THE CREATION OF SELF THROUGH THE CULTURE OF EMOTIONS: IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AT TWO LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the
Department of Sociology
The Colorado College
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Arts

Lauren Schneider
Spring 2013

On my honor
I have neither given nor received
unauthorized aid on this thesis.

Lauren Schneider
Spring 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Gail Murphy-Geiss for the support and guidance throughout this process. Thank you for responding to frantic emails throughout the day and night, editing drafts, and guiding me through each stage. Thank you to my participants from Carleton and Colorado College who were so willing to devote time and energy into my senior thesis.

ABSTRACT

Sociologists are starting to understand emotions as a socially constructed phenomenon. Research has been conducted to understand how emotions prevail in every environment, whether it is academic, person, or work settings. However, there is a lack of information gathered regarding emotions during critical transition periods. Based on previous theoretical findings about emotions, there are particular ways students should emote throughout their college experience. This study looks at the display of emotions at two liberal arts colleges. Through survey and focus group research, this thesis found that the colleges were much the same, and the expected differences in gender were not found. The major difference was between the expression and suppression of emotion between freshmen, sophomores, and upperclassmen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

As I walked into the student center at Colorado College, I saw my friend running towards a hidden corner of the building, where she collapsed to the floor sobbing. I went over to see what was going on, only to hear that she had just found out her boyfriend cheated on her the previous weekend. She was trying to wipe away her tears, saying she needed to pull herself together because she was in public. I offered to take her back to my house so she could have privacy and the freedom to express whatever emotions she felt. As we walked out, we crossed paths with a freshman who was in her new student orientation group. Seeing the remnants of tears on her face, she asked if everything was okay. My friend faked a smile and said, "Yes, I am fine!" We proceeded to the exit trying to avoid further interactions.

This scenario is only one of many emotional outbursts that occur on college campuses. There are clearly issues that arise amongst college students regarding the expression of emotions. As a sociology major, I have been interested in understanding emotions more sociologically because emotions dictate how we view the world and how others view us. I specifically wanted to analyze emotions on college campuses, wondering how students felt about the expression of emotions in various situations. I wondered if males and females express them differently and why. I wondered if freshmen emoted differently than seniors and the reasons behind that. Though past research has explored the sociology of emotions in work and family settings, I was inclined to conduct this research focusing solely on emotions at liberal arts colleges. To enhance my research, I chose to explore Carleton College, which was ranked one of the happiest colleges in the country, as well as Colorado College, which has also made appearances on the rankings list as one of the happiest colleges in past years.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sociologists are finally beginning to understand the relevancy of emotions as a socially constructed phenomenon. In all settings, individuals act based on who they are interacting with and their surroundings. Beginning in 1938, George Herbert Mead studied *conventional gestures*, where people role-take, putting themselves in the place of others in order to understand how they are being viewed and judged (Mead 1956). Later, in 1959, Erving Goffman took a dramaturgical approach, explaining that each encounter between individuals takes place within a larger context (Goffman 1959). These larger contexts create structural parameters that people act according to, which ultimately develop into cultural scripts. People present themselves according to the particular norms of their surroundings. Arlie Hochschild (1979) extended Goffman's ideas, postulating that all environments have an *emotion culture* that dictates the way people are supposed to feel.

Although these theorists have differing opinions on emotions and how they play a role in our lives, they all understand that emotions are connected to our personal interactions and societal norms. Moreover, recent theorists have studied the relevancy of gender in conjunