.

In the upcoming chapters I give a brief overview and recent history of Structural Identity Theory. I explore limitations in previous measurement of emotion and provide evidence to support the incorporation of multidimensional measures of the emotional experience. Chapter two provides the blueprint for this project; it provides details to the questions driving this work along with the appeal from previous research to include emotion in our understanding of interaction. Chapter two presents all hypotheses related to the current endeavor. Chapter three describes the design of this project as well as provides a description of the sample and analyses. Chapters four and five are analysis chapters. Chapter four examines the relationship between emotions, specifically, the relationship between the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness, anger and shame as they relate to the key concepts of Identity theory, commitment and identity salience. Chapter four presents analysis of a series of structural equation models placing emotion as both a force and product of commitment and identity salience. These analyses begin to
enrich our understanding of the relationships between emotion and Identity Theory.

Chapter five builds upon Chapter four with the incorporation of self-esteem and mastery. Specifically, chapter five examines the impact of self-esteem and mastery as mediating the relationship between commitment, identity salience and emotions. Chapter six concludes this dissertation and provides details related to both the theoretical and applied implications of this project. In chapter six, I discuss both the contribution and limitations of this dissertation as well as invite future consideration of the relationship between emotion and Identity Theory.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation is driven by a series of research questions. The first relates to the relationship between specific emotions and Structural Identity Theory. The dissertation addresses some of the propositions established by Stryker (2004) regarding the placement of emotions within Identity Theory. I seek to theoretically and empirically investigate the placement of emotions within Identity Theory. Stryker (2004) proposes that emotions are both a cause and consequence of the Identity Theory concepts of commitment and identity salience. Chapter four explores my first set of hypotheses seeking to investigate where emotions fit into Identity Theory. The first section of this review and hypotheses are guided by the following questions:

1. How do the frequency, intensity and duration of specific emotions fit into Identity Theory?
2. What is the influence of frequency, intensity and duration of specific emotions on commitment and identity salience (emotions as social force)?
3. What is the relationship between commitment and identity salience on the frequency, intensity and duration of specific emotions (emotion as social product)?

Chapter five will examine the relationship between Identity Theory, self-esteem, mastery and emotions. Motivated by the literature recognizing the importance of self-
Esteem and mastery in our understanding of the self, chapter five is driven by the following question:

1. How does the inclusion of emotions enhance our understanding of Identity Theory’s relationship to self-esteem and mastery?

**EMOTIONS AND STRUCTURAL IDENTITY THEORY**

Emotions are central to the human experience (Darwin 1886; Ekman 1992a, 1992b; Francis 2006; Frijda 1986; Kaplan 2006; Turner 2007; Turner and Stets 2006a; Stets 2006; Stryker 2004). They are part of our everyday reflexive encounters with others and within our self (Boyns 2006; Kaplan 2006; Stets 2006; Stryker 2004). Emotions are both social product and social force informing self and others about contextual meaning of interactions (Boyns 2006; Kaplan 2006; Stryker 2004; Stets 2006; Turner and Stets 2006; Turner 1999). Research and interest in emotions within sociological research is very central to current issues of social interaction (Franks 1985; Francis 2006; Kemper 1981, 1991; Rosenberg 1999; Simon and Lively 2010; Simon and Nath 2004; Stets 2006; Stryker 2004; Turner 1999; Turner and Stets 2006).

This chapter reviews the literature related to the role of emotion in Identity Theory and specifically, outlines the expectations and hypotheses related to this endeavor. I begin this review giving consideration to the theoretical roots and traditions of Identity Theory beginning with Structural Symbolic Interaction (Stryker 1968; Stryker 1980). I then provide a brief review of the research related to emotions within the sociological paradigm of Symbolic Interaction. I spend some time discussing previous
propositions, specifically of Stryker (2004) in relation to how Identity Theory can be extended to incorporate emotions. I proceed to articulate the importance of specific emotions, such as happiness, anger and shame within my theoretical model. This review also demonstrates the call from previous research to incorporate a multidimensional emotional experience into theorizing and research related to emotions. This multidimensional approach in theorizing and measuring emotion includes; the frequency, intensity and duration of the emotional experience. The second portion of Chapter 2 details hypotheses related to this dissertation along with the literature utilized to generate these hypotheses. This review provides a background to the theoretical tradition I build upon in this dissertation.

My goal of this chapter is to provide a roadmap of the progression of relevant literature and research that informs this dissertation from past, present and into the future. From early roots in Structural Symbolic Interaction, to the building of Identity Theory that incorporates the power and influence of multidimensional, specific emotions - this chapter provides some insight into the rich history of Identity Theory as well as clear pathways to refine and build Identity Theory to include happiness, anger and shame.

STRUCTURAL SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

Structural Symbolic Interaction has a series of metatheoretical assumptions providing a foundation for theoretical development that make the conceptual linkages among theory and research programs that are ripe for investigation. Starting with the
statement that “behavior is dependent upon a named and classified world,” Stryker (1980:54) discusses the relevance of social positions in interaction and their corresponding expectations; individuals self-definitions; situational definitions; the degree to which the social structure facilitates or constrains interaction; and how role-taking and role-making facilitates stability and change, respectively, in interaction. The assumptions of a Structural Symbolic Interactionist perspective identify for identity theorists critical components that must be considered when studying the identity process. Importantly, this assumes that changes in the meanings associated with a role can in turn result to changes in the larger social structure. Even with the emphasis upon social structure, Structural Symbolic Interaction has a cognitive theoretical component (Serpe 1991; Stryker 1991; Stryker and Ervin 2001; Stryker 2004). Identities derive from social structure and are one way to conceptualize the self. Identities develop from the roles people play in social interaction from which people are embedded and serve as cognitive representations of the position(s) they occupy. Identities carry internalized meanings of structure through normative and shared meanings that become role expectations.

Early Structural Symbolic Interaction (Stryker 1968) theorized the self as composed of three separate (but interdependent) components – conative (I want), cathartic (I feel) and cognitive (I am). Much of the research related to Structural Symbolic Interaction, and Structural Identity Theory specifically, have focused upon the cognitive (I am) component of Stryker’s earlier work (Ervin and Stryker 2001; Stryker 2004). This research seeks to build upon the cathartic component of Structural Symbolic Interaction.
The Structural Symbolic Interactionist frame reformulates Mead’s (1934) central dictum emphasizing the impact and influence of organized structure. Specifically, society remains emergent from social processes however, organized society exists prior to new members and begins to take seriously the social structural conditions to facilitate or constrain social action. Social structures pattern interactions and relationships that are stable, durable and for the most part resistant to change (Stryker et al. 2005; Stryker 2008). Social structure influences agency as it acts as a gatekeeper that both promotes and inhibits social exchange.

Refinement to the conception of social structure is one way that Identity Theory acknowledges the complexity of social structures in society. The refinements have included differentiating between large, intermediate, and proximate social structures (Serpe and Stryker 2011; Stets and Serpe 2013; Stryker, Serpe, and Hunt 2005). Large social structures include race/ethnicity, class, sex and socioeconomic status. Large social structures define social boundaries; these boundaries have critical consequence for individual agency and the likelihood of entering social networks. Large social structure can, and does, provide individuals with a social identity.

Intermediate social structures are localized networks (Stets and Serpe 2013; Serpe and Stryker 2011; Stryker et al. 2005). Intermediate social structures increase or decrease the probability of social relationships forming. Examples of intermediate social structures include neighborhoods, schools and other organized units which bring a number of persons together in one setting with the potential of relationships being
formed, and later maintained. In comparison, proximate social structures are those closest to the interpersonal relationships. Proximate social structures include interactions associated with family, teams and departments within larger structures (Stets and Serpe 2013; Serpe and Stryker 2011; Stryker et al. 2005). These structures increase or decrease the probability of social relationships forming. Examples of intermediate social structures include neighborhoods, schools and other organized units which bring a number of persons together in one setting with the potential of relationships being formed, and later maintained. In comparison, proximate structures are those closest to the interpersonal relationships.

Proximate structures include interactions associated with family, teams and departments within larger structures (Stets and Serpe 2013; Serpe and Stryker 2011; Stryker et al. 2005). Social relationships directly attributable to role identities in the enactment of role identities support participation within proximate structures. Proximate social structures also provide availability and access to others who have counter identities necessary for role performance.

In the most general sense, social structure is social organization, it serves to organize and pattern relationships within society. Structure impedes upon human agency as it acts as a gatekeeper that both promotes and inhibits social exchange. Society is organized by a series of role relationships; structure in this regard is built through networks of organized interactions based upon these role relations.
Society, within the structural framework, is a series of organized boundaries that both facilitate and inhibit social interactions. Society is organized by a series of role relationships; structure in this regard is built through networks of organized interactions based upon these role relations. Structural Symbolic Interaction emphasizes the principle that social life is premised on the assumption that society shapes self (Mead 1934). Self is reflective of society and society is a complex system of organized relations, the self must then reflect this complexity. Structural Symbolic Interactionism recognizes a reflexive self that is multifaceted. Following James (1890) claim that one has as many selves as groups of people to whom they interact, Structural Symbolic Interaction posits a testable model of the relationship between self and society and vice-versa.

STRUCTURAL IDENTITY THEORY

Identity Theory develops out of Structural Symbolic Interaction (Stryker 2001) and shares assumptions of the frame. Identity Theory seeks to explain why, given choice, one invokes a particular identity over another (Serpe 1987; Serpe and Stryker 1987, 1993, 2011). Identity Theory simultaneously recognizes that constructing the new and reproducing the old can fit within a single framework. Identity Theory clearly distinguishes the self (as the whole) from identities (parts of the whole) (Stryker 1980). This distinction is critical. Roles carry expectations attached to positions in network relationships and identity is the internalization of those role expectations. A role is a set of appropriate behaviors attached to a social position. A role identity is the personal attachment or intrinsic acceptance of the identity associated with a specific role. For
example, I can see myself as a mother, student and friend. Each of these role identities comes with a social script that I have learned through interactions with others. Along the way I have learned what it means to be a student, mother and friend and thus I can negotiate between role identities.

Mead’s (1934) proclamation self reflects society mandates a highly differentiated yet organized conceptions of self as consisting in part of multiple identities, internalized meanings attached to role relationships. Stryker (1968, 1980) posits that multiple identities are organized into a salience hierarchy. He defines identity salience as the probability that a specific identity will be invoked across situations. Stryker (1980) asserts that more salient identities will be those in which (1) role performances are consistent with the role expectations tied to the identity, (2) situations are seen as the opportunity to enact the identity, and (3) actors seek out situations that provide the opportunity to enact the identity. Role choice is a consequence of identity salience (Stryker 2008). Stryker further suggests that the social networks impact the salience of an identity associated with identity and influence a person’s experiences in relationship to the identity. Stryker defines this as commitment to the identity and commitment represents the social structural context of identity for the individual. This reasoning leads to Stryker’s postulation that “commitment impact identity salience impact role related behaviors” (Stryker 2004:2).

Commitment is the social tie to a network and emphasizes the foundation of society through social interactions (Stryker 1980). Commitment relates to the degree
individual relationships within networks depend upon specific identities or enacting particular roles. Commitment is conceptualized by the costs of foregoing meaningful relations with others should the identity be foregone (Stryker 1980). Derived from this assertion is the hypothesis, salience of an identity reflects commitment to the relationships requiring that identity. Identity Theory’s specification of Mead’s (1934) formulation related to commitment is: “commitment shapes identity salience shapes role choice behavior” (Stryker 1968; 2000; 2001:228). Serpe (1987) examined the causal ordering of commitment and identity salience finding that commitment had a stronger impact upon identity salience than identity salience had on commitment. Based upon longitudinal data of first year college students, Serpe and Stryker (1987) found that students attempted to recreate relationships with others, thus re-establishing the level of commitment that enabled them to maintain prior identities.

Identity researchers have specified two distinct types of commitment (Stryker 1987; Serpe 1987; Serpe and Stryker 2011). Affective commitment refers to the sense of belonging and attachment to others in role relationships; it is defined operationally in terms of the costs of losing relationships high on positive affect (Stryker 1968, 1980). Interactional commitment refers to the extensivity and intensivity of role relationships; it is defined operationally in terms of the size of the network of relationships and amount of interaction on engages with people related to the identity (Stryker 1968, 1980). The earliest work building Identity Theory conceptualized commitment as a single variable incorporating both interaction and affect (Stryker and Serpe 1982).
empirical study (Serpe 1987) explicitly utilized both interactive and affective commitment in a longitudinal study.

The Identity Theory conceptions of identity and identity salience assert stability in identities and their salience over time and social situations, (Stryker and Burke 2000) this stability was demonstrated by Serpe (1987). Serpe finds that students experience changes in prior commitments by entering new social relationships and that these changes in commitments have expected effects on the salience of the identities (Serpe 1987; Serpe and Stryker 1987, 1993; Stryker and Burke 2000). Change in the environmental social situations causes the individual to renegotiate their identity, behavioral expectations and subsequently reorganize their own salience of identities.

EMOTIONS IN SYMBOLIC INTERACTION

I seek to investigate the relationship between commitments, identity salience and the emotions that shape them. I build upon the rich history of symbolic interactionist thought purporting that emotions influence self and behavior as well as behavior’s influence self and emotions (Mead 1934). The relationship proposes that emotions shape self, the self shapes society and that society shapes both self and emotion. This statement is central to this dissertation and is consistent with Stryker’s (2004) formulation. An expanding body of research suggests that self and emotion are intricately linked, and the self-conscious emotions lie at their intersection (Boyns 2006; Brown and Marshall 2001; Epstein 1993; Denzin 1983; Kaplan 2006;
Mead did not ignore emotions entirely though his focus was not on emotive processes but rather the emotive instinct in the act and higher intelligence resulting in an understanding of emotive instincts (Mead 1894, 1908, 1916, 1934). He elaborated on the biological aspects of emotions in his recognition of physiological changes that provided actors with feedback to their action within a given situation (Mead 1894, 1908).

According to Mead (1908:386), “The central phase of the act--the emotional--is subject to development only when a system of instincts or derivatives of instincts become organized about some object when a sentiment arises.” For Mead (1934), the gesture provides insight to emotional expression. When one invokes an emotive gesture it is not necessarily meant to call upon others to share in that specific emotion but rather to communicate through purposeful action in the form of a gesture one’s emotional catharsis. Mead brought meaning to the expression of emotion that he felt was absent from Darwin’s (1886) study of emotional expression in humans and animals. Impulse or suggests that of disequilibrium motivate social behavior in Mead’s social behaviorism (Turner and Stets 2005).

A major criticism of the symbolic interactionist tradition into the 1980’s was that it downplayed or neglected entirely the importance of emotion in social life (Gordon 1981; Meltzer et al. 1975; Shibutani 1961; Stryker 1980). In the symbolic interactionist tradition, interaction centers upon the individual’s effort to sustain self-conceptions or identity within situations. Symbolic interaction recognizes the self as an emotive force.
that is both active and reactive. Researchers call for empirical investigations and theoretical statements to be developed within the symbolic interactionist frame that take into account the pervasive impact of emotions in interaction (Turner 2007a, 1999; Franks 1985). No treatment of either sociology of emotions or symbolic interactionism is complete without the other (Fields et. al 2006; Franks 2006; Sandstorm and Kleinman 2005).

It is important to understand how others have taken account of emotions within a symbolic interactionist frame to situate where emotions fit within Identity Theory. Symbolic interactionists of the mid-twentieth century incorporated and addressed ways in which emotions and the expression of emotion entered into social situations (Lindesmith and Strauss 1949). The impact and social control of emotion(s) is a central theme in Blumer’s (1951, 1986) discussions of collective behavior. For Gerth and Mills (1953) emotions were part of the linkage between feeling, gestures and self. Shibutani (1961) incorporated emotional arousal into social sentiments through feelings within interpersonal relationships. For Goffman (1967) it was more about specific emotions such as embarrassment when individuals fail to perform to their ideal self-conceptions. For each of these theorists, emotions serve as linkage between behavior, self and society. Emotion is one way that social structures are reflected in our personal experiences (Smith-Lovin 1990; Stryker 2004).

Shott (1979) launched a systematic analysis using a symbolic interactionist perspective in her theory of emotion. Her theory accepts the basic premise that emotions
rise from social interaction and advance through role taking emotions. Shott’s (1979) theory of emotions builds upon the centrality of roles and the role taking process (Thoits 1989). As a product of the social, emotions are a mechanism of social control. For Shott (1979), role taking is highly reflexive. Individuals view their self from the perspective of the other and from the reactions, both real and imagined, of others. Throughout this process individuals are abiding social norms (Turner and Stets 2005; Shott 1979). While emotions help to sustain the individual, emotions also work to maintain social structure (Shott 1979).

Rosenberg (1990) recognizes that emotions are involved in social control, role satisfaction, and interpersonal interaction. Rosenberg (1990:4) stresses, “Emotions are matters of profound concern for everyone.” According to Rosenberg, reflexivity is central to emotional experience, emotional display and emotional identification. Emotions are reflexive in the internalized experiences. One must be able to identify an emotional label to a bodily response and situate that response within the mind. Emotions are reflexive in how individuals express themselves.

Symbolic interactionism recognizes the centrality of sentiments (Boyns 2006; Kaplan 2006; Shott 1979; Stets 2006; Stryker 2004; Turner 2007a). While some theoretical branches of symbolic interaction emphasize the emergence of emotions as a result of collective definitions of when and how it is appropriate to express affect others see society as a trigger for emotion. Regardless of whether emotion is the cause or consequence of the relationship between society and the individual, symbolic
interactionism attends to sentiments, both implicitly and explicitly. This dissertation will begin to look at the nature of emotion as cause and consequence.

Previous research suggests there is a relationship between roles and emotion (Heise 1979, 2007; Robinson, Smith-Lovin, and Tsoudis 1994; Smith-Lovin 1990) and subsequently between role occupancy and distress (Simon 2002; Thoits 1987, 1986). Through careful investigation and examination of the emotional components of particular roles we gain an informed understanding of the process to which shape interaction in role enactment (Lively and Heise 2004).

This brief review of emotions within the symbolic interactionist framework establishes the foundation from which this dissertation is built. Emotions are vital to the experience of self and society. Emotional experiences are essential in symbolic interactionist theorizing and contribute to my consideration of the extension of Identity Theory and the role of emotions within Structural Identity Theory.

EMOTIONS AND IDENTITY THEORY

Since the conception of Structural Symbolic Interaction and Structural Identity Theory there has remained room for incorporation of affect. Structural Symbolic Interaction includes three main components to self, I am (cognitive), I want (conative) and I feel (affective) (Stryker 1968; Ervin and Stryker 2001; Stryker 2004). While much of the empirical work within the Structural Identity Theory tradition has focused upon the “I am”, cognitive component of self, we must be reminded of the importance of
incorporating the affective, “I feel” (Stryker 2004; Stets 2006). Evidence generated early recognized the importance of affect to Structural Identity Theory’s predictions by “insisting on an independent contribution of affective commitment to the hierarchical ordering of identities” (Stryker 2004: 7). Stryker and Statham Macke (1985) emphasize the importance of role distancing, role involvement and role satisfaction – all conceptualizations that include an emotional component. Identity Theory has important implications for understanding the linkages between emotion and self through identities. Identity Theory proposes that self-conception is not merely composed of conceptions of the self but conceptions of the self that are “simultaneously intertwined with emotional valences” (Boyns 2006:256).

According to Stryker (2004), the inclusion of emotions into Identity Theory could usefully focus on the particular characteristics of the experience of emotion(s). Stryker (2004) emphasizes that it not the concern of Identity Theory whether those emotional experiences are evolutionary, through social structural, cultural or interactional positioning. Identity Theory is concerned with the social processes that contribute to the shaping of commitments and organization of identities that impact the role choice and identity enactment. Understanding how these emotions impact social processes is of primary concern for the development of both theory and research. Theory and research examining emotions and Identity Theory must recognize the implications of the cognitive responses to the emotional experiences. It is within the experiences and meanings critical to the consequences of emotion where implications for self and identity will be found (Stryker 2004).
Emotions enter Identity Theory the same way as social structures do, by increasing or decreasing the probability of social networks forming and being maintained (Stryker 2004; Stets 2006). Sentiments are likely to impact commitment to groups to the degree that sentiments are shared within the group. Sentiments, whether positive or negative, impact commitment to the group. Positive affect is thought to increase commitment to the identity while negative affect is expected to decrease commitment the identity. Stryker (2004) speaks to the intensity of emotions, noting that highly salient identities are likely to result in intense emotional responses. Identities to which intense negative or positive affect is attached are thought to be more salient just by virtue of the intensity of the affective response. Intense affect influences messages to self (Stryker 2004).

In regards to the Identity Theory variables of commitment and identity salience, Stryker suggests a reciprocal relationship between commitment and emotions, as well as identity salience and emotions. According to Stryker (2004), if positive affect increases commitment then so higher commitment will influence and generate positive affect. If intense affect increases the salience of the identity then salient identities will influence the positive emotive response to others related to that role identity. This relationship proposes that emotion is both a social force, impacting commitment and identity salience and a social product, being influenced by commitment and identity salience.

Stryker (2004:16-17) acknowledges that theoretical statements about how specific emotions impact identity theoretic variables of commitment and identity salience is an
“unfinished agenda” and encourages researchers to engage in the meanings of specific emotional responses and how they relate to concepts of identity theory. Stryker contends that while emotions are central to our understanding of self and to identity much work has yet to be done to empirically testing these relationships. I attempt to build upon a subset of Stryker’s (2004) propositions to incorporate specific emotions into Identity Theory. The second half of this chapter outlines specific hypotheses related building upon these propositions but first a brief review of emotion is necessary.

SPECIFIC EMOTIONS

It is important that the development of theory recognize the importance in distinguishing specific emotions from the general valence of emotion (Ekman 1992a, 1992b; Frijda 1986; Kemper 1987). Valence is used to generalize and categorize specific emotions, for instance emotions with negative valence would include anger or fear whereas emotions with positive valence would include happiness and joy. While valence informs the understanding of emotion it limits specification of the emotion as well as oversimplifies the complexity that specific emotions present. I seek to integrate emotions into Identity Theory and I do so by recognizing the limitations of generalizing valence of emotions and prefer to focus on specific emotions. I seek to explore happiness, anger and shame as they relate to Identity Theory. I establish the importance of measuring specific emotions and the characteristics of happiness, anger and shame as they inform this work.

Scheff (2003: 257) emphasizes that “generalized emotions have only ambiguous reference” and that our knowledge of emotions is not generalized, but particular.
According to Scheff (2003) particular emotions hold particular information regarding social situations and without careful inquiry to the specific emotion we fail to understand the impact between emotion and self. For example, literature on anger begins to disentangle the causes, gradations and potential outcomes of how we experience the emotion of anger (Averill 1983; Collett and Lizardo 2010; Kring 2000; Galambos, Barker, and Krahn 2006; Mabry and Kiecolt 2005; Schieman 2006, 2010; Simon and Lively 2010). Research has recently begun to generate similar knowledge and theoretical developments for other primary emotions such as fear, grief, shame, contempt, disgust, love and joy (Scheff 2003). Stets (2006) calls for cumulative theory that builds upon the cultural and structural conditions under which both positive and negative emotions are activated. She too encourages future research to disentangle the conditions that activate and perpetuate specific emotional responses and experiences.

There is a general agreement within the emotions literature to four primary emotions; happiness, fear, anger and sadness (Kemper 1987). Of these primary emotions, I analyze both happiness and anger. The inclusion of shame as another emotion examined will be discussed later.

**Happiness**

Happiness is a state of wellbeing and contentment; it is one of pleasure generally followed by satisfying experience. Happiness is a positive emotion. Sociological research related to happiness is limited with some exceptions (e.g. Kim 2011; Lu and Jian 1997; Yang 2008; Magen 1996). Happiness and happiness studies has a great deal to offer
sociology by contributing to the understanding of self and society. It informs the extent society is meeting the needs of its members and how members of society get along.

Happiness can be characterized as a measure of subjective well-being (Cast 2004; Fujita, Diener, and Sandvik 1991; Kahneman, Diener, and Schwarz 2003; Kroll 2011; Ryan and Deci 2001). Subjective well-being is increasingly being adopted as a social indicator to assess quality of life. Research identifies subjective well-being as a “state of stable, global judgment of quality and the degree to which people evaluate the overall quality of their present lives positively” (Yang 2008). Subjective reports of happiness are the measure of well-being examined most frequently (George 2006; Veenhoven 1991, 2000; Yang 2008). Happiness will detail and refine the understanding of “positive” emotions in Identity Theory. Levels of happiness are related to, and a result of, both commitment and identity salience.

*Anger*

Anger is "a strong feeling of distress or displeasure in response to a specific provocation" (Thomas 1993:13). Anger is among the most influential aspects of stress processes (Mirowsky and Ross, 2003; Schieman, 1999). Analysis of anger is indispensable to our understanding of behavior as it informs our understanding of social life along with the relationships, norms and expectations (Schieman 2010). Research shows that anger is one of the most frequently reported and recognized emotions (Averill 1983; Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, and O’Connor, 1987). Anger is characterized by
cognitions and affect as well as by triggers, physiological reactions, expressions, and social consequences (Fehr and Baldwin 1996). Anger has been found to be easily distinguishable from other emotions (Russell and Fehr 1994). Anger often represents a negative appraisal of self, others or society (Smith-Lovin 1995; Averill 1982). Some research operationalizes anger as feelings such as, annoyed or angry, and others as behavioral expressions such as, yelling at someone (Ross and Van Willigen 1996; Mirowsky and Ross 1995). The experience of anger has consequences for health and illness (Schieman 1999). Anger is important as it adds greater precision to our understanding of what is historically referred to as “negative” emotions.

**Shame**

While there is some, albeit debatable, consensus on universal emotions there also remain two distinct emotions of sociological concern; pride and shame. Returning to our theoretical roots, Cooley (1902) explicitly included emotional processes into his concept of social interaction. Cooley’s “looking glass self” claimed that individuals read gestures of others in situations, those gestures become a ‘mirror’ to one self, reflecting back upon the individual. Cooley’s “looking glass self” placed particular emphasis upon both pride and shame (Cooley 1902:184-185). Permeating social interaction, pride and shame were theorized to greatly impact behavior and self-perceptions. Emotions such as pride, shame and fear are but one way that structure and societal pressures influenced the behaviors of individuals. Shott (1979) identified four emotions that held importance to sociology; guilt, shame, embarrassment and pride. Again, shame is important because it impacts
people’s identity or ‘transsituational’ self-concept (Shott 1979; Turner and Stets 2005). Shame motivates individuals to avoid situations or gravitate towards situations

Shame is also important to Scheff’s general sociological theory of emotions (1988; 2000; 2003). For Scheff, shame is theorized as a mechanism for solidarity and social order. Shame is used as negative sanction to realign social behaviors to normative suggests that. Self-conscious emotions such as shame play a central role in both motivating in regulating peoples thoughts feelings and behaviors. Most people spend a great deal of time avoiding social situations that elicit shame. Often we worry about the social status we hold in the eyes of the others. According to Scheff (1988: 399) we are always in a “state of either pride or shame.” Shame is important as it enhances knowledge of what has been referred to often as “negative” emotions.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE

To understand the experience of emotions it is essential to move beyond measuring only the frequency of the emotion. While evolutionary and biologically dominant fields such as neurology and some psychological circles seek biomarkers for to gauge emotional suggests that (Turner 2007a; Franks 2001), research has demonstrated that it is the experience and perceptions felt by the individual are equally important to our understanding of emotions (Ellestad and Stets 1998; Turner and Stets 2006; Stets and Turner 2007; Turner 2007a). It is the socially constructed labels that we associate to the physiological reactions under certain conditions that remain of most importance to sociologists. Social psychologists interested in the response of emotions and their
subsequent consequences on behavior have conceptualized emotions in a variety of ways (Kemper 1990, Stets and Turner 2007; Turner and Stets 2006).

To explore the interplay of the experience and perception of emotions, the conceptualization of emotions must gauge the frequency of the emotion, the duration of emotion and the intensity of emotion. A differentiation between dimensions of the emotion avoids limitations in a global measure of the emotion (Scheff 2003). Measuring frequency of the emotion alone does not capture the complexity (Morris and Feldman 1996; Beck and Fernandez 1998). Gordon (1990:161) claimed that an individual's position in the social structure shapes the "type, frequency, and intensity of emotions that will be directed toward him or her or aroused in him or her." Relevance of the sense of control of emotions and subsequent behavior varies depending on the dimension of emotion processes under review—“the frequency, intensity and duration,” of these dimensions of emotion processes within different role contexts are necessary for a richer understanding (Schieman 2006:509).

Morris and Fieldman (1996) caution that conceptualization of emotion in terms of only frequency of the emotional display as it misses the complexity in the construct. According to Morris and Fieldman (1996) conceptualizing emotion only in terms of the frequency fails to take into account the “complexity of the construct”. The duration of emotional expression and intensity of emotional expression are positively related (Morris and Fieldman 1996). Brief expression of emotion is likely to be scripted and require little intensity, while longer emotional expression are likely to be unscripted and require more
intensity (Rafaeli and Sutton 1989). Morris and Fieldman (1996:1003-1004) call upon future research to conceptualize emotional as a “multidimensional construct” and that researchers should focus on “developing and validating measures” components of emotional labor including surveys that capture frequency, intensity and duration of the emotional construct.

There has been research supporting the differences in frequency and intensity of emotions throughout life. For example, there is a negative association between age and the frequency of anger (Carstensen et al. 2000; Mirowsky and Ross 2003a; Schieman 1999). This finding supports the importance of utilizing a multidimensional approach to measuring emotions and conceptualizing them as more than a single global indicator such as frequency of emotional experience.

Emotional intensity refers to how strongly or with what magnitude an emotion is experience or expressed. Frijda, Ortony, Sonnemans, and Clore (1992) argued that it is the intensity of the expressed emotion more than any other factor that determines whether individuals change their behavior during interactions. Emotion varies from low to high intensity (Ekman 1996; Izard 2009; Turner 2000). The level of awareness of an emotion feeling depends in part on its intensity and expression, and after language acquisition, on labeling, articulating, and acknowledging the emotion experience (Izard 2009: 6). While the significance of the frequency of emotions is highlighted, the intensity of emotions should not be ignored but should be studied in combination with frequency and duration of feelings (Diener, Sandvik and Pavot 1991). Previous research suggests that duration
of emotional display and intensity of emotional display are positively related (Morris and Fieldman 1996). Intensity and duration of an emotion as dimensions of the emotional experience are often neglected in research on emotion (Frijda et al. 1991).

Ekman (1992a) suggest that the characteristics of basic emotions include unique autonomic responses, they are quick in their onset, and they are brief in their duration. This suggests that more complex emotions vary in relative duration whereas basic, debatably reactionary or biological responses to an event are immediate and short in duration, pending the cultural script for the emotions. Hochschild (1979) expanded the idea of emotional norms set forth by Goffman (1959) by developing the concept of feeling rules, cultural norms that specify the type of emotion, the extent of emotion, and the duration of feeling that are appropriate in a situation. The duration of the emotion becomes relevant in our culture, for instance consider grieving spouses. Their feelings of intense unhappiness immediately after the death are appropriate however they are expected to “snap out of it” after a few months (Smith Lovin 1995). Feeling rules govern the intensity (strong versus weak), direction (positive versus negative), and duration (fleeting versus lasting) of an emotion (Peterson 2007).

I seek to understand the relationship between multidimensional emotional experiences of specific emotions on commitment, identity salience and their subsequent relationship with self-esteem and mastery. The relationship of the frequency, intensity and duration of specific emotions is expected to vary as they relate to key Identity Theory variables of commitment and identity salience.
IDENTITY THEORY AND EMOTION: HYPOTHESES

Any account of Structural Identity Theory must take into consideration social structure and the influence of commitment and identity salience. I take into account the social structure by examining the impact of large structure by examining age, race and gender as they relate to the key aspects of my theoretical and empirical claims. In the upcoming section, I give a brief review of the relationship between age, race, gender and emotions as well as the relationship between age, race and gender as they relate to commitment and identity salience.

Age and Emotion

Older adults demonstrate increasing ability to incorporate affect and subjectivity (Carstensen, Isaacowitz and Charles 1999); report superior emotional regulation (Gross et al., 1997) exhibit well-preserved expressive systems (Levenson, Carstensen, Friesen, and Ekman, 1991); and are comparatively happy (Diener and Diener, 1996) and content with life (Herzog and Rodgers, 1991). Research that suggests older adults experience less of the social causes of anger, including economic hardship (Mirowsky and Ross 2003), work-home conflict (Mennino, Rubin and Brayfield 2005), job dissatisfaction (Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983) and interpersonal conflict in the workplace (Schieman and Reid 2008). Mroczek and Kolarz (1998) found that age was associated with a self-report increase in positive affect and a decrease in negative affect. Ben-Zur (2002) finds similar results, as age increases negative affect decreases. Carstensen et. al., (2000) find that
older people experience positive emotions just as often as their younger counterparts and—until the age of approximately 60 years—experience fewer negative emotions in their everyday lives. According to Schieman (2010:332) a crucial question in the sociological study of anger has been “Do older adults report less anger than their younger peers?” Research has demonstrated that anger is lower among older adults (Carstensen, Pasupathi, Mayr, and Nesselroade, 2000; Mirowsky and Ross, 2003; Schieman 2010). I expect that older respondents will report less frequent, less intense, shorter duration of negative emotions (shame and anger) and more frequent, more intense, longer lasting positive emotions (happiness).

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis One: Older respondents will report 1a) more frequent, 1b) more intense, 1c) longer lasting happiness related to their identity.

Older respondents will report 1d) less frequent, 1e) less intense and 1f) shorter lasting anger related to their identity.

Older respondents will report 1g) less frequent, 1h) less intense and 1i) shorter lasting shame related to their identity.

**Age and Commitment/Identity Salience**

Previous research (Stryker, Serpe and Hunt 2005) examining the relationship between age and commitment demonstrates that age is related to commitment. Stryker et al. (2005) finds that age directly and negatively impacts interactional commitment to the worker identity with older respondents exhibiting less commitment. They find similar results examining a Black subsample; younger Blacks were more affectively committed
to the identity. Based upon these findings I expect older respondents less committed to the student and family identity. I do not expect any difference in the relative salience of either identity by age.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Two: Older respondents will report 2a) less interactive commitment and 2b) less affective commitment related to their identity.

2c) Age is not expected to influence identity salience in either the student or family identity.

Race and Emotion

Difference by race in the experience of emotions is difficult to pinpoint. Some research (Davis 1984; Hughes and Thomas 1998) find that Blacks are less happy than Whites however, Yang (2008) analyzed GSS data of nearly 42,000 Black and White respondents and found no significant difference between groups in subjective wellbeing or happiness. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) found that all demographic factors, including race, accounted for less than 20 percent of the variance in subjective wellbeing including measures of happiness. Matsumoto (1993) examined differences in the emotional experience by race and ethnicity, findings indicated that Blacks report a greater frequency of anger, however there was no significant difference in reports of happiness. Other research has found that race is not related to reports of anger (Mabry and Kiecolt 2005). Based upon the variation in the previous findings, I do not expect to find a difference in reports of emotion between White and Nonwhite respondents.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:
Hypothesis Three: There will be no difference in the 3a) frequency, 3b) intensity or 3c) duration of happiness related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.

There will be no difference in the 3d) frequency, 3e) intensity or 3f) duration of anger related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.

There will be no difference in the 3g) frequency, 3h) intensity or 3i) duration of shame related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.

**Race and Commitment/Identity Salience**

Previous research (Stryker et al 2005) finds no difference by race related to the identity salience within the family or worker identity. However, variation by race has been found in commitment to work and family identities. Specifically, Blacks report greater affective commitment to the family and volunteer identity whereas Whites report greater commitment to the worker identity (Stryker et. al. 2005). I examine emotions, commitment and identity salience related to the family and student identity. Based upon previous research, I expect to find no difference between White and Nonwhite respondents’ interactive commitment related to either the family or student identity.

I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Four: 4a) There will be no difference in the interactive commitment to the identity (family or student) between Whites and Nonwhites.

4b) Nonwhite respondents will report greater affective commitment to the family identity.

4c) There will be no difference in the affective commitment to the student identity between Whites and Nonwhites.

**Gender and Emotion**

While the perception is that men’s anger is more intense (Kring 2000), analysis of
the 1996 GSS data demonstrates that women tend to report more intense anger than men (Simon and Nath, 2004; Stets and Tsushima, 2001). These findings are also consistent with other studies that report women feel negative emotions more intensely (Fujita et al., 1991), including anger (Brody et al. 1999; Fehr and Baldwin 1996). Simon and Nath’s (2004) examination of gender and emotion found that women report negative feelings more often than men, whereas men report positive feelings more often than women. They also found no differences between men and women in the frequency of happiness, anger or shame. These findings contrast with Ross and Van Willigen (1996) who report women experience anger more often than men. What is most interesting is that it is not the frequency of the emotion that is different between men and women but rather the intensity and duration of the emotion. While women do not report more frequent feelings of anger than men, women report that their anger is both more intense and of longer duration than men’s (Mabry and Kiecolt 2005). I do not expect to find any difference between men and women in the experience of happiness related to either identity. Based upon the previous studies reviewed, I do not expect women to report more frequent anger; however I do expect them to report more intense, longer lasting the anger related to their identity. I do not expect to find any difference in reports of shame between men and women.

In regards to the expected relationships between gender and emotions I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Five: There will be no difference in the 5a) frequency, 5b) intensity or 5c) duration of happiness related to the identity between men and women.

There will be no difference in 5d) frequency of anger related to their identity between men and women.
Women will experience more intense, longer lasting the anger related to their identity.

There will be no difference in frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to their identity between men and women.

**Gender and Commitment/Identity Salience**

Gender has been found to significantly impact commitment. For instance, Stryker, Serpe and Hunt (2005) examine the relationship between gender and commitment between racial subsamples. Within the White subsample, women had greater affective commitment to family and to work (Stryker et al. 2005). Similar results were found in the Black subsample, women had significantly greater affective commitment. Stryker et al (2005) found that the instances in which large social structure impact commitment, it is affective rather than interactive commitment that is involved. Owens and Serpe (2003) conclude that regarding gender, a reasonably consistent finding is that being female impacts commitment. Based upon previous research, I do not expect to find a difference in interactive commitment between men and women. I do expect to find that women will report greater affective commitment. I do not expect there to be any difference in the salience of the identity between men and women.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Six: 6a) There will be no difference in interactive commitment to either identity between men and women.

6b) Women will report greater affective commitment to their identity.

6c) There will be no difference between men and women in reports of identity salience of their identity.
Emotions, whether positive or negative, impact the commitment to an identity (Stryker 2004). Stryker does not elaborate beyond the proposition that positive affect will increase commitment to the identity and that negative affect will decrease commitment to the identity. Stryker (2004) speaks briefly to the intensity of emotions but not to the duration or frequency of the emotional experience. The following hypotheses are developed under the assumption that emotions impact commitment and identity salience and that commitment and identity salience impact emotion. Regardless of the emotion; happiness, anger, or shame, that the impact on commitment and identity salience is reciprocal. Some variation is expected between emotions. I expect there will be variation also by frequency, intensity and duration of the emotional experience.

Happiness and Commitment/Identity Salience

Happiness is a state of wellbeing and contentment. Commitment and identity salience are reflective of the social structure. Happiness is one way in which social structure, emotions and identity relate. The greater the happiness related to a given identity influences the level to which one is committed to the identity.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Seven: The 7a) more frequent, 7b) more intense and 7c) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity.

The 7d) more frequent, 7e) more intense and 7f) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity.

In addition to commitment, happiness will have a direct impact on salience of the identity. Specifically, I hypothesize that:
Hypothesis Eight: The 8a) more frequent, 8b) more intense and 8c) longer lasting the happiness related to the identity the higher salience of the identity.

The relationship between emotion and identity is reciprocal. As such, I analyze both emotion as a force acting on commitment and identity salience and emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience. In relation to happiness, the higher the respondent’s commitment to an identity the greater happiness one will experience related to that identity.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Nine: The higher the respondent’s interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9b) more frequency, 9c) more intense, 9d) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

The higher the respondent’s affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9e) more frequency, 9f) more intense, 9g) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

Similar relationships can be expected between identity salience and happiness.

The higher the identity salience of an identity the greater emotional potential, identity salience will generate more frequent, more intense longer lasting happiness.

Specifically, I hypothesize that

Hypothesis Ten: The more salient an identity the respondent will report 10a) more frequency, 10b) more intense, 10c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

Anger and Commitment/Identity Salience

Anger is "a strong feeling of distress or displeasure in response to a specific
provocation" (Thomas 1993:13). Anger will impact the relationship between commitment and identity salience as well as be impacted by commitment and identity salience. Anger is a way in which structure, emotion and identity intersect. Variation in anger associated to a given identity will influence the level to which one is committed to that identity.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Eleven: The 11a) more frequent, 11b) more intense and 11c) longer lasting the anger, the less interactive commitment to the identity.

The 11d) more frequent, 11e) more intense and 11f) longer lasting the anger, the less affective commitment to the identity.

Similarly, the impact of anger on identity salience is expected to be significant. The greater the anger related to an identity the greater the impact upon identity salience.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Twelve: 12a) more frequent, 12b) more intense and 12c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity the lower salience the identity.

I turn now to expectations related to models examining emotion as a product; I begin to demonstrate the importance of a multidimensional measure of emotions, specifically measuring multidimensional emotive experiences (i.e. frequency, intensity and duration). While commitment and identity salience are predicted to decrease the frequency of anger related to an identity, they are thought to have opposite impact upon intensity and duration of anger. The greater commitment or higher salience of an identity, the more intense, longer lasting the anger related to that identity. When one feels anger related a highly salient identity that one is highly committed to it is likely to have greater impact.
I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Thirteen: The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the H14a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity

The higher the affective commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity

Similarly, I expect to find a relationship between identity salience and anger.

Specifically, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis Fourteen: The more salient an identity the 14a) less frequent, 14b) more intense, 14c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity.

_Shame and Commitment/Identity Salience_

As a self-conscious emotion, shame is expected to have an impact on commitment and identity salience as well as be impacted by commitment in identity salience. Shame serves as a mechanism for solidarity and social order. Shame, is used as a negative sanction to realign social behaviors to normative suggests that. Self-conscious emotions such as shame play a vital role in both creating and regulating individual thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Most individuals spend a great deal of time avoiding social situations that elicit shame and as such can be expected to greatly impact the relationship of commitment and identity salience. It can be expected then that the greater the experience of shame (frequency, intensity and duration) the less commitment one will have to that identity. Shame will impact the relationship between commitment and identity salience as well as be impacted by commitment and identity salience. Shame is
one way in which structure, emotion and identity intersect. Shame will influence the level to which one is committed to an identity.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Fifteen: The 15a) more frequent, 15b) more intense and 15c) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less interactive commitment to the identity. The 15d) more frequent, 15e) more intense and 15f) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less affective commitment to the identity.

Similarly, I hypothesize that shame will impact identity salience. Specifically, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Sixteen: the 16a) more frequent, 16b) more intense and 16c) longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the lower salience of the identity.

The relationship between emotion and identity is thought to be reciprocal; emotion is both a force and product. Commitment and identity salience are expected to impact emotion. The level of commitment and identity salience will impact reports of shame. While commitment is predicted to decrease the frequency of shame related to an identity, commitment is thought to have opposite impact upon intensity and duration of shame related to the identity. The greater commitment to the identity the more of intense, long lasting the shame related to that identity. The greater commitment to an identity the less likely one will experience shame but when they do, they it will be intense and long lasting.

Specifically, I hypothesize that:
Hypothesis Seventeen: The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17a) less frequent, 17b) more intense, 17c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.

The higher the affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17d) less frequent, 17e) more intense, 17f) longer lasting shame related to the identity.

Identity salience is expected to have a similar impact upon shame. Identity salience is predicted to decrease the frequency of shame related to an identity, but it will have the opposite impact upon intensity and duration of shame related to the identity. The higher the salience of an identity, the more of intense, long lasting the shame related to that identity. When one feels shame related a highly salient identity it is likely to have greater emotive impact. The greater commitment to an identity the less likely one will experience shame. I hypothesize that identity salience will impact shame.

Specifically I hypothesize that;

Hypothesis Eighteen: The more salient an identity the respondent will report 18a) less frequency, 18b) more intense, 18c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.
Figure 2.1 Heuristic Model: Emotion as Force

Figure 2.2 Heuristic Model: Emotion as Product
SELF-ESTEEM

According to Rosenberg et al (1995: 142) self-esteem is an attitude toward an object, that object being the self. Self-esteem refers to the evaluative and affective aspects of the self-concept, to how "good" or "bad" we feel about ourselves (Gecas 1982, 1989, 2003; Owens and Serpe 2003). Self-esteem is a self-evaluative part of the self-concept (Owens and Serpe 2003). Self-esteem theory holds that individuals are highly motivated to protect and enhance their self-esteem. Gecas and Schwalbe (1983) identify two dimensions of self-esteem, efficacy-based self-esteem and worth-based self-esteem. Efficacy based self-esteem is seeing oneself as competent and capable. Worth-based self-esteem is the feeling that one is accepted and valued (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1983). Self-esteem has been analyzed as an outcome (social product) (Rosenberg 1981); a buffer in the stress process (social process) (Thoits 1995) and as a motive that directs behavior (social force) (Cast and Burke 2002). Owens (1994) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing positive and negative self-esteem. He (1994) tests the relationship of self-esteem and emotional well-being, he analyzes self-deprecation (negative self-esteem) and positive self-worth (general positive self-esteem) as separate concepts. Rosenberg et al (1995) distinguishes between global self-esteem and specific self-esteem warning against using these concepts interchangeably. Both global and specific self-esteem are important in understanding the self, however Rosenberg et al (1995) reminds us that they (measures of self) “are important for different reasons and in different ways.” Global self-esteem has a greater impact on psychological well-being and specific self-esteem has a greater impact upon the behavioral output of an actor.
Thoits (1995) compares self-esteem to a reservoir of energy it can be built up and depleted. According to Cast and Burke (2002) that reservoir of self-esteem is filled up by successful self-verification and used up when the self-verification process is disrupted (Cast and Burke 2002). Self-esteem is an outcome of successful self-verification and a buffer against the negative emotions from failure of self-verification (Cast and Burke 2002).

Much research documents the consequences of self-esteem. Self-esteem works to maintain positive self-views by processing feedback in a self-serving manner (Baumeister 1998, Burke and Stets 2009). Some have found that self-esteem provides individuals with an anchor of stability both for their sense of self and emotional qualities (Baumeister 1998; Burke and Stets 2009). Others have discovered the beneficial cognitive resources that self-esteem provides enable individuals to deal with hardships more effectively (Baumgardner, Kaufman, and Levy 1989; Burke and Stets 2009; Kaplan, Robbins and Martin 1983; Shamir 1986; Turner and Roszell 1994; Spencer, Josephs and Steele 1993; Steele 1993). Burke and Stets (2009:81) point out that self-esteem protects the self from stressors including experiences that otherwise may be considered harmful to the self (Longmore and DeMaris 1997; Spencer, Josephs, and Steele 1993), distress (Cohen 1959; Rosenberg 1979), and depression (Burke 1991; 1996; Mirowsky and Ross 1989; Pearlin and Lieberman 1979; Pearlin, Lieberman, Menaghan and Mullan 1981).

Research on self-esteem assumes one of three conceptualizations, with each conceptualization often examined independently of the others. First, self-esteem has
been studied as an *outcome*. Focus within this literature is on processes that produce or inhibit self-esteem (e.g., Coppersmith 1967; Harter 1993; Peterson and Rollins 1987; Rosenberg 1979). Another way self-esteem has been examined is as a *self-motive*, emphasizing the propensity for individuals to perform in a manner that maintains or enhances positive evaluations of the self (Kaplan 1975; Tesser 1988). Lastly, self-esteem has been examined as a *buffer* for the self, affording protection from experiences that are destructive (Bachman et al. 2011; Longmore and DeMaris 1997; Pearlin and Schooler 1978; Spencer, Josephs and Steele 1993; Thoits 1994).

Much research focuses upon the causes of variations in the amount of self-esteem between individuals (Harter 1993), the way in which self-esteem attends to a behavioral motive (Swann 1990), or how self-esteem functions as a protector or buffer from negative information about the self that is obtained during interaction (Burke 1991). However, there has been limited research on self-esteem as a process of identity (see Ascencio 2007; Cast and Burke 2002; Ervin and Stryker 2001 for exceptions). Ascencio (2007) examines self-esteem as a mediator of the reflected appraisal process, emphasizing the centrality of self-esteem on the self-view and identity. Ascencio’s work demonstrates the importance of examining the relationship between self-esteem, Identity Theory and the implications upon self-view. She conceptualizes self-esteem as mediating the relationship between identities and self-view (appraisals) her work demonstrates the importance of external appraisals upon those with high and low self-esteem.
MASTERY

Mastery greatly impacts individual functioning and well-being. High self-efficacy has beneficial and therapeutic consequences for individuals, and low self-efficacy (powerlessness) has negative and maladaptive consequences (Gecas 1989). Self-efficacy and mastery is increasingly present within the sociological literatures, often expressed in concepts other than self-efficacy or mastery but yet deal with the themes of agency, personal control, and perceived competence (Gecas 1989).

Mastery is the extent to which one regards one’s life-chances as being under one’s control in contrast to being fatalistically ruled (Pearlin and Schooler 1978:5; Pearlin et. al. 1981). As it is often conceptualized in the social psychological literature, mastery is most conceptually akin to Bandura’s (1977) specification of personal efficacy as reflecting the belief that desired outcomes are achievable and that one can reach them (Pearlin et al. 2007). Mastery refers to the understanding that people harbor about their ability to manage the circumstances of their lives (Pearlin and Schooler 1978). Mastery is similar to, but must be distinguished from, other concepts that attempt to gauge personal control over life circumstances. Mastery is not locus of control (Rotter 1966) – mastery does not focus on the controllability of circumstances in general but rather how one can control circumstances that are important to the individual. It is also important to distinguish mastery from fatalism (Mirowsky and Ross 1990). Fatalism is ambiguous in relation to control because it may stem either from the belief that one’s life is directed by a higher power or that it entails circumstances that appear to be so overwhelmingly
immutable that one becomes resigned to their presence. It cannot be assumed that if one is fatalistic they too have low mastery (Pearlin et al. 2007:164).

Mastery is a coping resource. Many studies demonstrate that mastery is both directly and indirectly related to buffering the impact of stress on physical and mental health (see reviews Rodin 1986; Turner and Roszell 1994; also Kessler, Turner and House 1988, Miller et al 1995; Mirowsky and Ross 1990; Rosenfield 1989; Turner and Noh 1988). Mastery has been shown to be a valuable construct, within the framework of the stress process and health (Aneshensel 1992; Pearlín et al. 1981; Pudrovskaja et al. 2005; Schieman et al. 2006). Mastery has a positive association with well-being, controlling for stressors (Caputo 2003; Keith 2004; Turner and Lloyd 1999).

IDENTITY THEORY, SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY and EMOTION: HYPOTHESES

Age and Self-esteem

Research has been inconclusive on the relationship between age and self-esteem (Demo 1992; Gove et al. 1989; Brandtstadter and Greve 1994; Ryff 1989). Some studies find that self-esteem is stable throughout adulthood (Bengston, Reedy and Gordon 1985; Demo 1992) other research has demonstrated that self-esteem increases throughout adulthood (Erol and Orth 2011; Giarrusso et al., 2001). Stability or gradual increases in self-esteem throughout adulthood is consistent with life course theories that recognize the growing acceptance of one self throughout the life course (Gove et al., 1989). It also is consistent with the idea that as individuals age they improve emotional coping skills over time (Cast and Burke 2002). In contrast, some research has shown that self-esteem
decreases with age (McMullin and Cairney 2004). This pattern may be a consequence of two opposing processes (Tennen and Affleck 1993), which could lead to declines in the stability of self-esteem during middle and old age (Trzesniewski et al., 2003). Some speculate that mechanisms of self-esteem enhancement (e.g., in Western culture – power and status, career success, beauty, athletic ability, etc.) are less available in old age (Brandtstädter and Greve 1994). Based upon previous research examining the relationship between age and self-esteem and the restricted age of the sample of college students; It can be predicted that self-esteem will increase with age in a convenient sample of college students.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Nineteen: Self-esteem will increase with age.

Mastery and Age

Some studies have examined mastery over the life course (often based on cross-sectional analyses of different age groups), in some instances a curvilinear pattern has been discovered. Mastery is important to incorporate in the understanding of the stress process in understanding depression in late life (Bierman 2011). Mastery has been found to increase through childhood and early adulthood, peaking in middle age, and decline after age sixty (Dowd 1975; Gurin and Brim 1984, Woodward et al 1988). Other research has examined the association between age and mastery (Mirowsky 1995) based upon these the nature of the association are inconclusive (Lachman 1986). Positive associations between age and mastery assume that as one ages attainment of personal and institutional
resources provides greater mastery. In contrast, some research has shown a negative association between age and mastery noting that control declines after the age of sixty (Mirowsky 1995) and that the loss of status associated with age contributes to the decline (Mirowsky and Ross 1992). Based upon previous research highlighting the peak of mastery in middle age and the restricted age of the sample of college students; it is predicted that mastery will increase with age in a convenient sample of college students.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis Twenty: Older respondents will report greater mastery related to their identity.

Self-esteem and Race

Reviews of studies on race differences in self-esteem have determined that despite social status disadvantage, Black adults tend to have self-esteem that is at least as high as Whites (Barbarin 1993; Demo and Hughes 1990; Gray-Little and Hafdahl 2000; Hughes and Demo 1989). High self-esteem among Blacks may be a self-protective mechanism that membership in stigmatized or disadvantaged group generates. Researchers have proposed that membership to a racial minority group may protect or buffer self-esteem (e.g., Crocker et al. 1994; McCarthy and Yancey 1971; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, and Smith 1998; Simmons and Rosenberg 1971). Positive racial identity may also add to heightened self-esteem in Blacks. For instance Social Identity Theory suggests that that (Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Gray-Little and Hafdahl, 2000) when group identity is salient and the group is undervalued or is seen as unfavorable by other groups, people work to
attain a positive in-group identity by accentuating the desired characteristics of their group, ultimately changing the negative stereotypical qualities to be considered positive and favorable among in-group members over out-group members. According to Social Identity Theory, members of the minority racial groups redefine their group identity in positive terms (Carter 1995; Helms 1990; Rowe, Behrens, and Leach 1995). When racial identity is salient and positive self-esteem will be high (Adams 2010; Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Phinney, Cantu, and Kurtz 1997; Pope 2000; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, and Smith 1998; Wilson and Constantine, 1999). In a meta-analysis of self-esteem and race, Blacks consistently scored higher than Whites on measures of self-esteem (Lyubomirsky, Tkach, and DiMatteo 2006). Other research demonstrates that studies find little difference in the self-esteem of Blacks and Whites (see Gecas 1982).

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-one: Nonwhite respondents will report greater self-esteem than Whites.

Mastery and Race

Gurin et al (1978) found Whites to hold significantly higher mastery than blacks. Jang et al (2003) find similar results specifically; older African Americans have lower mastery than Whites. The lower mastery of Blacks, compared to Whites, may be a function of racial discrimination and its subsequent consequences on obtaining power, control, and resources promoting efficacious accomplishments (Twenge and Crocker 2002; Watkins et al 2010). One explanation of these differences between race and
mastery is that like self-efficacy, mastery is more responsive to social structural influences such as discrimination (Gecas and Schwalbe 1983; Gecas 1989; Hughes and Demo 1989; Lincoln, Chatters and Taylor 2003).

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-two: White respondents will report greater mastery than Nonwhites.

**Self-esteem and Gender**

Much evidence has been provided related to the relationship of gender and self-esteem. Consistently, women report lower self-esteem than men (Gecas 1989). Rosenfield (1999) contends that men and women have distinctive social structural experiences in early childhood and are reflective of the relative power that men and women have in larger society.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-three: Men will report greater self-esteem than women.

**Mastery and Gender**

Previous research indicates that men have a greater sense of mastery than do women in our society (Block 1976; Gecas 1989; Maccoby and Jacklin 1974). The opportunity to exert control over external events is more salient for men than for women (Bachman et al. 2011; McMullin and Cairney 2004; Spencer, Josephs, and Steele 1993; Falci 2011; Lyubomirsky et al. 2006; Josephs, Markus, and Tafarodi 1992)
I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-four: Men will report greater mastery.

**Self-esteem, Mastery and Commitment and Identity Salience**

Research examining self-esteem's impact on interactive and affective commitment, find differential impact by race (Gecas 1989). For instance, among Whites, self-esteem had no impact on either form of commitment. For Blacks, however, self-esteem was not related to interactive commitment but associated with affective commitment. Owens and Serpe (2003) conclude that as self-esteem increased among Blacks, only affective commitment increased, not interactive commitment. Owens and Serpe (2003) find that interactive commitment plays a role in identity salience. Unlike interactive commitment, affective commitment had a significant impact on identity salience. This research highlights the powerful impact affective commitment, has upon identity salience (Owens and Serpe 2003). Self-esteem impacts identity salience among both Whites and Blacks. It was also discovered that self-esteem has an effect on identity salience through affective commitment (Owens and Serpe 2003). Based upon these findings, I expect that the greater the commitment to the identity and the higher the salience of the identity the higher the self-esteem and greater the mastery.

Related to self-esteem, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-five: 25a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon self-esteem

25b) Affective commitment will increase self-esteem

25c) The higher the identity salience of an identity the higher the self-esteem
Related to mastery, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-six: 26a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon mastery

26b) Affective commitment will increase mastery

26c) The higher the identity salience of an identity the greater the mastery

SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and HAPPINESS

I expect to find a relationship between self-esteem, mastery, commitment, identity salience and happiness. Of respondents who report higher self-esteem will be more likely to report greater happiness related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that self-esteem acts as buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance, happiness is the product of these models. Happiness is expected to be more frequent, more intense and longer lasting when self-esteem is high.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-seven: The higher self-esteem the 27a) more frequent, 27b) more intense, 27c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

I expect to find a relationship between mastery, commitment, identity salience and happiness. Of respondents who have higher greater mastery will be more likely to report greater happiness related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that mastery acts as buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance, happiness is the product of the relationship between
commitment, identity salience and mastery. Happiness is expected to be more frequent, more intense and longer lasting when mastery is high.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-eight: The greater mastery the 28a) more frequent, 28b) more intense, 28c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and ANGER

I expect to find a relationship between self-esteem, commitment, identity salience and anger. Of respondents who have higher greater self-esteem will be less likely to report anger related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that self-esteem acts as buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance, anger is the product of the relationship between commitment, identity salience and self-esteem. Anger is expected to be less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting when self-esteem is high.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis twenty-nine: The higher the self-esteem the 29a) less frequent, 29b) less intense and 29c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity

I expect to find a relationship between mastery, commitment, identity salience and anger. Of respondents who have higher greater mastery will be less likely to report anger related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that mastery acts as buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance,
anger is the product of the relationship between commitment, identity salience and mastery. Anger is expected to be less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting when mastery is high. Previous research finds that mastery is negatively related to frequency of anger (Mabry and Kiecolt 2005).

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis thirty: The greater the mastery the 30a) less frequent, 30b) less intense and 30c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity.

SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and SHAME

I expect to find a relationship between self-esteem, commitment, identity salience and shame. Of respondents who have higher greater self-esteem will be less likely to report shame related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that self-esteem acts as buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance, shame is the product of the relationship between commitment, identity salience and self-esteem. Shame is expected to be less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting when self-esteem is high.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis thirty-one: The higher the self-esteem the 31a) less frequent, 32b) less intense and 31c) shorter in duration shame related to the identity.

I expect to find a relationship between mastery, commitment, identity salience and shame. Of respondents who have higher mastery will be less likely to report shame related to the identity. This hypothesis is based upon the assumption that mastery acts as
buffer between commitment, identity salience and emotions. For this instance, shame is the product of the relationship between commitment, identity salience and mastery. Shame is expected to be less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting when mastery is high.

I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis thirty-two: The greater the mastery the 32a) less frequent, 32b) less intense and 32c) shorter in duration anger related to the identity.
| Hypothesis 1  | Older respondents will report 1a) more frequent, 1b) more intense, 1c) longer lasting happiness related to their identity.  
|              | Older respondents will report 1d) less frequent, 1e) less intense and 1f) shorter lasting anger related to their identity.  
|              | Older respondents will report 1g) less frequent, 1h) less intense and 1i) shorter lasting shame related to their identity. |
| Hypothesis 3  | There will be no difference in the 3a) frequency, 3b) intensity or 3c) duration of happiness related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.  
| Race & Emotion| There will be no difference in the 3d) frequency, 3e) intensity or 3f) duration of anger related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.  
|              | There will be no difference in the 3g) frequency, 3h) intensity or 3i) duration of shame related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. |
| Hypothesis 4  | 4a) There will be no difference in the interactive commitment to the identity (family or student) between Whites and Nonwhites.  
| Race & Commitment| 4b) Nonwhite respondents will report greater affective commitment to the family identity.  
|              | 4c) There will be no difference in the affective commitment to the student identity between Whites and Nonwhites. |
| Hypothesis 5  | There will be no difference in the 5a) frequency, 5b) intensity or 5c) duration of happiness related to the identity between men and women.  
| Gender & Emotion| There will be no difference in 5d) frequency of anger related to their identity between men and women.  
|              | Women will experience more 5e) intense, 5f) longer lasting anger related to their identity.  
|              | There will be no difference in 5g) frequency, 5h) intensity or 5i) duration of shame related to their identity between men and women. |
| Hypothesis 6  | 6a) There will be no difference in interactive commitment to either identity between men and women.  
| Gender & Commitment/| 6b) Women will report greater affective commitment to their identity.  
| Salience      | 6c) There will be no difference between men and women in reports of identity salience to their identity. |
| Hypothesis 7 | The 7a) more frequent, 7b) more intense and 7c) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the more interactive commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 8 | The 7d) more frequent, 7e) more intense and 7f) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the more affective commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 9 | The 8a) more frequent, 8b) more intense and 8c) longer lasting the happiness related to the identity the higher salience to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 10 | The higher the respondent’s interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9b) more frequency, 9c) more intense, 9d) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 11 | The higher the respondent’s affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9e) more frequency, 9f) more intense, 9g) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 12 | The more salient an identity the respondent will report 10a) more frequency, 10b) more intense, 10c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 13 | The 11a) more frequent, 11b) more intense and 11c) longer lasting the anger, the less interactive commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 14 | The 11d) more frequent, 11e) more intense and 11f) longer lasting the anger, the less affective commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 15 | 12a) more frequent, 12b) more intense and 12c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity the lower salience the identity.  
| Hypothesis 16 | The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting anger related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 17 | The higher the affective commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting anger related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 18 | The more salient an identity the 14a) less frequent, 14b) more intense, 14c) longer lasting anger related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 19 | The 15a) more frequent, 15b) more intense and 15c) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less interactive commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 20 | The 15d) more frequent, 15e) more intense and 15f) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less affective commitment to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 21 | The 16a) more frequent, 16b) more intense and 16c) longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the lower salience to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 22 | The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17a) less frequent, 17b) more intense, 17c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 23 | The higher the affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17d) less frequent, 17e) more intense, 17f) longer lasting shame related to the identity.  
| Hypothesis 24 | The more salient an identity the respondent will report 18a) less frequency, 18b) more intense, 18c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 19</th>
<th>Self-esteem will increase with age.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 20</td>
<td>Older respondents will report greater mastery related to their identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 21</td>
<td>Nonwhite respondents will report greater self-esteem than Whites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 22</td>
<td>White respondents will report greater mastery than Nonwhites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 23</td>
<td>Men will report greater self-esteem than women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 24</td>
<td>Men will report greater mastery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hypothesis 25 | 25a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon self-esteem  
| Commitment,  | 25b) Affective commitment will increase self-esteem  
| Salience &   | 25c) The higher the salience of an identity the higher the self-esteem |
| Self-Esteem  |                                    |
| Hypothesis 26 | 26a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon mastery  
| Commitment,  | 26b) Affective commitment will increase mastery  
| Salience &   | 26c) The higher the salience of an identity the greater the mastery |
| Mastery      |                                    |
| Hypothesis 27 | Higher self-esteem the 27a) more frequent, 27b) more intense, 27c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. |
| Self-Esteem & |                                    |
| Happiness    |                                    |
| Hypothesis 28 | The greater mastery the 28a) more frequent, 28b) more intense, 28c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. |
| Mastery &    |                                    |
| Happiness    |                                    |
| Hypothesis 29 | The higher the self-esteem the 29a) less frequent, 29b) less intense and 29c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Self-Esteem & |                                    |
| Anger        |                                    |
| Hypothesis 30 | The greater the mastery the 30a) less frequent, 30b) less intense and 30c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Mastery &    |                                    |
| Anger        |                                    |
| Hypothesis 31 | The higher the self-esteem the 31a) less frequent, 32b) less intense and 31c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Self-Esteem & |                                    |
| Shame        |                                    |
| Hypothesis 32 | The greater the mastery the 32a) less frequent, 32b) less intense and 32c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Mastery &    |                                    |
| Shame        |                                    |
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

SAMPLE

The data for this research is a convenience sample of 1100 undergraduate and graduate students at Kent State University. Students in sociology, education and history courses were administered a questionnaire. The sample was collected over two semesters, fall 2008 (n= 539) and spring 2009 (n=561). The sample was collected from twenty-five classes, sixteen of which were sampled at the end of the fall of 2008 and nine classes were sampled at the beginning of the spring of 2009. The collection of this data resulted in ninety-five percent of the students present on the day of administration completing the survey.

Data were collected at the start or at the end of class at the convenience of the instructor. Students read a verbal script (below) highlighting the voluntary nature of the questionnaire and my intent on protecting their anonymity. No incentive was provided for participation. Included in my script was contact information and resources available on campus for professional psychological counseling if participating in the research brought up any uncomfortable feelings. Of respondents completed the self-administered questionnaire during class time. All questionnaires were distributed and collected in envelopes to further protect the respondent’s anonymity. The self-administered questionnaire took approximately thirty to forty-five minutes to complete.
I want to do research testing the relationship of identities, emotions and behavior. I would like you to take part in this project. If you decide to do take part, you will complete the questionnaire that will take approximately 30 minutes. Please keep the consent form for your records. Anonymity will be ensured. Your questionnaire has a code number I will use to identify your responses. This research is no way related to your performance in the course. If you chose to take part in this project you will be contributing to the scientific community. Taking part in this project is voluntary; no one will hold it against you if you decide not to participate. If you participate, you may stop at any time or skip any question. Only students 18 years of age or older are eligible, if you are under the age of 18 please return the questionnaire. There will be no way for anyone to identify you based upon your responses to the following questions. Please feel secure in knowing that I respect your anonymity. Many of these questions ask about your emotions and feelings about yourself. If you feel you need to discuss any related issues with a psychological professional, services are available to you on campus through University Health Services (330.672.2487). If you want to know more about this research project, please call me (330.672.3597), or Richard Serpe (330.672.4896). The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. John West, Vice President of Research, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (330.672.2704).

The sample is 70 percent female (n=720), 30 percent male (n=313). Of respondents’ ages range from 18-57 years (64 percent of the students were under the age of twenty). Of respondents are overwhelmingly white, 85 percent (n=881) white and 15 percent non-white (n=155).

Table 3.1 Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (1)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (2)</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (3)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over (4)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (0)</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonWhite (1)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (0)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (1)</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHICS

I analyze the demographic variables of age, race and gender for these analyses. Age was broken into four groups, 18 (1), 19 (2), 20 (3) and >21 (4). Gender was dummy coded, men (0) and women (1). Race was dummy coded (0) White and (1) Nonwhite. These variables are measured by asking the respondents to record their age, race and gender with the self-report questionnaire.

IDENTITY

A role identity is the personal attachment or intrinsic acceptance of the identity associated with a specific role. Of respondents were directed to think about themselves in two different role identities, as a student and a family member. Identities were selected based upon their practicality related to a student population. Following previous research within Identity Theory among a college student population (Serpe 1987; Serpe and Stryker 1987, 1993) both the student and family identity are identities to which a college student sample often engages. College students are most likely to hold roles within the university (as a student) and within families (as a family member). These identities reflect social networks that college students regularly interact. These two identities are identities in which college students are likely to interact and interact with regularity. To ensure respondents were answering questions related to the targeted identity I added directions
before each subset of questions related to their student identity, respondents were directed to for instance related to the student identity, “Think about your role as a student, specifically think of the activities that you engage in as a student (class, student organizations, study groups, etc.). For the following section think about your role as a student and answer the following questions.” Another mechanism that I utilized to remind respondents to respond to the questions with respect to specifically to their identity was when asking questions related to their experience of emotion related to their identity I embed the statement, “In thinking of yourself as a family member….“ followed by the emotion specific question.

COMMITMENT

Commitment reflects social structure and is the social tie to a network and emphasizes the foundation of society through micro level interactions (Stryker et al 2005). Commitment refers an individual’s connection to network(s) and it relates to the degree individual relationships within networks depend upon specific identities or enacting particular roles. Commitment is measured by the costs of foregoing meaningful relations with others should the identity be foregone. Commitment is related to the social and personal costs entailed in no longer fulfilling a role based on a given identity (Stryker 1980). The costs are conceptually a function of the strength of ties to others in social networks, to which one relates by virtue of enacting a role and holding an identity. Interactional ties and affective ties are distinct and independent types of commitment –
thus are labeled as such; interactional commitment and affective commitment (Serpe 1987; Stryker 1987; Stryker and Serpe 1994).

*Interactive Commitment*

Interactive commitment is the number of relations linked to a given identity and the ties among those network relationships (Serpe 1987; Stryker 1987; Stryker and Serpe 1994). For this dissertation interactive commitment is measured through the construction of interactive commitment scale consisting of six items. The scale consists of items measuring the number of relations and resources spent in a given identity. The interactive commitment scale includes: 1) How often do you do things related being student/friend/family member? 2) In an average week how many hours do you spend in the student/friend/family member role? 3) In an average week how many emails do you send related to your student/friend/family member role? 4) In the average week, how many texts do you send related to your student/friend/family role? 5) How many friends have you made through your student/friend/family role? 6) Of the money you do not need for rent, food, clothing and other essentials how much do you spend on activities related to being a student/friend/family member? All items are quartiles and responses ranged from 0 (low) to 4 (high). The interactive commitment scale ranges from 6 (low) to 25 (high). Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities for the student identity is .535 and for the family identity is .619.

*Affective Commitment*
Affective commitment is the emotional attachment to others in network relationships (Serpe 1987; Stryker 1987; Stryker and Serpe 1994). In this dissertation affective commitment is analyzed by summing to items creating an affective commitment variable. Affective commitment was conceptualized through the items, “How close (in personal and emotional terms) are you to others in your student related activities?” and “Of all the people that you have known through your activities as a student, how many are important to you, that is how many would you really miss if you did not see them?” The affective commitment scale ranges from 14 (low) to 39 (high). Affective commitment correlations for the family identity = .369, and friend identity = .535.

IDENTITY SALIENCE

Identities are organized in a salience hierarchy (Stryker, 1980; Serpe and Stryker 2011). The salience of an identity is measured by the probability of being invoked across settings. Salience of the identities was accessed through adapting the identity salience scale used in previous research (Serpe, 1987; Serpe and Styker 1987, 1993; Stryker and Serpe 1994) to the identities being examined in the current study, student, and family member. The identity salience scale consists of four items. Of respondents are asked about meeting a co-worker, person of the opposite sex, friend of a close friend and a family member for the first time, how certain is it that they would tell the person about being a student or family member Of respondents selected from almost certainly would, probably would, probably would not or almost certainly would not. Identity salience ranges from 4 (low) to 16 (high). The alpha reliabilities are; student .840, family .919 and friend .890.
This research focuses upon the two primary emotions, happiness and anger, along with shame. Of respondents were asked about their emotional experiences related to each identity specifically for the emotions of happiness, anger and shame.

Replicating the 1996 General Social Survey Emotions Module I include a multidimensional measurement of emotions including frequency, intensity and duration. As detailed in the previous chapter (Chapter 2), a differentiation between dimensions of the emotion avoids limitations in a global measure of the emotion.

FREQUENCY

Frequency is how often the emotion occurs. Frequency of the emotional response was operationalized following the same pattern as the 1996 General Social Survey Emotions Module. Frequency of each emotion was measured by asking the respondent in thinking of their self as a student or family member, how many days in the previous week they have felt the specific emotion? Responses were not at all this week (0), one or two days this week (1), three or four days this week (2), five or six days this week (3) or daily or multiple times a day (4).

INTENSITY

Emotional intensity refers to how strongly or with what magnitude an emotion is experience or expressed. Intensity was again operationalized using the 1996 General Social Survey Emotions Module measure. Intensity of each emotion was measured by
asking the respondent in thinking of their self as a student or family member and to recall the last time they felt the specific emotion - how intense was it. Responses range from 0 – not intense at all through 10 very intense.

**DURATION**

Duration refers to how long a particular emotion lasts. Following the 1996 General Social Survey Emotions Module, duration of each emotion was measured by asking the respondent in thinking of their self as a student or family member, think of the last time they felt the specific emotion. Followed by how long did they feel the emotion? Responses range from 1 – a few seconds to 7- continuously.

**SELF-ESTEEM**

Self-esteem refers to the evaluative and affective aspects of the self-concept, to how "good" or "bad" we feel about ourselves (Gecas 1982; Gecas and Burke 1990; Rosenberg 1979). Rosenberg et al (1995) defines self-esteem as an attitude toward an object, the object being the self. Negative items from the Rosenberg scale were reverse coded. Self-esteem was captured by the creation of a 10–item scale. Of respondents were asked to rate their general feelings about their self. Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree) for each of the following items. Self-esteem ranges from 0 (low esteem) to 3 (high esteem). The self-esteem scale has an alpha reliability of .892.

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (Reversed coded)
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (Reversed coded)
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. (Reversed coded)
9. I certainly feel useless at times (Reversed coded)
10. At times I think that I am not good at all. (Reversed coded)

MASTERY

Mastery is the extent to which one regards one’s life-chances as being under one’s control (Pearlin and Schooler 1978:5; Pearlin et. al. 1981). The Pearl Mastery Scale measures the extent to which individuals perceive themselves in control of forces that significantly influence their lives. In this analysis mastery is operationalized as a 7-item scale. Each item is a statement regarding the respondent's perception of self, and respondents are asked how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement. Responses included (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) agree; and (4) strongly agree. Mastery ranges from 1 (low) to 4 (high). To obtain a positively oriented measure negatively phrased questions were reverse coded. The mastery scale has an alpha reliability of .809.

1. I have little control over the things that happen to me.
2. There is really no way that I can solve some of the problems I have.
3. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.
4. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.
5. What happens to me in the future mostly depends upon me. * (Reverse Coded)
6. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do. * (Reverse Coded)
7. Sometimes I feel like I am being pushed around in life

ANALYSIS

The nature of emotion data reflects a unique set of challenges. Specifically, all respondents do not report all emotions within any given identity. As such, there are a
number of skipped items within the data. If respondents report they did not experience the emotion in a particular identity in the previous week, they were directed to skip the subsequent emotion questions. As in previous research using similar data (Lively and Heise 2004; Simon and Lively 2010; Simon and Nath 2004) this analysis is based upon subsamples for each specific emotion in each specific role identity. The subsamples are based upon respondents who experience the emotion in the identity at least once in the previous week. By only examining respondents who experience the emotion, related to the identity I reduce issues associated with missing data. For instance, a large number of respondents experience happiness related to the student identity (n= 979) whereas a relatively low portion of the sample experience shame related to the family identity (n=162). Basing analysis only on the subsample enables my conclusions to be exclusively about the relationship among respondents experience the particular emotion related to the specific identity. Table 3.x represents the sample sizes for each emotion in each identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion by Identity Subsample</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Family Identity</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Student Identity</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Family Identity</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Student Identity</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Family Identity</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Student Identity</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VARIABLE ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS

The zero-order correlations for each of sub-samples for the dissertation are presented below. The six tables represent the variables and sample size for each emotion by identity. Tables 3.3 through 3.8 report the correlations for all variables within each emotion by identity.

Table 3.3 Zero-Order Correlations Happiness in Family Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations - Happiness Family Identity Subsample</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-1.08**</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.08**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Commitment</td>
<td>-1.08**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Salience</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>-0.249**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-0.171*</td>
<td>0.505*</td>
<td>.728*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-0.171*</td>
<td>0.505*</td>
<td>.728*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.568 0.135 0.724 14.705 31.268 13.112 2.132 1.913 2.539 7.412 4.557

Std. Deviation: 1.209 0.342 0.447 3.819 4.912 2.990 0.546 0.519 1.176 1.882 1.127

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

Table 3.4 Zero-Order Correlations Happiness in Student Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations - Happiness Student Identity Subsample</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Commitment</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.705**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Salience</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>-0.277**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-0.246**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.561 0.139 0.719 15.790 28.092 14.173 2.130 1.919 2.377 7.014 4.315

Std. Deviation: 1.200 0.346 0.450 3.598 4.680 1.963 0.545 0.527 1.113 1.785 1.066

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01
Table 3.5 Zero-Order Correlations Anger in Family Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Commitment</strong></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.492*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Salience</strong></td>
<td>-0.153*</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.356*</td>
<td>.360*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mastery</strong></td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>-0.139*</td>
<td>-0.223*</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.690*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>-0.155*</td>
<td>-0.139*</td>
<td>-0.353*</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.282*</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity</strong></td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-0.105*</td>
<td>-0.245*</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.172*</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-0.112*</td>
<td>-0.286*</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.134*</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.380*</td>
<td>.631*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.594 0.141 0.749 14.873 29.592 12.851 1.971 2.066 1.390 5.795 3.317

Std. Deviation: 1.226 0.348 0.434 3.872 5.842 3.037 0.565 0.543 0.761 2.506 1.334

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

Table 3.6 Zero-Order Correlations Anger in Student Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Commitment</strong></td>
<td>-0.178*</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>.508*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Salience</strong></td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>.259*</td>
<td>.256*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mastery</strong></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.160*</td>
<td>-0.268*</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.688*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.259*</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity</strong></td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-0.196*</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.307*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-0.157*</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.582*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.515 0.164 0.705 16.007 27.843 14.075 2.022 2.022 1.400 5.810 3.387

Std. Deviation: 1.201 0.370 0.457 3.596 4.758 2.013 0.542 0.529 0.717 2.470 1.232

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01
Table 3.7 Zero-Order Correlations Shame in Family Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Commitment</td>
<td>-.194*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-.193*</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.179*</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Salience</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.481**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.212*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.260**</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>.240**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.537 0.136 0.667 14.444 28.652 12.534 1.884 2.126 1.352 5.401 3.370

Std. Deviation 1.271 0.344 0.473 3.908 5.604 3.113 0.505 0.530 0.735 2.671 1.444

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

Table 3.8 Zero-Order Correlations Shame in Student Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interactive Commitment</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Identity Salience</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Commitment</td>
<td>-.217*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.132*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-.132*</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Salience</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.153*</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.197*</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>-.264**</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.589**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.320**</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.216**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.715**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.49 0.127 0.7341 15.66 27.72 14.026 1.86 2.104 1.392 5.154 3.15

Std. Deviation 1.216 0.334 0.443 3.482 4.714 1.982 0.520 0.482 0.764 2.545 1.349

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELS

A series of structural equation models (SEM) with manifest and latent variables is used for this analysis. SEM is similar to multiple regression, but in a more powerful way which takes into account the modeling of interactions, nonlinearities, correlated independents, measurement error, correlated error terms, multiple latent independents
each measured by multiple indicators, and one or more latent dependents also each with multiple indicators. SEM was chosen over separate aggregate OLS regression analysis on the basis of the data violating assumptions of OLS regression. Due to the possibility of multicollinearity SEM with manifest variables offers robust measurements in the face of OLS regression violations such as multicollinearity. Additionally, it was optimal to obtain analysis using SEM as the research question had more than one dependent (endogenous) variable. The benefit of SEM over separate OLS regression allows for a more precise specification as it takes into consideration the impact of all control variables on all endogenous variables simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

Testing of the key variables of Identity Theory (interactive commitment, affective commitment and identity salience) I examine their relationship and emotions. The first series of structural equation models measure the relationships between demographic variables (age, race and gender), interactive commitment, affective commitment, identity salience and specific emotions. A structural equation was run for each emotion (happiness, anger and shame) in each role identity (student and family member). Results of these analyses are presented in Chapter four. The second series of analyses for this dissertation, presented in Chapter five examines the relationship between Identity Theory variables such as commitment (affective and interactive), identity salience, self-esteem and mastery and specific emotions. Chapter five provides analyses that examine self-esteem and mastery as mediating the relationship between commitment, salience and emotion.
CHAPTER 4

IDENTITY THEORY and EMOTION: ANALYSIS

In this analysis I examine the relationship between the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness, anger and shame as they relate to Identity Theory. This chapter has four sections. The first section of this chapter will present analysis of a series of structural equation models that examine emotion as both a social force and product. The second section of this chapter details the results by hypothesis. This section of Chapter four elaborates on the results and summarizes patterns that emerges. The third part of Chapter four offers brief discussion of the key findings emphasizing the patterns I discovered in my analysis. The last portion of this chapter is a summation table of my findings by hypothesis. Each subsection of Chapter four is organized in a similar fashion; I begin with the specific emotion (i.e. happiness, anger then shame) by type of model (emotion as social force followed by emotion as social product) by identity (family member followed by student).
HAPPINESS

Family Happiness as Force

Table 4.1 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between happiness related to the family identity. In this model happiness is a social force on commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 942 respondents, those who experience happiness related to the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = 9.861/1; p = .002$ and RMSEA = 0.097 demonstrating the model has an adequate fit. While this model does not represent a ‘good fit’, the large sample size decreases the chance of a significant model.

Among respondents who report happiness related to the family identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of

---

1 The coefficients presented are unstandardized. The standard errors are not report in the tables. This decision was made to keep the large number of tables as parsimonious as possible.
happiness by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report significantly less affective commitment ($B = -0.285; p= .05$) to the family identity (hypothesis two). There is no difference in the frequency, intensity of duration of happiness between whites and nonwhites (hypothesis three). There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites related to commitment to the family identity (hypothesis four). Women significantly report more frequent ($B = 0.331; p=.001$), more intense ($B = 0.614; p=.001$), longer lasting happiness ($B = 0.417; p=.001$) (hypothesis five). I find no difference between interactive commitment or identity salience between men and women among those who report happiness related to their family identity. Women report greater affective ($B = 1.009; p=.01$) commitment to the family identity (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis seven suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the commitment (interactive and affective). The more frequent, more intense respondents experience happiness related to the family identity the higher commitment (interactive and affective) to the family identity. Of respondents who experience happiness in the previous week related to the family identity, the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity ($B = 0.676; p=.001$). Of respondents who experience happiness, the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity ($B = 1.009; p=.01$). Similarly, of respondents who experience happiness the more intense the happiness, the greater the interactive commitment to the identity ($B = 0.302; p=.001$). A similar relationship was observed with respect to affective commitment, the more intense the happiness, the greater the affective commitment to the identity ($B = 0.857; p=
Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity, those who experience longer lasting happiness report significantly greater the interactive commitment to the family identity ($B = 0.448$; $p = .001$). Hypothesis eight suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels happiness related to the identity the higher salience of the identity. Among respondents who report more frequent happiness report higher salience of the family identity ($B = 0.223$; $p = .05$). Of respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity those who report longer lasting happiness report higher salience of the family identity ($B = 0.317$; $p = .01$).

**Family Happiness as Product**

Table 4.2 Family Happy - Emotion as Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.295 **</td>
<td>-0.2 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.929 ***</td>
<td>1.755 ***</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.115 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.157 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 942 \chi^2/df = 9.144/1 \ p = .002 \ RMSEA \ .093$

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4.2 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship of happiness and Identity Theory concepts associated with the family identity. In this model happiness is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 942 respondents, those who experience happiness related to
the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = 9.144/1$; $p = .002$ and RMSEA = 0.093 demonstrating the model has an adequate fit.

Among respondents who report happiness related to the family identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report less affective commitment ($B = -0.295; p = .01$) and older respondents reports significantly lower identity salience of the family identity ($B = -0.2; p = .01$) (hypothesis two). There is no difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness between whites and nonwhites related to the family identity (hypothesis three) and there is no difference in the commitment (interactive or affective) to the family identity between whites and nonwhites (hypothesis four). Women report significantly more intense ($B = 0.245; p = .01$) and longer lasting ($B = 0.213; p = .01$) happiness related to the family identity (hypothesis five). Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, women report greater interactive ($B = 0.929; p = .001$) and affective ($B = 1.755; p = .001$) commitment to the family identity (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis nine suggests that the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the respondent will report more frequent, more intense and longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity in the previous week, those who report greater interactive commitment to their family identity report more frequent ($B = 0.06; p = .001$), more intense ($B = 0.087; p = .001$), longer lasting ($B = 0.058; p = .001$)
happiness (hypothesis nine). Those who report greater affective commitment to their family identity report more frequent \( (B = 0.078; p = .01) \), more intense \( (B = 0.157; p = .001) \), longer lasting \( (B = 0.07; p = .001) \) happiness (hypothesis nine). Hypothesis ten suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report more frequent, more intense and longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, the greater the salience of the family identity, the more frequent \( (B = 0.036; p = .001) \) and longer lasting \( (B = 0.036; p = .001) \) the happiness related to the family identity (hypothesis ten).

**Student Happiness as Force**

Table 4.3 Student Happy - Emotion as Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.204 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>0.183 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.252 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>0.076 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.059 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 979 \; \chi^2/df=2.7/1 \; p=.097 \; RMSEA=.043 \)

*\( p < 0.05 \), **\( p < 0.01 \), ***\( p < 0.001 \)

Table 4.3 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between happiness related to the student identity. In this model happiness is a social force on both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 979
respondents, those who experience happiness related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = 2.7/1; p = .097$ and RMSEA = 0.043 demonstrating the model has a good fit.

Among respondents who report happiness related to the student identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report less interactive ($B = -0.571; p = .001$) and affective ($B = -0.266; p = .01$) commitment (hypothesis two). There is no difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness related to the student identity between whites and nonwhites (hypothesis three). There is no difference in the commitment (interactive or affective) to the student identity between whites and nonwhites (hypothesis four). There is no difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness (hypothesis five). Women report higher commitment (interactive $B = 0.68; p = .01$ and affective $B = 0.722; p = .01$) and salience of the student identity ($B = 0.327; p = .01$) (hypothesis six).

According to Hypothesis seven the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the commitment (interactive and affective) to the identity. Of respondents who experience happiness at least once in the previous week the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity ($B = 0.204; p = .01$) the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity ($B = 0.204; p = .01$). The more intense happiness, the greater the interactive commitment to the student identity ($B = 0.857; p = .01$).
the more intense the happiness in the student identity the greater the affective commitment to the student identity ($B = 0.183; p = .01$). Of respondents who report longer lasting happiness report significantly greater interactive ($B = 0.252; p = .01$) and affective commitment related to the student identity ($B = 0.406; p = .01$). Hypothesis eight suggests that that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels happiness related to the identity the higher salience of the identity. The frequency, intensity and duration of happiness related to the student identity do not significantly impact the salience of the student identity.

**Student Happiness as Product**

Table 4.4 Student Happy - Emotion as Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Interactive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.616 ***</td>
<td>-0.369 ***</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.09 **</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.692 **</td>
<td>0.733 *</td>
<td>0.325 **</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>0.078 ***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.068 ***</td>
<td>0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.1 ***</td>
<td>0.046 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.038 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=979 \ \chi^2/df = .8/1 \ p=.366 \ RMSEA .000$

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4.4 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between happiness related to the student identity. In this model happiness is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 979 respondents, those who experience happiness related to the student identity in the
previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = .8/1; p = .366$ and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model has a very good fit.

Among respondents who report happiness related to the student identity in the previous week, older respondents report significantly less frequent happiness ($B = -0.09; p = .01$ related to the student identity (hypothesis one). and older respondents report significantly less interactive ($B = -0.616; p = .001$) and affective ($B = -0.369; p = .001$) commitment to the student identity (hypothesis two). There is no difference between whites and nonwhites in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness related to the student identity (hypothesis three) and no significant difference between whites and nonwhites related to commitment to the student identity (hypothesis four). There is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness related to the student identity between men and women (hypothesis five). However women report greater commitment (interactive $B = 0.692; p = .01$ and affective $B = 0.733; p = .05$) and salience ($B = 0.325; p = .01$) to the student identity (hypothesis six).

According to hypothesis nine, the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the respondent will report more frequent, more intense and longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity in the previous week, those who report greater affective commitment to their student identity report more frequent ($B = 0.047; p = .001$), more intense ($B = 0.1; p = .001$), longer lasting ($B = 0.046; p = .001$) happiness. Interactive commitment to the student identity is not related to the frequency,
intensity or duration of happiness related to the identity. Hypothesis ten suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report more frequent, more intense, and longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity, the higher the salience of the student identity the longer lasting the happiness ($B = 0.038; p = .01$) related to the identity.

ANGER

*Family Anger as Force*

Table 4.5 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between anger related to the family identity. In this model anger is a social force on commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 377 respondents, those who experience anger related to the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = 1.5/1$; $p = .220$ and RMSEA $= 0.037$ demonstrating the model has a good fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anger Frequency</th>
<th>Anger Intensity</th>
<th>Anger Duration</th>
<th>Commitment Interactive</th>
<th>Commitment Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>-0.311 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.456 *</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.286 **</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>1.103 **</td>
<td>2.139 **</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>-2.09 ***</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-0.681 *</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>0.193 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.119 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 377 \, \chi^2/df = 1.5/1 \, p = .220 \, \text{RMSEA} \, .037$

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001*
Among respondents who experience anger with respect to their family identity, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the family identity by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report less salience of the family identity ($B = -0.311; p = .01$) (hypothesis two). Nonwhite respondents report significantly longer lasting the anger ($B = 0.456; p = .05$) (hypothesis three) and there were no difference between whites and nonwhites in commitment (interactive or affective) (hypothesis four). Among men and women who experience anger, men report significantly more frequent anger ($B = -0.286; p = .01$) (hypothesis five) while women report significantly more interactive ($B = 1.103; p = .01$) and affective ($B = 2.139; p = .01$) and commitment related to the family identity (hypothesis six). There is no significant difference in the salience of the family identity between men and women (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis eleven suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels anger the less commitment (interactive and affective). I find limited support for hypothesis eleven. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity in the previous week only two significant relationships emerge. Those who report more frequent, longer lasting the anger related to the family identity in the previous week held less affective commitment to the family identity. The more frequent anger is report the less significant affective commitment related to the family identity ($B = -2.09; p = .001$). Additionally the longer lasting the anger report the significantly less affective commitment related to the family identity ($B = -0.681; p = .05$).
Hypothesis twelve suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels anger related to the identity the lower salience of the identity. Among respondents who experience anger in the previous week, there is no significant relationship between the frequency, intensity or duration of anger and the salience of the family identity (hypothesis twelve).

*Family Anger as Product*

Table 4.6 Family Anger - Emotion as Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-0.327 **</td>
<td>-0.06 **</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.867</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.406 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.26 **</td>
<td>2.738 ***</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>0.196 ***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.108 ***</td>
<td>-0.049 ***</td>
<td>-0.103 ***</td>
<td>-0.076 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 376 $\chi^2$/df = 1.2/1 p=.283 RMSEA .020
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4.6 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between anger related to the family identity. In this model anger is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 377 respondents, those who experience anger related to the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2$/df =1.2/1; p=.283 and RMSEA = 0.020 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who report anger related to the family identity in the previous week, older respondents report significantly less frequent anger related to their family identity ($B$= -0.06; $p$= .01) (hypothesis one) and older respondents report significantly
less salience of the family identity ($B = -0.327; p = .01$) (hypothesis two). Nonwhite respondents report significantly longer lasting the anger related to their family identity ($B = 0.406; p = .01$) (hypothesis three) and there is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites related to commitment to the family identity (hypothesis four). There is no significant difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the family identity (hypothesis five). However women report significantly more interactive ($B = 1.26; p = .01$) and affective ($B = 2.738; p = .001$) commitment to the family identity (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis thirteen suggests that the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the respondent will report less frequent but more intense, longer lasting the anger related to the identity. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity, interactive commitment does not impact the frequency, intensity or duration of anger. However, among respondent that experience anger related to the family identity the greater the affective commitment the less frequent ($B = -0.047; p = .001$), less intense ($B = -0.103; p = .001$), and the shorter in duration ($B = -0.076; p = .001$) while hypothesis thirteen is partially supported in with the frequency of anger, the impact of commitment on the intensity and duration of anger is opposite than expected suggesting that among those who experience anger related to their family identity, the greater the affective commitment to the family identity the less intense and shorter in duration the experience of anger related to that identity.
Hypothesis fourteen suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report less frequency, more intense, longer lasting the anger. I find no support for hypothesis 17, among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity, there is no significant relationship between the salience of the identity and the frequency, intensity or duration of anger.

**Student Anger as Force**

Table 4.7 Student Anger - Emotion as Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Commitment Interactive</th>
<th>Commitment Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.623 ***</td>
<td>-0.476 **</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>-0.494</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.703 **</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.994 **</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.249</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.089 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 623 χ²/df = 0.061/1 p = .805 RMSEA = 0.000
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4.7 represents a structural equation model examining the relationships between anger and student identity. In this model anger is a social force on both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 623 respondents, those who experience anger related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the χ²/df = 0.061/1; p = .805 and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.
Among respondents who experience anger with respect to the student identity, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report less interactive (B= -0.623; p=.001) and affective (B= -0.476; p=.01) commitment to the identity (hypothesis two). There is no significant difference between whites and non-whites in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity (hypothesis three) and there is no difference between whites and nonwhites in interactive or affective commitment to the student identity (hypothesis four). Additionally, there is no difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity (hypothesis five). However women report significantly greater the interactive commitment (B= 0.994; p=.01) related to the student identity (hypothesis six). There is no significant difference in affective commitment or the salience of the student identity between men and women (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis eleven suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels anger the less commitment (interactive and affective). I find no support for hypothesis eleven in the student identity. There is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger and the respondent’s commitment (interactive or affective) to the student identity.

Hypothesis twelve suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels anger related to the identity the lower salience of the identity. Among respondents who experience anger in the previous week, there is no significant
relationship between the frequency, intensity or duration of anger and the salience of the student identity.

**Student Anger as Product**

Table 4.8 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between anger related to the student identity. In this model anger is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 623 respondents, those who experience anger related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = .036/1$; $p = .850$ and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Table 4.8 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between anger related to the student identity. In this model anger is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 623 respondents, those who experience anger related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2/df = .036/1$; $p = .850$ and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who report anger related to the student identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference by age of reports of frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity (hypothesis one). Older respondents report significantly less interactive commitment to the student identity ($B = -0.494; p = .001$) (hypothesis two). There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites
in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity (hypothesis three) and no significant difference between whites and nonwhites related to commitment (interactive or affective) to the student (hypothesis four). There is no significant difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity (hypothesis five). Women report significantly more interactive ($B= 1.159; p= .01$) and affective ($B= 1.218; p= .001$) commitment to the student identity (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis thirteen suggests that the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the respondent will report less frequency, more intense and longer lasting the anger related to the identity. Among respondent that experience anger related to the student identity, neither interactive or affective commitment impact the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity.

Hypothesis fourteen suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report less frequency, more intense and longer lasting the anger. I find no support for hypothesis fourteen, among respondents who experience anger related to the student identity, there is no significant relationship between the salience of the identity and the frequency, intensity or duration of anger.
SHAME

Family Shame as Force

Table 4.9 Family Shame - Emotion as Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shame Frequency</th>
<th>Shame Intensity</th>
<th>Shame Duration</th>
<th>Commitment Interactive</th>
<th>Commitment Affective</th>
<th>Commitment Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.618 **</td>
<td>-0.697 *</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.442 **</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1.874 *</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-2.03 ***</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.209 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.098 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 162 \chi^2/df = 1.5/1 \ p = .220 \ \text{RMSEA} = .037 \)

\(*p < 0.05, \ **p < 0.01, \ ***p < 0.001 \)

Table 4.9 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between shame and the family identity. In this model, shame is a social force on both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 162 respondents, those who experience shame related to the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the \( \chi^2/df = 1.5/1; \ p = .220 \) and \( \text{RMSEA} = 0.037 \) demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who experience shame with respect to their family identity, there was no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the family identity by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents who experience shame report significantly less interactive (\( B = -0.618; \ p = .01 \)) and affective (\( B = -0.697; \ p = .05 \)) commitment to the family identity (hypothesis two). Nonwhite respondents report
significantly more frequent ($B = 0.442; p = .01$) shame related to the family identity (hypothesis three). There were no differences between white and nonwhites in interactive or affective commitment to the family identity (hypothesis four). There is no difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame in the family identity (hypothesis five). While women report significantly more affective ($B = 1.874; p = .05$) commitment related to the family identity. Lastly, there is no significant difference in the interactive commitment or identity salience of the family identity between men and women (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis fifteen suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the less commitment (interactive and affective) to the identity. I find limited support for hypothesis fifteen. Among respondents who experience shame in the previous week, the more frequent shame related to their family identity the less affective commitment to the family identity ($B = -2.03; p = .001$).

Hypothesis sixteen suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent experiences shame related to the identity the lower salience of the identity. Among respondents who experience shame in the previous week, there is no significant relationship between the frequency, intensity or duration of anger and the salience of the family identity.
Family Shame as Product

Table 4.10 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between shame and the family identity. In this model, shame is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 162 respondents, those who experience shame related to the family identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the χ²/df = .7/1; p = .408 and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who report shame related to the family identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report significantly less commitment (interactive B = -0.627; p = .05 and affective B = -0.713; p = .05) to the family identity (hypothesis two). Nonwhites report more frequent shame related to the family identity (hypothesis three). There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites related to commitment to the family identity among respondents who experience shame in the previous week related to their family identity (hypothesis four). There is no

Table 4.10 Family Shame - Emotion as Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.627 *</td>
<td>-0.713 *</td>
<td>-0.306</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.919</td>
<td>0.395 *</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>0.211 **</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.112 **</td>
<td>-0.039 ***</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.048 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 162 χ²/df = .7/1; p = .408 RMSEA = 0.000
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the family identity (hypothesis five). There is no significant difference between men and women in commitment (interactive and affective) commitment or salience of the family identity (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis seventeen suggests that the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the less frequency, more intensity and longer lasting shame related to the identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, those who report significantly greater affective commitment experience less frequent (B = -0.039; p= .001), shorter lasting (B = -0.048; p= .05) shame related to the family identity. While I find partial support for hypothesis seventeen, the shorter duration of shame related to the identity is unexpected. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, there is no significant relationship between the level of interactive commitment and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the family identity.

Hypothesis eighteen suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report less frequent, more intense and longer lasting shame. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, there is no significant relationship between the salience of the identity and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame.
Student Shame as Force

Table 4.11 Student Shame - Emotion as Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shame Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Commitment Interactive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-0.588 ***</td>
<td>-0.539 **</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1.935 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.192 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n =268  χ²/df = .652/1 p=.419 RMSEA .000
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4.11 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between shame and the student identity. In this model, shame is a social force on both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 162 respondents, those who experience shame related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the χ²/df =1.5/1; p=.220 and RMSEA = 0.037 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who report shame related to the student identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report significantly less interactive (B = -0.588; p=.001) and affective (B = -0.539; p=.01) commitment to the student identity (hypothesis two). There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity (hypothesis three). However, nonwhite respondents report greater affective commitment (B = 1.935;
p= .01) to the student identity (hypothesis four). There is no significant difference between men and women in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity (hypothesis five). There is no significant difference in reports of interactive and affective commitment or salience of the student identity between men and women (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis fifteen suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the less commitment (interactive and affective) to the identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, the frequency, intensity or duration of shame does not significantly impact the interactive or affective commitment to the student identity.

Hypothesis sixteen suggests that the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the lower salience of the identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, the frequency, intensity or duration of shame does not significantly impact the salience of the student identity.
Student Shame as Product

Table 4.12 Student Shame - Emotion as Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>Shame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.569</td>
<td>-0.52 **</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.846 **</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.196 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=268  $\chi^2$/df = .6/1  p=.427  RMSEA .000
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Table 4.12 represents a structural equation model examining the relationship between shame and the student identity. In this model, shame is a social product of both commitment and identity salience. This analysis consists of a subsample of 268 respondents, those who experience shame related to the student identity in the previous week. The fit indices include the $\chi^2$/df = .6/1; p=.427 and RMSEA = 0.000 demonstrating the model is a very good fit.

Among respondents who report shame related to the student identity in the previous week, there is no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity by age (hypothesis one). Older respondents report significantly less affective commitment to the student identity ($B = -0.52$; $p = .01$) (hypothesis two). Among whites and nonwhites there is no significant difference in frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity (hypothesis three). However, nonwhite respondents report significantly greater the affective commitment related to the student identity ($B = 1.846$; $p = .01$) (hypothesis four). There is
no significant difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity between men and women (hypothesis five). There is no significant difference in reports of interactive and affective commitment or identity salience of the family identity between men and women (hypothesis six).

Hypothesis seventeen suggests that the higher the respondent’s commitment (interactive and affective) to an identity the respondent will report less frequency but more intensity and longer lasting shame related to the identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, there is no significant relationship between commitment (interactive or affective) and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to that identity.

Hypothesis eighteen suggests that the more salient an identity the respondent will report less frequency but more intensity and longer lasting shame. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, there is no significant relationship between the salience of the identity and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame.

AGE and EMOTION (HYPOTHESIS ONE)

I hypothesize the as respondents age they will report more frequent, more intense, longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Related to anger and age, I hypothesize that older respondents will report less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting anger related to their identity. Regarding age and shame, I hypothesize older respondents will
report less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting shame related to their identity. Table 4.13 summarizes the results of a series of structural equation models elaborated in the first section of Chapter 4. Specifically, Table 4.13 examines the relationship between all sub-hypotheses related to hypothesis 1 (1a-1i) examining the relationship between age and emotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Force</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Product</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Force</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Product</td>
<td>-0.09 **</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Force</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Product</td>
<td>-0.06 **</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Force</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Product</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Force</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Product</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Force</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Product</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
**Age and Happiness**

I hypothesize that older respondents will report 1a) more frequent, 1b) more intense, 1c) longer lasting happiness related to their identity. I find limited support for this sub-hypothesis. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity within the previous week, older adults report significantly less frequent happiness (B = -0.09; p = .01). The student identity is one that is often associated with youth and as such the positive affect associated with that identity, specifically happiness might be more frequent as a result of cultural expectations and norms associated with happiness within the student identity.

**Age and Anger**

Related to anger and age, I hypothesize that older respondents will report 1d) less frequent, 1e) less intense and 1f) shorter lasting anger related to their identity. Older respondents report no difference in experiences of emotional frequency, intensity or duration within the family or student identities except for the frequency of anger in the family identity in the models examining emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience. I find partial support for my hypotheses among adult respondents who experience anger at least once in the previous week in the family identity; older adults report significantly less frequent anger (B = -0.06; p = .01).
Age and Shame

Regarding age and shame, I hypothesize older respondents will report 1g) less frequent, 1h) less intense and 1i) shorter lasting shame related to their identity. I find no significant difference in reports of shame by age. Older respondents do not differ in reports of frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to either the family or student identity.

AGE and COMMITMENT/IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS TWO)

I hypothesize that older respondents will report 2a) less interactive commitment and 2b) less affective commitment related to their identity. In regards to identity salience and age, I hypothesize that (2c) age is not expected to influence identity salience in either the student or family identity. Table 4.14 summarizes the results of a series of structural equation models elaborated in the first half of this chapter. Specifically, Table 4.14 examines the relationship between all sub-hypotheses related to hypothesis 2 (a-c) examining the relationship between age, commitment and identity salience.
Age and Interactive Commitment

I hypothesize that older respondents will report 2a) less interactive commitment to their identity. Among models examining emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience, older respondents who experience anger in the student identity (B = -0.494, p = .001), shame in the family identity (B = -0.627; p = .05) and happiness in the student identity (B = -0.616; p = .001) report significantly less interactive commitment. While this lends some support for my hypothesis findings are inconsistent.
Age and Affective Commitment

I hypothesize that older respondents will report 2b) less affective commitment to their identity. Among models examining emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience, older respondents appear to have significantly less affective commitment to both family and student identity among respondents who experience shame and happiness at least once in the previous week. Of respondents who experience shame in the previous week related to their family identity older respondents report significantly less affective commitment (B = -0.713; p = .05). I find related to their family identity older respondents report significantly less affective commitment (B = -0.713; p = .05). Older respondents who experience shame related to their student identity report significantly less affective commitment (B = -0.520; p = .01). Older adult respondents experience happiness in the student identity report significantly less affective commitment (B = -0.369; p = .001). Among the models examining emotion as a force on commitment and identity salience, older respondents report significantly less affective commitment in all emotions (anger, shame and happiness) in both identities (family and student) except for those respondents who report anger related to the family identity. Of respondents who experience anger within the student identity (B = -0.476; p = .01), shame in both the family (B = -0.697; p = .05) and student identity (B = -0.539; p = .01) and happiness in both the family (B = -0.285; p = .05) and student identity (B = -0.266; p = .01) older respondents report significantly less affective commitment to their identity.
With respect to age, models examining emotion as force on commitment and identity salience seem to produce the most consistent finding in support of my hypothesis (with the exception of anger related to the family identity), which is older respondents report significantly less affective commitment to their identity. Among models examining emotion as a product of both commitment and identity salience there are inconsistent findings surface. Subsamples including respondents who experience anger and happiness related to the student identity and shame related to the family identity support my hypothesis, older respondents report less affective commitment. While I find partial support for my hypothesis, results are inconsistent related to the models that place emotions as a product of both commitment and identity salience.

Age and Identity Salience

I hypothesize that (2c) age is not expected to influence identity salience in either the student or family identity. I find inconsistent support for this sub-hypothesis. In most models examining the relationship between age and identity salience I find support for my hypothesis. There is no difference between age and identity salience with three exceptions. Among models examining emotion as product, older respondents who experience anger related to their family identity in the previous week report significantly less salience of the family identity (\(B = -0.327; p=.01\)). This relationship was found among respondents who experience happiness in their family identity. Older respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity report significantly less salience
of the family identity ($B = -0.200; p = .01$). The last instance that I do fail to find support for my hypothesis is among the model examining the emotion as force, older respondents report significantly less salience related to their family identity if they experience anger ($B = -0.311; p = .01$). The pattern that emerges is related to respondents who experience anger related to their family identity, among those who do, older respondents report less identity salience.

Older respondents report less commitment and less identity salience of both the family and student identities. The pattern that emerges is not only for those respondents who experience negative emotions such as anger and shame but also those who experience the positive emotions such as happiness. This may be due to the restricted age range in the data. The older respondents are at time in the life where they are beginning to establish independent lifestyles that may be less connected to their families.

RACE and EMOTION (HYPOTHESIS THREE)

Hypothesis three explores the relationship between race and emotion. Related to happiness, I expect no difference in the 3a) frequency, 3b) intensity or 3c) duration of happiness related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Related to anger, I expect no difference in the 3d) frequency, 3e) intensity or 3f) duration of anger related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Related to shame I expect no difference in the 3g) frequency, 3h) intensity or 3i) duration of shame related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.
Race and Happiness

Hypothesis three explores the relationship between race and emotion. Related to happiness, I expect no difference in the 3a) frequency, 3b) intensity or 3c) duration of happiness related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Among models examining emotion as product, there is no significant difference by race in the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness in either the family or student identity. Among

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Force</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Product</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Force</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Product</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Force</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.456 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Product</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.406 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Force</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Product</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Force</td>
<td>0.442 **</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Product</td>
<td>0.395 *</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Force</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Product</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = White; 1=Nonwhite  
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
models examining emotion as a force, the same pattern surfaces. There is no significant
difference by race in the frequency, intensity or duration of happiness in either the family
or student identity.

Race and Anger

Hypothesis three explores the relationship between race and emotion. Related to
anger, I expect no difference in the 3d) frequency, 3e) intensity or 3f) duration of anger
related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Among models examining
emotion as product, of respondents who experience anger related to their family identity
in the previous week, nonwhite respondents report significantly longer lasting the anger
($B = 0.406; p = .01$). Among models examining emotion as a force, of respondents who
report anger related to the family, nonwhite respondents report significantly longer
lasting the anger ($B = 0.456; p = .05$).

Race and Shame

Hypothesis three explores the relationship between race and emotion. Related to
shame I expect no difference in the 3g) frequency, 3h) intensity or 3i) duration of shame
related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Among respondents who
experience shame related to their family identity in the previous week, nonwhite
respondents report significantly more frequent shame related to the family identity ($B =$
Among models examining emotion as a force, among respondents who report shame related to their family identity, nonwhite respondents report significantly more frequent shame related to the family identity ($B = 0.442; p= .01$).

RACE and COMMITMENT/IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS FOUR)

Hypothesis four anticipates no difference in interactive commitment to the identity (family or student) between Whites and Nonwhites. Nonwhite respondents will report greater affective commitment to the family identity. And lastly, I expect no difference in the affective commitment to the student identity between Whites and Nonwhites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Interactive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Force</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Product</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Force</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Product</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Force</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Product</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Force</td>
<td>-0.494</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Product</td>
<td>-0.494</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Force</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Product</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student Shame Force          | 1.076       | 1.935     **
| Student Shame Product        | 1.061       | 1.846 **   |

0=White; 1=Nonwhite  *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Race and Interactive Commitment

Hypothesis four expects no difference in the interactive commitment to the identity (family or student) between Whites and Nonwhites. Among models examining emotions as product, there is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites and their report interactive commitment to either the family or student identities.

Race and Affective Commitment

Nonwhite respondents will report greater affective commitment to the family identity. And lastly, I expect no difference in the affective commitment to the student identity between Whites and Nonwhites. Among models examining emotions as product, in all but one model there is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites and the report affective commitment to either the family or student identities. The one exception that demonstrated a significant difference between races in affective commitment was related to shame in the student identity. In both models examining emotion as a force and product, among respondents who experience shame within the previous week in their student identity, nonwhite respondents report significantly greater the affective commitment to their student identity (emotion as force $B = 1.846; p= .01$ and emotion as product $B = 1.935; p= .01$).

GENDER and EMOTION (HYPOTHESIS FIVE)
Hypothesis five details the expected relationships between gender and emotion. Related to happiness, hypothesis five expects no difference in the 5a) frequency, 5b) intensity or 5c) duration of happiness related to the identity between men and women. In regards to anger, I expect no difference in 5d) frequency of anger related to their identity between men and women. I expect that Women will experience more 5e) intense, 5f) longer lasting the anger related to their identity. In relation to shame, I expect no difference in 5g) frequency, 5h) intensity or 5i) duration of shame related to their identity between men and women.

Table 4.17 Gender & Emotion Hypothesis 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Force</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Happy Product</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.213 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Force</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Happy Product</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Force</td>
<td>-0.286 **</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anger Product</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Force</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.703 **</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Anger Product</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Force</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shame Product</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Force</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Shame Product</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td>-0.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Men; 1 = Women

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Gender and Happiness

Related to happiness, hypothesis five expects no difference in the 5a) frequency, 5b) intensity or 5c) duration of happiness related to the identity between men and women. I find partial support for these sub-hypotheses. Among models examining emotion as product, the only significant difference between men in women and their reporting of emotional experiences in the previous week were among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity. Among respondents who experience happiness, women were significantly more likely to report longer lasting happiness related to their family identity (B = .213; p=.01). Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity, women report significantly more frequent (B = 0.331; p=.001), more intense (B = 0.614; p=.001), longer lasting happiness (B = 0.417; p=.001).

Gender and Anger

In regards to anger, I expect no difference in 5d) frequency of anger related to their identity between men and women. I expect that Women will experience 5e) more intense, 5f) longer lasting the anger related to their identity. I find partial support for these sub-hypotheses. Among models examining emotion as force, a number of other relationships emerge between gender and report emotional experiences. For instance, among respondents who experience anger in the previous week, men were likely to report significantly more frequent anger (B = -0.286; p=.01). Among respondents who
experience anger related to their student identity, men were significantly more likely to report more intense anger ($B = -0.703; \ p = .01$).

**Gender and Shame**

In reference to shame, I expect no difference in frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to their identity between men and women. I find support for my sub-hypotheses examining the relationship between gender and shame; there is no significant difference between men and women in reports of shame in either the family or student identity.

**GENDER and COMMITMENT/IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS SIX)**

Hypothesis six hypothesizes the expected relationships between gender, commitment and identity salience. Hypothesis six anticipates no difference in interactive commitment to either identity between men and women. In relation to affective commitment, women will report greater affective commitment to their identity. Lastly, in regards to identity salience, I expect no difference between men and women in reports of identity salience of their identity.
Gender and Interactive Commitment

Hypothesis six expects no difference in interactive commitment to either identity between men and women. I find only partial support for this hypothesis. Of respondents who experience anger or happiness related to either their student or family identity, women are significantly more committed to the identity. Specifically, among respondents who experience anger related to their family identity, women report significantly greater the interactive commitment related to their family identity ($B = 1.26; p = .01$). The same relationships materialize among respondents experience anger related to their student identity. Specifically, among respondents who experience anger related to their student...
identity, women report significantly greater the interactive commitment related to their student identity ($B = 1.159; p= .01$). Among those who experience happiness related to their student identity a similar pattern is found. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity, women report significantly greater the interactive commitment to the student identity ($B = 0.692; p= .01$). Among models examining emotion as force, results follow a comparable pattern. Among respondents who experience anger within the family identity, women report significantly greater the interactive commitment to the family identity ($B = 1.103; p= .01$). Among respondents who experience anger related to their student identity, women report significantly greater the interactive commitment to the student identity ($B = 0.994; p= .01$). Among respondents who report feeling happy within the student identity, women report significantly greater interactive commitment than men to their student identity ($B = 0.680; p= .01$).

**Gender and Affective Commitment**

In relation to affective commitment, women will report greater affective commitment to their identity. Specifically, among respondents who experience anger related to their family identity, women report significantly greater the affective commitment related to their family identity ($B = 2.738; p= .001$). The same relationships are found among respondents experience anger related to their student identity. Specifically, among respondents who experience anger related to their student identity,
women report significantly greater the affective commitment related to their student identity ($B = 1.218; p= .001$). Similar results are noted among those who experience happiness related to their student identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity, women report significantly greater the affective commitment to the student identity ($B = 0.733; p= .05$). Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity women report significantly greater affective commitment to the family identity ($B = 2.139; p= .01$). Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, women report significantly greater affective commitment to the family identity than men ($B = 1.874; p= .05$). Among respondents who report feeling happiness related to the family identity, women report significantly greater affective commitment than men to the family identity ($B = 0.800; p= .01$). Among respondents who report feeling happiness related to the student identity, women report significantly greater affective commitment than men to the student identity ($B = 0.722; p= .01$).

**Gender and Identity Salience**

Lastly, in regards to identity salience, I expect no difference between men and women in reports of identity salience of their identity. I find limited support for this sub-hypothesis; the one exception is among women who report happiness related to the student identity. Among models examining emotion as a force, among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity women report significantly higher
salience of the student identity than men. I find a similar relationship with the model with emotion as a social force, among respondents who report happiness related to their student identity women report significantly higher salience of the student identity than men (B = 0.327; p= .01).

HAPPINESS and COMMITMENT (HYPOTHESIS SEVEN)

Hypothesis seven predicts the expected relationship between happiness and commitment. In regards to interactive commitment I hypothesize that the 7a) more frequent, 7b) more intense and 7c) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity. Regarding affective commitment, the 7d) more frequent, 7e) more intense and 7f) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Identity Commitment</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity Commitment</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Frequency</td>
<td>0.676 ***</td>
<td>1.009 **</td>
<td>0.204 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>0.302 ***</td>
<td>0.857 ***</td>
<td>0.183 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.448 ***</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.252 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
**Happiness and Interactive Commitment**

In regards to interactive commitment I hypothesize that the 7a) more frequent, 7b) more intense and 7c) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity. Of respondents who experience happiness at least once in the previous week the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the interactive commitment to the identity (family $B = 0.676; p = .001$ and student $B = 0.204; p = .01$). Similarly, of respondents who experience happiness the more intense the happiness, the greater the interactive commitment to the identity (family $B = 0.302; p = .001$ and student $B = 0.857; p = .001$). Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity, those who experience longer lasting happiness report significantly greater the interactive commitment to the family identity $B = 0.0448; p = .001$. Similarly, among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity those who report longer lasting happiness report significantly greater interactive commitment. ($B = 0.252; p = .01$).

**Happiness and Affective Commitment**

Regarding affective commitment, the 7d) more frequent, 7e) more intense and 7f) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity. Of respondents who experience happiness at least once in the previous week the more frequent they experience happiness the greater the affective commitment to the identity (family $B = 0.676; p = .001$ and student $B = 0.204; p = .01$). Similarly, among
respondents who experience happiness, the more intense the happiness, the greater the affective commitment to the identity (family $B = 0.857; p = .001$ and student $B = 0.183; p = .01$). Similarly, among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity, those who report longer lasting happiness report significantly greater affective commitment related to the student identity ($B = 0.406; p = .01$). However, of those respondents who experience long lasting happiness related to the family identity there was no significant difference in affective commitment related to the family identity.

**HAPPINESS and IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS EIGHT)**

Hypothesis eight examines the relationship between happiness and identity salience. In hypothesis eight I expect the 8a) more frequent, 8b) more intense and 8c) longer lasting the happiness related to the identity the higher salience of the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Family Identity Salience</th>
<th>Student Identity Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.223 *</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.317 **</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

I find partial support for hypothesis eight. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity those who report more frequent happiness report higher salience of the family identity ($B = 0.223; p = .05$). Among respondents who
experience happiness related to their family identity those who report longer lasting
happiness report higher salience of the family identity (B = 0.317; p= .01).

COMMITMENT and HAPPINESS (HYPOTHESIS NINE)

Hypothesis nine predicts the expected relationship between commitment and
happiness. In regards to interactive commitment, hypothesis nine expects the higher the
respondent’s interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9b) more
frequency, 9c) more intense, 9d) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. In
regards to affective commitment, the higher the respondent’s affective commitment to an
identity the respondent will report 9e) more frequency, 9f) more intense, 9g) longer
lasting happiness related to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Identity</th>
<th>Interactive Frequency</th>
<th>Interactive Intensity</th>
<th>Interactive Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.06 ***</td>
<td>0.087 ***</td>
<td>0.058 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.078 ***</td>
<td>0.157 ***</td>
<td>0.07 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Identity</th>
<th>Interactive Frequency</th>
<th>Interactive Intensity</th>
<th>Interactive Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.1 ***</td>
<td>0.046 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Interactive Commitment and Happiness

Hypothesis nine predicts the expected relationship between commitment and happiness. In regards to interactive commitment, hypothesis nine expects the higher the respondent’s interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9b) more frequency, 9c) more intense, 9d) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. I find partial support for hypothesis nine, among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity in the previous week, those who report greater interactive commitment to their family identity report more frequent ($B = 0.06; p = .001$), more intense ($B = 0.087; p = .001$), longer lasting ($B = 0.058; p = .001$) happiness.

Affective Commitment and Happiness

In regards to affective commitment, the higher the respondent’s affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9e) more frequency, 9f) more intense, 9g) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. I find support for the sub-hypotheses related to affective commitment and happiness. Among respondents who experience happiness related to their family identity in the previous week, those who report greater affective commitment to their family identity report more frequent ($B = 0.078; p = .01$), more intense ($B = 0.157; p = .001$), longer lasting ($B = 0.07; p = .001$) happiness. I find the same relationship among the student identity. Specifically, among respondents who experience happiness related to their student identity in the previous week, those who report greater affective commitment to their student identity report more
frequent (B = 0.047; p= .001), more intense (B = 0.1; p= .001), longer lasting (B = 0.046; p= .001) happiness.

IDENTITY SALIENCE and HAPPINESS (HYPOTHESIS TEN)

Hypothesis ten predicts the relationship between salience and identity. Hypothesis ten expects the more salient an identity the respondent will report 10a) more frequency, 10b) more intense, 10c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.22 Salience &amp; Happiness Hypothesis 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Salience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

I find partial support for hypothesis ten. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, the greater the salience of the family identity, the more frequent (B = 0.036; p= .001) and longer lasting (B = 0.036; p= .001) the happiness. I find a slightly similar relationship within the student identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the student identity, respondents who report greater salience of the student identity report longer lasting happiness related to the student identity (B = 0.038; p= .01).
Hypothesis eleven suggests that the expected relationship between anger and commitment. In regards to interactive commitment, I hypothesize the 11a) more frequent, 11b) more intense and 11c) longer lasting the anger, the less interactive commitment to the identity. Regarding affective commitment, the 11d) more frequent, 11e) more intense and 11f) longer lasting the anger, the less affective commitment to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.23 Anger &amp; Commitment Hypothesis 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Anger and Interactive Commitment

In regards to interactive commitment, I hypothesize the 11a) more frequent, 11b) more intense and 11c) longer lasting the anger, the less interactive commitment to the identity. I find no support this this set of sub-hypothesis related to hypothesis eleven. There is not difference in the frequency, intensity or duration of anger and interactive commitment to the either identity.
Anger and Affective Commitment

Regarding affective commitment, the 11d) more frequent, 11e) more intense and 11f) longer lasting the anger, the less affective commitment to the identity. I find limited support for hypothesis eleven. Among respondents who report anger related to the family or student identity, only two significant relationships emerge. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity those who experience more frequent anger report significantly less affective commitment related to the family identity (B = -2.09; p = .001). Additionally, among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity those who experience longer lasting the anger report significantly less affective commitment related to the family identity (B = -0.681; p = .05).

ANGER and IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS TWELVE)

Hypothesis twelve is related to the expected relationship between anger and identity salience. In Hypothesis twelve I expect the 12a) more frequent, 12b) more intense and 12c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity the lower salience the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anger</th>
<th>Family Identity Salience</th>
<th>Student Identity Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
I expect the 12a) more frequent, 12b) more intense and 12c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity the lower salience the identity. I find no support for hypothesis twelve, the frequency, intensity and duration of anger is unrelated to the salience of the identity in both the family and student identity.

COMMITMENT and ANGER (HYPOTHESIS THIRTEEN)

Hypothesis thirteen examines the relationship between commitment and anger. In hypothesis thirteen, regarding interactive commitment I expect the higher the interactive commitment to an identity the hypothesis 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity. Regarding affective commitment, I expect the higher the affective commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Identity</th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.049 ***</td>
<td>-0.103 ***</td>
<td>-0.076 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Interactive Commitment and Anger

Regarding interactive commitment, I expect the higher the interactive commitment to an identity the hypothesis 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity. I find no support for these sub-hypotheses. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity, interactive commitment does not impact the frequency, intensity or duration of anger. Among respondents that experience anger related to the student identity, interactive commitment does not impact the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity.

Affective Commitment and Anger

Regarding affective commitment, I expect the higher the affective commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity. I find partial support for these sub-hypotheses. Among respondents that experience anger related to the family identity the greater the affective commitment the less frequent (B = -0.047; p=.001), less intense (B = -0.103; p=.001), shorter in duration anger (B = -0.076; p=.001) related to the family identity. Among respondents that experience anger related to the student identity, affective commitment does not impact the frequency, intensity or duration of anger related to the student identity.
IDENTITY SALIENCE and ANGER (HYPOTHESIS FOURTEEN)

Hypothesis fourteen is related to the impact of identity salience on anger. I expect the more salient an identity the 14a) less frequent, 14b) more intense, 14c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Salience</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Salience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

I find partial support for hypothesis fourteen. Among respondents who experience anger related to the student identity, respondents who report high salience of the student identity report longer lasting the anger related to that identity (B =0.016; p=0.01).

SHAME and COMMITMENT (HYPOTHESIS FIFTEEN)

Hypothesis fifteen elaborates on the relationship expected between shame and commitment. Specifically, hypothesis fifteen anticipates that the 15a) more frequent, 15b) more intense and 15c) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less interactive commitment to the identity. Regarding affective commitment, the 15d) more frequent, 15e) more intense and 15f) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less affective commitment to the identity.
Shame and Interactive Commitment

Hypothesis fifteen expects that the 15a) more frequent, 15b) more intense and 15c) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less interactive commitment to the identity. I find no support for these sub-hypotheses. I find no difference between the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to both identities and the subsequent commitment to that identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shame</th>
<th>Family Identity Commitment</th>
<th>Student Identity Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Shame and Affective Commitment

Regarding affective commitment, the 15d) more frequent, 15e) more intense and 15f) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less affective commitment to the identity. I find only partial support for these sub-hypotheses. Among respondents who experience shame in the previous week, the more frequent shame related to their family identity the less affective commitment to the family identity (B = -2.03; p = .001).
SHAME and IDENTITY SALIENCE (HYPOTHESIS SIXTEEN)

Hypothesis sixteen explores the impact of shame on identity salience. Specifically, I expect the 16a) more frequent, 16b) more intense and 16c) longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the lower salience of the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shame</th>
<th>Family Identity Salience</th>
<th>Student Identity Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the relationship between shame and identity salience, I find no support for hypothesis sixteen. There is no relationship between the frequency, intensity or duration of shame and the salience of either the family or student identity.

COMMITMENT and SHAME (HYPOTHESIS SEVENTEEN)

Hypothesis seventeen examines the relationship between commitments and shame. Hypothesis seventeen expects the higher the interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17a) less frequent, 17b) more intense, 17c) longer lasting shame related to the identity. In regards to affective commitment, the higher the
affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17d) less frequent, 17e) more intense, 17f) longer lasting shame related to the identity.

Interactive Commitment and Shame

Hypothesis seventeen expect the higher the interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17a) less frequent, 17b) more intense, 17c) longer lasting shame related to the identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student or the family identity, there is no significant relationship between the level of interactive commitment and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the identity.

Affective Commitment and Shame

In regards to affective commitment, the higher the affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17d) less frequent, 17e) more intense, 17f) longer
lasting shame related to the identity. Analysis reveals only partial support for hypothesis seventeen sub-hypotheses. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, those who report significantly greater affective commitment experience less frequent ($B = -0.039; p= .001$), shorter lasting ($B = -0.048; p= .05$) shame related to the family identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, there is no significant relationship between affective commitment and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the student identity.

IDENTITY SALIENCE and SHAME (HYPOTHESIS EIGHTEEN)

Hypothesis eighteen suggests that that the more salient an identity the respondent will report 18a) less frequency, 18b) more intense, 18c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Salience</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Salience</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I* $p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$*

I find no support for hypothesis eighteen. I find no relationship between the salience of the family or student identity and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame.
DISCUSSION

The primary research question is: where do emotions fit into Identity Theory? It is evident from this analysis that each emotion is distinct. Each dimension, whether it is the frequency, intensity or duration of emotion is variable. The relationship between commitment and identity salience fluctuates with the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness, anger and shame. The patterns that emerge are noteworthy. In the following section I will discuss and highlight patterns that emerge from this analysis.

HAPPINESS and IDENTITY THEORY

Among both the family and student identity the frequency, intensity, and duration of happiness impact commitment to the identity. Within the family identity, the frequency and duration of happiness significantly increases the salience of the family identity. The same relationship cannot be found within the student identity. Interactive commitment increases the frequency, intensity, and duration of happiness related to the family identity. This relationship is not found within the student identity. Affective commitment to the family or the student identity increases the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness related to the identity. These results reveal the importance of affective commitment on the experience of happiness. The impact of identity salience on happiness is also notable. The higher the salience of the family identity, the more frequent and longer lasting happiness related to the identity. A similar relationship can be found within the student identity, the greater the salience of the student identity the longer lasting the
happiness related to the student identity. It is important to mention that identity salience does not impact the intensity of emotion in either identity.

The relationship between happiness, commitment, and identity salience is a complex one. Affective commitment and happiness appear to be connected. The more frequent, more intense and longer the experiences of happiness related to the identity, the greater the affective commitment to the identity. Regarding identity salience, there is a relationship between the frequency and duration of happiness and identity salience but not between the intensity of happiness and identity salience.

ANGER AND IDENTITY THEORY

The relationship between anger and Identity Theory is unanticipated. The variation in these relationships highlights the importance of investigating multidimensional emotional experiences. For instance, models exploring anger as a product of commitment and identity salience appear to be more in line with my theoretical expectations. The relationship between affective commitment and the frequency, intensity and duration of anger is distinct. The greater the affective commitment one has to the family identity the less frequent, less intense and shorter lasting the anger related the family identity. No other relationship is as pronounced. The relationship between the frequency and duration of anger is also related to affective commitment within the family identity. The greater the frequency of anger related to the family identity, the less affective commitment to the family identity. The greater the
duration of anger related to the family identity the less affective commitment to the
family identity. Identity salience and anger is not related in all but one model. Among
students that experience anger related to their student identity, the higher the salience of
the student identity the longer lasting their anger.

SHAME and IDENTITY THEORY

The relationship between shame and Identity Theory is less distinct than any of
the other emotions investigated. The one relationship that is consistent throughout the
models is the relationship between shame and affective commitment. Affective
commitment to the family identity decreases the frequency and duration of shame. The
greater the affective commitment to the family identity the less frequent and shorter
lasting the experience of shame related to the identity. The more frequent shame related
to the family identity the less affective commitment to the identity.

EMOTIONS and IDENTITY THEORY

Emotion is both a force and a product within Identity Theory. The relationship
between emotion and identity is multifaceted. Models examining emotion as a product
appear to be better equipped to inform the relationship between emotion, commitment
and identity salience. Commitment and identity salience influence the experience of
emotion. These relationships are well-defined between happiness and affective
commitment. The family identity is more associated with affective commitment. In all subsamples regardless of emotion, there was a relationship between emotion and affective commitment. The relationship between identity salience and emotion seems to be within the student identity and in regards to the length of time one experiences the emotion. This can be characterized as the higher the identity salience the longer the emotional experience. These analyses demonstrate the importance of the multidimensional approach to examining how specific emotions fit within Identity Theory. This analysis begins to disentangle how the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness, shame and anger relate to Identity Theory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Age &amp; Commitment</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Support</td>
<td>Older respondents will report 1a) more frequent, 1b) more intense, 1c) longer lasting happiness related to their identity. Older respondents will report 1d) less frequent, 1e) less intense and 1f) shorter lasting anger related to their identity. Older respondents will report 1g) less frequent, 1h) less intense and 1i) shorter lasting shame related to their identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Older respondents will report 2a) less interactive commitment and 2b) less affective commitment related to their identity. 2c) Age is not expected to influence identity salience in either the student or family identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>There will be no difference in the 3a) frequency, 3b) intensity or 3c) duration of happiness related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. There will be no difference in the 3d) frequency, 3e) intensity or 3f) duration of anger related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites. There will be no difference in the 3g) frequency, 3h) intensity or 3i) duration of shame related to the identity between Whites and Nonwhites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>4a) There will be no difference in the interactive commitment to the identity (family or student) between Whites and Nonwhites. 4b) Nonwhite respondents will report greater affective commitment to the family identity. 4c) There will be no difference in the affective commitment to the student identity between Whites and Nonwhites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>There will be no difference in the 5a) frequency, 5b) intensity or 5c) duration of happiness related to the identity between men and women. There will be no difference in 5d) frequency of anger related to their identity between men and women. Women will experience more 5e) intense, 5f) longer lasting anger related to their identity. There will be no difference in 5g) frequency, 5h) intensity or 5i) duration of shame related to their identity between men and women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>6a) There will be no difference in interactive commitment to either identity between men and women. 6b) Women will report greater affective commitment to their identity. 6c) There will be no difference between men and women in reports of identity salience to their identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong>&lt;br&gt;Happiness &amp; Commitment</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The 7a) more frequent, 7b) more intense and 7c) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the more interactive commitment to the identity. The 7d) more frequent, 7e) more intense and 7f) longer lasting the respondent feels happiness the more affective commitment to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8</strong>&lt;br&gt;Happiness &amp; Salience</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The 8a) more frequent, 8b) more intense and 8c) longer lasting the happiness related to the identity the higher salience the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9</strong>&lt;br&gt;Commitment &amp; Happiness</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The higher the respondent’s interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9b) more frequency, 9c) more intense, 9d) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. The higher the respondent’s affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 9e) more frequency, 9f) more intense, 9g) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong>&lt;br&gt;Salience &amp; Happiness</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The more salient an identity the respondent will report 10a) more frequency, 10b) more intense, 10c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11</strong>&lt;br&gt;Anger &amp; Commitment</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The 11a) more frequent, 11b) more intense and 11c) longer lasting the anger, the less interactive commitment to the identity. The 11d) more frequent, 11e) more intense and 11f) longer lasting the anger, the less affective commitment to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 12</strong>&lt;br&gt;Anger &amp; Salience</td>
<td>No Support&lt;br&gt;12a) more frequent, 12b) more intense and 12c) longer lasting the anger related to the identity the lower salience the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 13</strong>&lt;br&gt;Commitment &amp; Anger</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the H14a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting anger related to the identity. The higher the affective commitment to an identity the 13a) less frequent, 13b) more intense, 13c) longer lasting anger related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 14</strong>&lt;br&gt;Salience &amp; Anger</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The more salient an identity the 14a) less frequent, 14b) more intense, 14c) longer lasting anger related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 15</strong>&lt;br&gt;Shame &amp; Commitment</td>
<td>Partial&lt;br&gt;The 15a) more frequent, 15b) more intense and 15c) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less interactive commitment to the identity. The 15d) more frequent, 15e) more intense and 15f) longer lasting the shame related to the identity the less affective commitment to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 16</strong>&lt;br&gt;Shame &amp; Salience</td>
<td>No Support&lt;br&gt;The 16a) more frequent, 16b) more intense and 16c) longer lasting the respondent feels shame related to the identity the lower salience the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 17</strong>&lt;br&gt;Commitment &amp; Shame</td>
<td>No Support&lt;br&gt;The higher the interactive commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17a) less frequent, 17b) more intense, 17c) longer lasting shame related to the identity. The higher the affective commitment to an identity the respondent will report 17d) less frequent, 17e) more intense, 17f) longer lasting shame related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 18</strong>&lt;br&gt;Salience &amp; Shame</td>
<td>No Support&lt;br&gt;The more salient an identity the respondent will report 18a) less frequency, 18b) more intense, 18c) longer lasting shame related to the identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

IDENTITY THEORY, SELF ESTEEM, MASTERY and EMOTION: ANALYSIS

In the previous chapter, I examine the relationship of specific emotions as both a product and a force within Identity Theory. In the current chapter, I examine emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience, a process I expect to be mediated by the self-esteem and mastery. Based upon the strength of the pattern related to emotion as a product of commitment and identity salience found in chapter four I made the decision to only present models examining self-esteem and mastery as mediating the relationship between commitment, identity salience and emotion. Clearly one could estimate these models with emotion as force or with self-esteem or mastery as the product. For the purpose of the dissertation, and parsimony, I’m only presenting the one formulation.

Chapter five follows the same organization pattern of chapter four. I will begin with detailing the results of a series of structural equation models examining specific emotions by identity. I begin with happiness in the family identity. The models presented examine self-esteem and mastery as mediating the relationship between commitment, identity salience and specific (happiness, anger and shame), multidimensional (frequency, intensity and duration) emotion. I then proceed to the results of my analysis by hypothesis. I conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of the relationship between structural identity theory, self-esteem, mastery and emotion.
IDENTITY THEORY, SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY and HAPPINESS

Happiness and Family Identity

Among respondents who experience happiness in the previous week related to their family identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen) or mastery (hypothesis twenty). I find no difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). Related to gender differences in self-esteem, men report significantly more self-esteem (B = -0.107; p= .01) (hypothesis twenty-three). However, results indicate no significant difference between men and women in reports of mastery (hypothesis twenty-four).

According to hypotheses twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to reports of self-
esteem or mastery. Respondents who report higher affective commitment report higher self-esteem ($\beta = 0.023; \ p= .001$) and greater mastery ($\beta = 0.152; \ p= .001$). I find no significant relationship between identity salience of the family identity and self-esteem or mastery.

According to hypothesis twenty-seven and twenty-eight, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, those who report higher self-esteem report significantly more frequent happiness ($\beta = 0.256; \ p= .01$) and longer lasting happiness ($\beta = 0.203; \ p= .05$). There is no significant difference between those who report high self-esteem and the intensity of happiness related to the family identity. Those who report greater mastery report more frequent happiness ($\beta = 0.028; \ p= .05$). Results indicate there is no significant impact of mastery on the intensity or duration of happiness related to the family identity.

### Happiness and Student Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interactive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.616 ***</td>
<td>-0.366 **</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.098 ***</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.692 **</td>
<td>0.734 *</td>
<td>0.326 *</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077 ***</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.069 ***</td>
<td>0.032 ***</td>
<td>0.197 ***</td>
<td>0.024 **</td>
<td>0.074 ***</td>
<td>0.029 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.691 ***</td>
<td>0.62 ***</td>
<td>0.393 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=979 \ \chi^2/df = .8/1 \ p=.361 \ RMSEA .000$
Among respondents who experience happiness in the previous week related to their student identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen) or mastery (hypothesis twenty). There is no difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). I find no significant difference between men and women in self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-three) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-four).

According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the student identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to self-esteem or mastery. However, higher affective commitment leads to greater self-esteem (B = 0.032; p = .001) and mastery (B = 0.197; p = .001). No significant difference was found identity salience of the student identity and either self-esteem or mastery.

According to hypothesis twenty-seven and twenty-eight, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, those who report higher self-esteem report significantly more frequent happiness (B = 0.691; p = .001), more intense (B = 0.62; p = .001) and longer lasting happiness (B = 0.393; p = .001) related to the student identity. Those who report greater mastery experience longer lasting happiness (B = 0.026; p = .05). I find no significant
relationship between mastery and the frequency or intensity of happiness related to the student identity.

IDENTITY THEORY, SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY and ANGER

Anger and Family Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Interactive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.328 **</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.11 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>-0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.424 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.291 **</td>
<td>2.794 ***</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.196 ***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.109 ***</td>
<td>0.022 ***</td>
<td>0.12 **</td>
<td>-0.043 ***</td>
<td>-0.091 ***</td>
<td>-0.071 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.28 **</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 376 χ²/df = 1.1/1 p=.292 RMSEA .017

Among respondents who experience anger in the previous week related to the family identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen) or mastery (hypothesis twenty). Among respondents who experience anger related to their family identity in the previous week, there is no difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). Among respondents who experience anger related to their family identity in the previous week, there is no difference in reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-three) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-four) between men and women.
According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to reports of self-esteem or mastery. However, respondents who report higher affective commitment have greater self-esteem ($B = 0.022; p=.001$) and greater mastery ($B = 0.12; p=.01$). I find no significant difference in identity salience of the family identity and either self-esteem or mastery.

According to hypothesis twenty-nine and thirty, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the anger related to that identity. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity, those who report higher self-esteem report significantly less frequent anger ($B = -0.28; p=.01$). Self-esteem does not significantly impact the intensity or duration of anger. Similarly, I find no significant difference between those who report greater mastery and the frequency, intensity or duration of anger.
Anger and Student Identity

Among respondents who experience anger in the previous week related to their student identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen) or mastery (hypothesis twenty). There is no difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). I find no difference in reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-three) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-four) between men and women.

According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience anger related to the student identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to reports of self-esteem or mastery. Those who report higher affective commitment also report higher self-esteem ($B = 0.032; p=.001$) and greater mastery ($B = 0.21; p=.001$). There is no significant difference in identity salience of the student identity and either self-esteem or mastery.
According to hypothesis twenty-nine and thirty, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the anger related to that identity. Among respondents who experience anger related to the student identity, those who report higher self-esteem report significantly less frequent anger ($B = -0.231; p=.01$). There was no significant difference between those who report high self-esteem and the intensity or duration of anger. Regarding mastery, respondents who report greater mastery report significantly less frequent ($B = -0.028; p=.01$), less intense ($B = -0.126; p=.001$) and shorter lasting anger ($B = -0.063; p=.001$) related to the student identity.

IDENTITY THEORY, SELF-ESTEEM AND MASTERY and SHAME

**Shame and Family Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>-0.627 *</td>
<td>-0.699 *</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.726 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.398 *</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>1.561 *</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>0.203 **</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.111 *</td>
<td>0.022 **</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.034 **</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mastery</strong></td>
<td>-0.039 *</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents who experience shame in the previous week related to their family identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen). Older respondents report significantly greater mastery (hypothesis
There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). There is no difference in reports of self-esteem between men and women (hypothesis twenty-three). Women report significantly greater mastery ($B = 1.561; \ p= .05$) (hypothesis twenty-four) than men.

According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to reports of self-esteem or mastery. Those who report higher affective commitment also report higher self-esteem ($B = 0.022; \ p=.001$). Affective commitment does not significantly impact mastery. I find there is no significant difference in identity salience of the family identity and either self-esteem or mastery.

According to hypothesis thirty and thirty-one, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the shame related to that identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, there is no significant relationship between self-esteem and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame related to the identity. In regards to mastery, respondents who report greater mastery report significantly less frequent shame ($B = -0.039; \ p=.05$) related to the student identity. I find no significant relationship between mastery and the intensity or duration of shame.
Shame and Student Identity

Among respondents who experience shame in the previous week related to their student identity, there is no significant difference by age in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis nineteen) or mastery (hypothesis twenty). There is no significant difference between whites and nonwhites in the reports of self-esteem (hypothesis twenty-one) or mastery (hypothesis twenty-two). There is no difference in reports of self-esteem between men and women (hypothesis twenty-three). Women report significantly greater mastery ($\beta = 1.282; p = .01$) (hypothesis twenty-four) than men.

According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, interactive commitment is not significantly related to reports of self-esteem or mastery. Those who report higher affective commitment also report higher self-esteem ($\beta = 0.03; p = .001$) and mastery ($\beta = 0.174; p = .001$). There is no significant difference in identity salience of the student identity and either self-esteem or mastery.
According to hypothesis thirty and thirty-one, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the shame related to that identity. Among respondents who experience shame related to the student identity, the higher self-esteem respondents report the less frequent (B = -0.514; p= .001), less intense (B = -1.646; p= .001) and shorter duration (B = -0.767; p= .001) shame. Of respondents who report greater mastery report significantly more intense shame (B = 0.137; p= .01) related to the student identity. There is no significant relationship between mastery and the frequency or duration of shame.

AGE, SELF-ESTEEM and MASTERY

Table 5.7 Age, Self-Esteem & Mastery Hypotheses 19 & 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Family Identity</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Student Identity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Family Identity</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Student Identity</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Family Identity</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.726 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Hypothesis nineteen and twenty state self-esteem and mastery increase with age. Table 5.7 highlights the relationship between age and self-esteem and age and mastery among all emotions for all identities in this dissertation. I find no support for hypothesis nineteen, among respondents who experience anger, shame and happiness in the student or family identity – there is no significant relationship between age and self-esteem.
Among respondents who experience anger, shame or happiness related to the student or family identity, older respondents who report shame within the family identity report greater mastery. Among all other models examined there is no other significant relationship between age and mastery. I find no support hypothesis nineteen and weak support for hypothesis twenty.

RACE, SELF-ESTEEM and MASTERY

Table 5.8 Race, Self-Esteem & Mastery
Hypotheses 21 & 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Family Identity</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Family Identity</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Family Identity</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Hypothesis twenty-one expects that Nonwhite respondents will report greater self-esteem than Whites. Hypothesis twenty-two expects White respondents to report greater mastery than Nonwhites. Table 5.8 highlights that among respondents who experience anger, shame or happiness related to the student or the family identity there is no significant difference between whites or nonwhites in the self-esteem and mastery. I find no support for either hypothesis twenty-one or twenty-two.
GENDER, SELF-ESTEEM and MASTERY

Table 5.9 Gender, Self-Esteem & Mastery
Hypotheses 23 & 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Family Identity</td>
<td>-0.107 **</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Family Identity</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Family Identity</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>1.561 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Student Identity</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.282 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Hypothesis twenty-three and twenty-four expect men to report significantly greater self-esteem and mastery. Table 5.9 highlights that among respondents who experience anger, shame or happiness related to the student or family identity, men report greater self-esteem in only one of the models and women actually report greater mastery when examining subsamples of respondents who experience shame. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, men report significantly higher self-esteem (B=−0.107; p=.01). Among respondents who experience anger, shame or happiness related to the student or family identity, only two models identify a significant relationship between gender and mastery. Shame has an unexpected relationship between gender and mastery. Among respondents who experience shame related to the family (B=1.561; p=.05) or student (B=1.282; p=.01) identity, women report significantly greater mastery.
According to hypothesis twenty-five and twenty-six, interactive commitment will have no impact on self-esteem or mastery and affective commitment will increase both self-esteem and mastery. Table 5.10 highlights that among respondents who report anger, shame or happiness related to the student or family identity affective commitment is significantly related to both self-esteem and mastery (with one exception of shame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.023 ***</td>
<td>0.152 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.032 ***</td>
<td>0.197 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.022 ***</td>
<td>0.12 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.032 ***</td>
<td>0.21 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.022 **</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 5.10 Commitment, Salience, Self-Esteem & Mastery Hypothesis 25 & 26
within the family identity and mastery). Neither interactive commitment nor identity salience significantly impact self-esteem or mastery.

**SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and HAPPINESS**

Table 5.7 Age, Self-Esteem & Mastery Hypotheses 19 & 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Family Identity</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Student Identity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Family Identity</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Student Identity</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Family Identity</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.726 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame Student Identity</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

According to hypothesis twenty-seven and twenty-eight, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the more frequent, more intense and longer lasting the happiness related to the identity. Table 5.11 reports the relationship among those who experience happiness in the previous week related to the family or student identity, self-esteem, mastery and the frequency, intensity and duration of happiness. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity, those who report higher self-esteem report more frequent (B=0.256, p=0.01), longer lasting happiness (B=0.203, p=0.05), related to the family identity. However, among respondent that experience happiness related to the family identity, there is no significant relationship between self-esteem and the intensity of happiness related to the identity. Among respondents who report
happiness related to the family identity, respondents who report greater mastery report significantly more frequent happiness (B=0.028, p=0.05). There is no significant difference in the level of mastery and the intensity or duration of happiness related to the family identity among respondents who experience happiness in the previous week related to the family identity. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the student identity, the higher self-esteem the more frequent (B=0.691, p=0.001), more intense (B=0.62, p=0.001) and longer lasting (B=0.393, p=0.001) the happiness related to the student identity. Among respondents report happiness related to the student identity in the previous week, the greater the mastery the longer lasting (B=0.026, p=0.05) the happiness related to the student identity. However, higher mastery is not significantly related to the frequency or intensity of happiness related to the student identity among respondents who experience happiness related to the student identity.

SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and ANGER

Table 5.12 Self-Esteem, Mastery & Anger Hypothesis 29 & 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Identity</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>-0.231**</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-0.028**</td>
<td>-0.126***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

According to hypothesis twenty-nine and thirty, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the anger related to that
identity. Table 5.12 highlights the relationship among respondents who experience anger related to the family and student identity. In both models, respondents who experience anger related to the student or family identity that report higher self-esteem report significantly less frequent anger related to the identity (B = -0.28; p = .05) and (B = -0.231; p = .01), respectfully. Among respondents who experience anger related to the family identity there is no significant difference between mastery and the frequency, intensity or duration of anger. Additionally, among respondents who report anger related to the student identity, those who report higher mastery report less frequent (B = -0.28; p = .01), less intense (B = -0.126; p = .001), shorter (B = -0.063; p = .001) anger related to the student identity.

SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY, COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and SHAME

Table 5.13 Self-Esteem, Mastery & Shame Hypothesis 31 & 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Identity</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-0.039 *</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Identity</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>-0.514 ***</td>
<td>-1.646 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.137 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

According to hypothesis thirty and thirty-one, the greater the self-esteem and mastery, the less frequent, less intense and shorter duration the shame related to that identity. Table 5.13 highlights the relationship between self-esteem and mastery and the frequency, intensity and duration of shame related to the family or student identity.
Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, there is no significant impact of self-esteem and the frequency, intensity or duration of shame. However, among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, respondents who report high mastery report significantly less frequent shame ($B=-0.039; p=0.05$). Among respondents who report feeling shame in the previous week related to the student identity, respondents who report higher self-esteem report significantly less frequent ($B=-0.514; p=0.001$), less intense ($B=-1.646; p=0.001$), shorter in duration ($B=-0.767; p=0.001$) shame related to the student identity. One unexpected finding, is that among respondents that report shame related to the student identity, those who report greater mastery report significantly more intense shame related to the student identity ($B=0.137; p=0.01$).

**DISCUSSION**

Among respondents who experience shame related to the family identity, older respondents report significantly greater mastery. I find no other significant relationships between age and self-esteem. Among respondents who experience happiness related to the family identity men report significantly less self-esteem. Additional differences between men and women can be found among respondents who experience shame related to both the family and student identity. Among respondents who experience shame, women report significantly more mastery. These relationships run counter to previous research and my hypotheses. This relationship between gender, identity, mastery and
shame is an interesting finding and one that calls for a more detailed analysis in future research.

Examining the relationship between emotion by identity and its impact upon commitment, identity salience self-esteem and mastery, affective commitment is again the most consistent in its relationship upon self-esteem, mastery and emotions. For example; in a number of models, those with greater affective commitment report significantly higher self-esteem and mastery. Affective commitment has both direct and indirect (through self-esteem and mastery) impact upon happiness, anger (family identity) and, to a lesser degree, upon the frequency of shame (family identity). These findings illustrate the importance of affective commitment upon self-esteem, mastery and emotion. Interactive commitment and identity salience have little, to no, impact upon the self-esteem, mastery and emotions in these models.

While these analyses test the role of self-esteem and mastery mediating the impact of commitment and identity salience and emotions it is noted that this is but one way to explore these relationships. The relationship between these mechanisms is much more complex. Self-esteem and mastery is examined as a force in this theoretical model. I could also be modeled as a product of this theoretical model. For the sake of parsimony, this analysis only examines self-esteem and mastery as a mediating phenomenon between commitment, identity salience and emotion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.14 Summary Results: Hypotheses 19-32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 19 Age &amp; Self-Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 20 Age &amp; Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 22 Race &amp; Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 23 Gender &amp; Self-Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 24 Gender &amp; Mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hypothesis 25 Commitment, Salience & Self-Esteem | Partial | 25a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon self-esteem  
25b) Affective commitment will increase self-esteem  
25c) The higher the salience of an identity the higher the self-esteem |
| Hypothesis 26 Commitment, Salience & Mastery | Partial | 26a) Interactive commitment will have no direct impact upon mastery  
26b) Affective commitment will increase mastery  
26c) The higher the salience of an identity the greater the mastery |
| Hypothesis 27 Self-Esteem & Happiness        | Partial | Higher self-esteem the 27a) more frequent, 27b) more intense, 27c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. |
| Hypothesis 28 Mastery & Happiness            | Partial | The greater mastery the 28a) more frequent, 28b) more intense, 28c) longer lasting happiness related to the identity. |
| Hypothesis 29 Self-Esteem & Anger            | Partial | The higher the self-esteem the 29a) less frequent, 29b) less intense and 29c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Hypothesis 30 Mastery & Anger                | Partial | The greater the mastery the 30a) less frequent, 30b) less intense and 30c) shorter in duration of anger related to the identity. |
| Hypothesis 31 Self-Esteem & Shame            | Partial | The higher the self-esteem the 31a) less frequent, 31b) less intense and 31c) shorter in duration shame related to the identity. |
| Hypothesis 32 Mastery & Shame                | Partial | The greater the mastery the 32a) less frequent, 32b) less intense and 32c) shorter in duration anger related to the identity. |
I investigate the relationship between specific emotions and Identity Theory. I attempt to examine the intricacies of these relationships by expanding our conceptualization of emotion to include specific emotions. I demonstrate the importance of taking into account a multidimensional experience of those specific emotions such as the frequency, intensity and duration. The current project is motivated by the invitation of Identity Theory to build research and theory examining the relationship between emotion and Identity Theory. Stryker (2004) refers to this placement of specific emotions within Identity Theory as an unfinished agenda. This research begins to explore the nature and placement of emotion the within Identity Theory.

Returning to the research questions driving this endeavor, I set out to answer how the frequency, intensity and duration of specific emotions fit into Identity Theory. I also was motivated by investigating the influence of emotion both as social force (impacting commitment and identity salience) as well as social product (being impacted by commitment and identity salience). The results of the models in chapters four and five are only first steps in discovering how the inclusion of emotion enhances our understanding of Identity Theory as well as the relationship between Identity Theory, self-esteem, mastery and emotion.
SOCIAL STRUCTURE and EMOTION

The results of this investigation show that age, race and gender are more than just control variables. Age, race and gender represent large social structure (Stets and Serpe 2013; Serpe and Stryker 2011; Stryker et al. 2005). In this study, variation by age, race and gender was inconsistent, but present. While I find partial support for many of my structural hypotheses as they relate to emotion, this variation provides insight to the complexity of the relationship between emotion and social structure. The variation also generates support for distinguishing specific multidimensional emotional experiences as opposed to simple distinctions of frequency or valence of emotion. One potential reason for lack of consistent results by large social structure was the demographic heterogeneity of the sample. The sample was predominately young, white women. The results nonetheless indicate that social structure remains important.

COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE and EMOTION

In chapter four emotion is examined as both a force and product of commitment and identity salience. I find support for both types of models, emotion impacts commitment and identity salience and commitment and identity salience impact emotion. Based upon my analysis I conclude that models examining emotion as a product tell us slightly more about the relationship between emotion, commitment and identity salience.
Commitment and identity salience impact emotions. The most pronounced impact however is that of affective commitment upon happiness. The family identity is closely tied to affective commitment. In all of my subsamples regardless of emotion, there is a relationship between emotion and affective commitment. The relationship between identity salience and emotions is apparent within the student identity and in regards to the length of time one experiences the emotion, the higher the identity salience, the longer the emotion. The variation in results of these analyses demonstrates the importance of recognizing emotion as a complex mechanism within Identity Theory.

The lack of significant findings for salience and emotion was unexpected. This could just be an artifact of the sample and the identities I analyze. Results may be significant if I had utilized a random sample of adults and other identities (volunteer identities or organizational identities or more specific identities may yield significant effects). Even though salience and emotion had limited significant effects; the frequency and duration of happiness within the family identity increase salience of the family identity. Additionally, the higher the salience of the family identity the more intense, longer lasting happiness related to the identity. Another interesting finding related to salience and emotion within the student identity is the higher the salience of the student identity, the longer lasting the happiness and anger related to the identity. The variation and lack of significance within models examining shame could also be due to the relatively low sample size (family n=162 and student n=268).
COMMITMENT, IDENTITY SALIENCE, SELF-ESTEEM, MASTERY and EMOTIONS

The results of this my second series of analyses support conclusions drawn from the previous chapter. Affective commitment has a pronounced relationship two Identity Theory, emotions, self-esteem and mastery. Affective commitment has both direct and indirect (through self-esteem and mastery) impact upon happiness, anger (family identity) and, to a lesser degree, upon the frequency of shame (family identity). Taken together, these results illustrate the importance of affective commitment upon self-esteem, mastery and emotion. Affective commitment is based upon the relationship between people related to the specific identity, as such it is conceptualized by two measures that examine the closeness to others and the impact of loss of the relationship. Both cost of the loss and being tied to the identity carry personal meaning and value related to the role identity as such provide consistent and significant impact throughout my analysis.

CONTRIBUTIONS and SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS

The current findings add to a growing body of literature on emotions within sociology. While this study did not confirm all of the hypotheses these results suggest that measuring experiences of emotion as multidimensional, specific emotions is suitable for investigation within Identity Theory. These findings enhance our understanding of the Identity Theory and emotions. It adds to our understanding of how society shapes self and how self shapes society. Stryker’s (1968) early recognition of a cathartic component to Structural Identity Theory had yet to be incorporated and explored. These findings
clarify, to some degree, how social structural patterns shape interactions and relationships, through emotion. Emotions are important to the experience of self and society. This research will serve as a base for future studies. By examining the complexity of the emotional experience I hope to inspire future research to continue to examine emotion as more than just the relative valence or frequency of emotion.

Emotions are an important in understanding the relationship between commitment and identity salience. Emotions are not merely positive & negative valence; they are specific, separate phenomenon. Specific emotions such as anger and shame, while both hold negative “valence” are different in onset, experience and expression. The impact of an emotion is more than the sheer frequency. Multidimensional emotional experiences inform our understanding of the complexity and nature of specific emotions. The frequency of happiness, while important, only tells part of the story. Intensity and duration of happiness better estimate the emotional experience that in turn gives deeper clarity to the relationship between emotion and Identity Theory. My research is important because it begins to disentangle the relationship between Identity Theory and emotion; it recognizes the centrality that emotion has to our commitments, salience and behavior. The variation in results supports my call and development of multidimensional measurement of specific emotion.
LIMITATIONS

A number of important limitations need to be considered. First, these findings are limited by the use of a cross sectional design. Due to time and financial constraints the decision to base this analysis on a cross sectional design limited the conclusions that could be derived from the analysis. Emotion as both a force and product is not adequately explored without longitudinal data. Cross sectional data also limited my ability to clearly distinguish the relationships between self-esteem, mastery, Identity Theory and emotions. Cross sectional data also limited the conclusions that could be drawn.

Another potential weakness of this study is the use of global, as opposed to specific, self-esteem. Rosenberg (1995) distinguishes between global self-esteem and specific self-esteem and warns against using these concepts interchangeably. Both global and specific self-esteem are important in understanding the self, however Rosenberg (1995:144) reminds us that measures of self “are important for different reasons and in different ways.”

This dissertation was limited by the inclusion of just two identities. While identities were selected based upon their likelihood of presence within a convenient sample of college students, there are limitations of measuring just the family and student identity. The inclusion of other identities such as friend, parent, spouse, or worker can provide superior awareness into the variation of the relationships between emotion, commitment and identity salience.
Another limitation is the utilization of a convenient sample of college students. Results were based upon a predominately heterogeneous population. Recognition of the limitations of the sample are important especially when the conclusions being drawn are related to structural variations in age, race and gender and the study is overwhelming young, white and female.

This project was limited by the low reliabilities of commitment measures. Inclusion of previous conceptualizations of commitment where brought into this project but did not generate the reliability coefficients I would have expected. The implication of the lower reliabilities suggests that future research should examine a random adult population and include measures of commitment omitted from the present study. Refinement of the commitment items may be necessary. The low reliabilities limit the power to test my theory, without reliability measures I may not be testing what I set out to test. Results should be interpreted with some caution. A more reliable commitment measure may yield more support for my hypotheses. Acknowledgment of these low reliabilities is important and future research should begin to clarify how to best conceptualize interactive and affective commitment.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should explore the variation in emotion as both force and as a product of commitment and identity salience through examination of longitudinal data. Longitudinal data provides the ability to determine causal relations between emotion,
commitment and identity salience. It provides a deeper investigation into these relationships. Like many scientific endeavors, this project has generated more questions in need of investigation than answers. For instance, does frequent happiness have a greater impact upon affective commitment or does affective commitment have a greater impact upon the frequency one experiences happiness? Does happiness impact commitment in a differently than anger or shame over time? Is the experience of anger an outcome of commitment and identity salience? How do these relationships impact aggression, depression or anxiety? Future research is encouraged to continue to disentangle and distinguish impact of specific emotions, Identity Theory and subsequent behavioral outcomes.

Further work needs to be completed to establish what the impact of these processes may be on mental health outcomes such as depression and anxiety. Considerably more work will need to be done to determine where the frequency, intensity or duration of specific emotions fit within Identity Theory. This research only begins to introduce possibilities for future research and theoretical developments within a rich theoretical framework long recognized and respected for its consideration of the self within society.

Future work needs to continue to test and refine of Identity Theory. I believe that rethinking our commitment measures is important, while historically commitment has been a rather robust, this data demonstrates on some level an examination of the measures may be in order. Rethinking and discussing validity and reliability of our
measures can only strengthen our theory. Inclusion of emotions and the variation in results has more to say about emotions than Identity Theory. The multidimensional nature of specific emotions and the subsequent impact upon commitment and salience as well as the impact of commitment and salience upon emotion – generates a plethora of research questions to build future work. The variability in support for my hypotheses leads me to conclude the inclusion of emotion into Identity Theory is paramount to the future of the theory. The questions that remain demonstrate a long and productive future for the theory.
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DO NOT COMPLETE THIS IF YOU ARE UNDER THE AGE OF 18

SECTION 1

Think about your role as a student, specifically think of the activities that you engage in as a student (class, student organizations, study groups, etc.). For the following section think about your role as a student and answer the following questions.

1. Think about meeting a co-worker for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a student?
   □ Almost certainly would
   □ Probably would
   □ Probably would not
   □ Almost certainly would not

2. Think about meeting a person of the opposite sex for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a student?
   □ Almost certainly would
   □ Probably would
   □ Probably would not
   □ Almost certainly would not

3. Think about meeting a friend of a close friend for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a student?
   □ Almost certainly would
   □ Probably would
   □ Probably would not
   □ Almost certainly would not

4. Think about meeting a friend of a family member for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a student?
   □ Almost certainly would
   □ Probably would
   □ Probably would not
   □ Almost certainly would not

5. Have you joined any organization related being a student?
   □ Yes
   □ No, Skip to Q:7

6. How many such organizations have you joined?
   ___ # of organizations
7. How often do you do things related to being a student?
- Daily
- Several times a week
- Once a week
- Less than once a week
- Once a month
- Seldom
- Never

8. In an average week, how many hours do you spend with other students doing things together, including eating, having a conversation, talking on the telephone, emailing, texting, watching T.V. etc?
- hours per week

9. How many text messages and emails would you estimate you send out in the average week to in your role as a student?
- text messages per week
- emails per week

10. Have you met any friends through being a student?
- Yes
- No, Skip to Q:12

11. How many of such friends have you met?
- number of friends

12. How close (in personal and emotional terms) are you to others in your student related activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not close at all</th>
<th>Very Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Of the money you do not need for rent, food, clothing and other essentials how much do you spend on activities related to being a student.
- Almost all
- More than half
- About half
- Less than half
- Almost none

14. Of all the people that you have known through your activities as a student, how many are important to you, that is how many would you really miss if you did not see them?
- Almost all
- More than half
- About half
- Less than half
- Almost none
15. Think of those people who are important to you. About how many would you lose contact with if you did not participate in student related activities?

☐ Almost all
☐ More than half
☐ About half
☐ Less than half
☐ Almost none

16. How important is it to you that your parents view you as being a student?

☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not very important
☐ Not at all important

17. How good/successful at activities related to being a student do your parents think you are?

☐ Very successful/good
☐ Somewhat successful/good
☐ Not very successful/good
☐ Not at all successful/good

18. How important it is to you that your friends view you as being a student?

☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not very important
☐ Not at all important

19. How good/successful at activities related to being a student do your friends think you are?

☐ Very successful/good
☐ Somewhat successful/good
☐ Not very successful/good
☐ Not at all successful/good

20. After I do things related to my role as a student, I often feel unhappy.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree
21. I am very satisfied with being a student.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

22. I have met or am meeting my goals as a student.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

23. I can depend on feeling rewarded for what I do as a student.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

24. In thinking of yourself as a student, how many days in the previous week have you felt happy?
   □ Not at all this week, Skip to Q:29
   □ One or two day this week
   □ Three or Four days this week
   □ Five or Six days this week
   □ Daily or Multiple times a day

25. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt happy. How intense was your happiness?
   Not at all intense
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Intense

26. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt happy. How long did you feel happy?
   A few seconds
   1 2 3 4 5 6 Continuously

27. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?
   Not at all appropriate
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely Appropriate
28. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7
[ ] 8
[ ] 9
[ ] 10 Completely appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a student, in the previous week how many days have you felt proud?

[ ] Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:34*
[ ] One or two day this week
[ ] Three or Four days this week
[ ] Five or Six days this week
[ ] Daily or Multiple times a day

30. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt proud. How intense was your pride?

[ ] Not at all intense
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7
[ ] 8
[ ] 9
[ ] 10 Very intense

31. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt proud. How long did you feel proud?

[ ] A few seconds
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Continuously

32. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt proud. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7
[ ] 8
[ ] 9
[ ] 10 Completely appropriate

33. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt proud. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7
[ ] 8
[ ] 9
[ ] 10 Completely appropriate
In thinking of yourself as a student, in the previous week how many days have you felt **sad**?

- [ ] Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:39*
- [ ] One or two day this week
- [ ] Three or Four days this week
- [ ] Five or Six days this week
- [ ] Daily or Multiple times a day

35. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt sad. How intense was your **sadness**?

- [ ] Not at all intense
- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 7
- [ ] 8
- [ ] 9
- [ ] 10

36. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt sad. How long did you feel **sad**?

- [ ] A few seconds
- [ ] Continuously

37. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

- [ ] Not at all appropriate
- [ ] Completely appropriate

38. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

- [ ] Not at all appropriate
- [ ] Completely appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a student, in the previous week how many days have you felt **anger**?

- [ ] Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:44*
- [ ] One or two day this week
- [ ] Three or Four days this week
- [ ] Five or Six days this week
- [ ] Daily or Multiple times a day

40. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt anger. How intense was your **anger**?

- [ ] Not at all intense
- [ ] Very intense
41. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt anger. How long did you feel anger?

[ ] A few seconds
[ ] Continuously

42. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] Completely appropriate

43. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] Completely appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a student, in the previous week how many days have you felt fear?

[ ] Not at all this week, Skip to Q:49
[ ] One or two day this week
[ ] Three or Four days this week
[ ] Five or Six days this week
[ ] Daily or Multiple times a day

45. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt fear. How intense was your fear?

[ ] Not at all intense
[ ] Very intense

46. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt fear. How long did your fear last?

[ ] A few seconds
[ ] Continuously

47. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

[ ] Not at all appropriate
[ ] Completely appropriate
48. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

49.

In thinking of yourself as a student, in the previous week how many days have you felt shame?

Not at all this week, Skip to Q:54

One or two day this week

Three or Four days this week

Five or Six days this week

Daily or Multiple times a day

50. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt shame. How intense was your shame?

Not at all intense

Very Intense

51. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt shame. How long did you feel shame?

A few seconds

Continuously

52. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt shame. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

53. In thinking of yourself as a student, think of the last time you felt shame. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate
SECTION 2

Think about your role as a family member, specifically think of your relationships with others in your family (as a son, daughter, grandchild, aunt, uncle, brother, sister, etc.). For the following section think about your role as a family member and answer the questions.

Think about meeting a co-worker for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a family member?

☐ Almost certainly would
☐ Probably would
☐ Probably would not
☐ Almost certainly would not

55. Think about meeting a person of the opposite sex for the first time, how certain is it that would tell this person about you being a family member?

☐ Almost certainly would
☐ Probably would
☐ Probably would not
☐ Almost certainly would not

56. Think about meeting a friend of a close friend for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a family member?

☐ Almost certainly would
☐ Probably would
☐ Probably would not
☐ Almost certainly would not

57. Think about meeting a friend of a family member for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about being a family member?

☐ Almost certainly would
☐ Probably would
☐ Probably would not
☐ Almost certainly would not

58. How often do you do things related to being a family member?

☐ Daily
☐ Several times a week
☐ Once a week
☐ Less than once a week
☐ Once a month
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
59. In an average week, how many hours do you spend with your family doing things together, including eating, having a conversation, talking on the telephone, emailing, texting, watching T.V. etc?
   _____ hours per week

60. In the average week, how many text messages and emails do you send out to members of your family?
   _____ text messages per week
   _____ emails per week

61. Have you met any friends through your family?
   □ Yes
   □ No, Skip to Q:63

62. How many of such friends have you met?
   _____ Number of friends met through family

63. How close (in personal and emotional terms) are you to others in your family?
   □ 0  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5  □ 6  □ 7  □ 8  □ 9  □ 10
   Not close at all                      Very Close

64. Of the money you do not need for rent, food, clothing and other essentials how much do you spend on activities related to your family.
   □ Almost all
   □ More than half
   □ About half
   □ Less than half
   □ Almost none

65. Of all the people that you have known through your family, how many are important to you, that is how many would you really miss if you did not see them?
   □ Almost all
   □ More than half
   □ About half
   □ Less than half
   □ Almost none

66. Think of those people who are important to you. About how many would you lose contact with if you did not participate in family related activities?
   □ Almost all
   □ More than half
   □ About half
   □ Less than half
   □ Almost none
67. How important is it to **you** that your **parents** view you as being involved in family related activities?
- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Somewhat important
- [ ] Not very important
- [ ] Not at all important

68. How good/successful at activities related to being family member do your parents think you are?
- [ ] Very successful/good
- [ ] Somewhat successful/good
- [ ] Not very successful/good
- [ ] Not at all successful/good

69. How important is it to **you** that your **friends** view you as being involved family related activities?
- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Somewhat important
- [ ] Not very important
- [ ] Not at all important

70. How good/successful at activities related to being a family member do your friends think you are?
- [ ] Very successful/good
- [ ] Somewhat successful/good
- [ ] Not very successful/good
- [ ] Not at all successful/good

71. After I do things with my family, I often feel unhappy.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

In thinking of yourself as a family member, how many days in the previous week have you felt **happy**?
- [ ] Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:77*
- [ ] One or two day this week
- [ ] Three or Four days this week
- [ ] Five or Six days this week
- [ ] Daily or Multiple times a day
73. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt happy. How intense was your happiness?

Not at all intense | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very Intense

74. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt happy. How long did you feel happy?

A few seconds | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Continuously

75. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Completely Appropriate

76. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Completely Appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a family member, in the previous week how many days have you felt proud?

Not at all this week, Skip to Q:82

One or two day this week

Three or Four days this week

Five or Six days this week

Daily or Multiple times a day

78. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt proud. How intense was your pride?

Not at all intense | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very Intense

79. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt proud. How long did you feel proud?

A few seconds | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Continuously
80. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt **proud**. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

81. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt **proud**. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a family member, in the previous week how many days have you felt **sad**?

☐ Not at all this week, **Skip to Q:87**

☐ One or two day this week

☐ Three or Four days this week

☐ Five or Six days this week

☐ Daily or Multiple times a day

83. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt sad. How intense was your **sadness**?

☐ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all intense

Very Intense

84. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt sad. How long did you feel **sad**?

☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6

A few seconds

Continuously

85. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

86. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate
In thinking of yourself as a family member, in the previous week how many days have you felt anger?

☐ Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:92*
☐ One or two day this week
☐ Three or Four days this week
☐ Five or Six days this week
☐ Daily or Multiple times a day

88. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt anger. How intense was your anger?

☐ Not at all intense
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10
Very Intense

89. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt anger. How long did you feel anger?

☐ A few seconds
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
Continuously

90. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ Not at all appropriate
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10
Completely Appropriate

91. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ Not at all appropriate
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10
Completely Appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a family member, in the previous week how many days have you felt fear?

☐ Not at all this week, *Skip to Q:97*
☐ One or two day this week
☐ Three or Four days this week
☐ Five or Six days this week
☐ Daily or Multiple times a day

93. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt fear. How intense was your fear?

☐ Not at all intense
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10
Very Intense
94. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt fear. How long did your fear last?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6

A few seconds

95. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

96. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate

In thinking of yourself as a family member, in the previous week how many days have you felt shame?

☐ Not at all this week, Skip to Q:102

☐ One or two days this week

☐ Three or Four days this week

☐ Five or Six days this week

☐ Daily or Multiple times a day

98. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt shame. How intense was your shame?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

Not at all intense

Very Intense

99. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt shame. How long did you feel shame?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6

A few seconds

Continuously

100. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt shame. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

Not at all appropriate

Completely Appropriate
101. In thinking of yourself as a family member, think of the last time you felt **shame**. Do you think that others (your family, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely Appropriate

102. I am very satisfied with being a member of my family.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

103. I have met or am meeting my goals related to being a member of my family.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

104. I can depend on feeling rewarded for what I do as a member of my family.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
SECTION 3

Think about your role as a friend, specifically think of the closest friendships that you have, those friend(s) that you count on. For the following section think about your role in those close friendship(s) and answer the questions.

105. Think about meeting a co-worker for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about your friendships?
- Almost certainly would
- Probably would
- Probably would not
- Almost certainly would not

106. Think about meeting a person of the opposite sex for the first time, how certain is it that would tell this person about your friendships?
- Almost certainly would
- Probably would
- Probably would not
- Almost certainly would not

107. Think about meeting a friend of a close friend for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about your friendships?
- Almost certainly would
- Probably would
- Probably would not
- Almost certainly would not

108. Think about meeting a friend of a family member for the first time, how certain is it that you would tell this person about your friendships?
- Almost certainly would
- Probably would
- Probably would not
- Almost certainly would not

109. How often do you do things with your close friend?
- Daily
- Several times a week
- Once a week
- Less than once a week
- Once a month
- Seldom
- Never
110. In an average week, how many hours do you spend with your close friends doing things together, including eating, having a conversation, talking on the telephone, emailing, texting, watching T.V. etc?

___ hours/week

111. How many text messages and emails would you estimate you send out in a week to your close friends?

___ text messages

___ emails

112. Have you met any friends through your close friends?

☐ Yes

☐ No, , Skip to Q:114

113. How many of such friends have you met?

___ Number of friends met through friend

114. How close (in personal and emotional terms) are you to your close friends?

☐ 0 Not close at all

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

☐ 6

☐ 7

☐ 8

☐ 9

☐ 10 Very Close

115. Of the money you do not need for rent, food, clothing and other essentials how much do you spend on activities with your close friends.

☐ Almost all

☐ More than half

☐ About half

☐ Less than half

☐ Almost none

116. Of all the people that you consider close friends, how many are important to you, that is how many would you really miss if you did not see them?

☐ Almost all

☐ More than half

☐ About half

☐ Less than half

☐ Almost none

117. Think of those people who are important to you. About how many would you lose contact with if you did not participate in activities with your close friends?

☐ Almost all

☐ More than half

☐ About half

☐ Less than half

☐ Almost none
118. How important it is to you that your parents view you as being a close friend?

- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Somewhat important
- [ ] Not very important
- [ ] Not at all important

119. How good/successful at being a close friend to others do your parents think you are?

- [ ] Very successful/good
- [ ] Somewhat successful/good
- [ ] Not very successful/good
- [ ] Not at all successful/good

120. How important it is to you that your friends view you as being a close friend?

- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Somewhat important
- [ ] Not very important
- [ ] Not at all important

121. How good/successful at being a friend do your close friends think you are?

- [ ] Very successful/good
- [ ] Somewhat successful/good
- [ ] Not very successful/good
- [ ] Not at all successful/good

122. After I do things with my close friends, I often feel unhappy.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

123. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, how many days in the previous week have you felt happy?

- [ ] Not at all this week, Skip to Q:128
- [ ] One or two day this week
- [ ] Three or Four days this week
- [ ] Five or Six days this week
- [ ] Daily or Multiple times a day
124. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt happy. How intense was your happiness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all intense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Intense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

125. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt happy. How long did you feel happy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completely Appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt happy. Do you think that others (your friend, family, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completely Appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128. In thinking of yourself as a friend, in the previous week how many days have you felt proud?

- Not at all this week, **Skip to Q:133**
- One or two day this week
- Three or Four days this week
- Five or Six days this week
- Daily or Multiple times a day

129. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt proud. How intense was your pride?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all intense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Intense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt proud. How long did you feel proud?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
131. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt **proud**. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely Appropriate

132. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt **proud**. Do you think that others (your friend, friends, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely Appropriate

133. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, in the previous week how many days/times have you felt **sad**?

- Not at all this week, **Skip to Q:138**
- One or two day this week
- Three or Four days this week
- Five or Six days this week
- Daily or Multiple times a day

134. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt sad. How intense was your **sadness**?

Not at all intense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Intense

135. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt sad. How long did you feel **sad**?

- A few seconds 1 2 3 4 5 6 Continuously

136. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely Appropriate

137. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt **sad**. Do you think that others (your friend, family, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely Appropriate
138. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, in the previous week how many days have you felt anger?

- Not at all this week, Skip to Q:143
- One or two days this week
- Three or Four days this week
- Five or Six days this week
- Daily or Multiple times a day

139. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt anger. How intense was your anger?

Not at all intense

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Very Intense

140. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt anger. How long did you feel anger?

A few seconds

1
2
3
4
5
6
Continuously

141. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Completely Appropriate

142. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt anger. Do you think that others (your friend, family, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

Not at all appropriate

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Completely Appropriate

143. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, in the previous week how many days have you felt fear?

Not at all this week, Skip to Q:148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

144. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt fear. How intense was your fear?

Not at all intense

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Very Intense
145. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt fear. How long did your fear last?

- □ A few seconds
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ Continuously

146. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

- □ Not at all appropriate
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ 7
- □ 8
- □ 9
- □ 10
- □ Completely appropriate

147. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt fear. Do you think that others (your friend, family, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

- □ Not at all appropriate
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ 7
- □ 8
- □ 9
- □ 10
- □ Completely appropriate

148. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, in the previous week how many days have you felt shame?

- □ Not at all this week, Skip to Q:153
- □ One or two day this week
- □ Three or Four days this week
- □ Five or Six days this week
- □ Daily or Multiple times a day

149. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt shame. How intense was your shame?

- □ Not at all intense
- □ 0
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ 7
- □ 8
- □ 9
- □ 10
- □ Very Intense

150. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt shame. How long did you feel shame?

- □ A few seconds
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ Continuously

151. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt shame. Do you think that your emotional response was appropriate?

- □ Not at all appropriate
- □ 0
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4
- □ 5
- □ 6
- □ 7
- □ 8
- □ 9
- □ 10
- □ Completely appropriate
152. In thinking of yourself as a close friend, think of the last time you felt **shame**. Do you think that others (your friend, family, etc.) would have thought your emotional response was appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completely Appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

153. I am very satisfied with my close friendships.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

154. I have met or am meeting my goals in my close friendships.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

155. I can depend on feeling rewarded for what I do with my close friends.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
The following is a list of statements about how you express yourself as a student, family member and close friend. Please check the corresponding box if you strongly disagree through strongly agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, what I am feeling is written all over my face.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, No matter how nervous or upset I am, I tend to keep a calm exterior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, I've learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, it is difficult for me to hide my fear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, people often do not know what I am feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, I am an emotionally expressive person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, I laugh aloud when someone tells a joke that is funny.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a student, when I am happy my feelings show.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about me as a student, whenever I feel positive emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a family member, what I am feeling is written all over my face.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a family member, whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a family member, No matter how nervous or upset I am, I tend to keep a calm exterior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a family member, I've learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a <strong>family member</strong>, I am an emotionally expressive person.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a <strong>family member</strong>, I laugh aloud when someone tells a joke that is funny.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a <strong>family member</strong>, when I am happy my feelings show.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about me as a <strong>family member</strong>, whenever I feel positive emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, what I am feeling is written all over my face.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, No matter how nervous or upset I am, I tend to keep a calm exterior.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, I’ve learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, it is difficult for me to hide my fear.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, people often do not know what I am feeling.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, I am an emotionally expressive person.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, I laugh aloud when someone tells a joke that is funny.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about myself as a close <strong>friend</strong>, when I am happy my feelings show.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In thinking about me as a close <strong>friend</strong>, whenever I feel positive emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please check the corresponding box if you strongly disagree, disagree, agree or strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times I think that I am not good at all.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have little control over the things that happen to me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is really no way that I can solve some of the problems I have.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to me in the future mostly depends upon me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel like I am being pushed around in life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Please tell me how often you have felt this way during the past week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling / Behavior</th>
<th>Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)</th>
<th>Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)</th>
<th>Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days)</th>
<th>Most or all of the time (5-7 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt depressed.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that everything I did was an effort.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt fearful.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt lonely.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get “going”.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt so restless That I couldn’t sit long in a chair.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt worried a lot about little things.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt anxious and tense.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the past week…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)</th>
<th>Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)</th>
<th>Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days)</th>
<th>Most or all of the time (5-7 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of characteristics. Rate each item using the scale where 1 = “least characteristic of me” to 5 = “most characteristic of me”. Check your responses to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Characteristic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Most Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given enough provocation, I may hit another person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have threatened people I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often find myself disagreeing with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends say that I’m somewhat argumentative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have trouble controlling my temper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people always seem to get breaks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of the following best represents your sex?  □ Male  □ Female

As of today what is your age?  ______

Which of the following best represents your current status?
□ Single, not dating
□ Single, dating casually
□ Single, dating one person seriously
□ Single, living with a partner
□ Married

Which of the following best represents your marital history?
□ Never married
□ Married once
□ Married two or more times
□ Widowed

Which of the following best represents your race?  (multiple answers possible)
□ White
□ Black/African American
□ Hispanic/Latino
□ American Indian or Alaska Native
□ Asian
□ Other (specify) _______________________

What is your year in school?
□ Freshman
□ Sophomore
□ Junior
□ Senior
□ Other (specify) _______________________

What is your overall grade point average (on a 4.0 scale)?  ______

What is your religious preference?
□ Protestant
□ Catholic
□ Jewish
□ Other (specify) _______________________
□ None

In an average week, how many emails do you send?  _______ emails

In an average week, how many text messages do you send?  _______ text messages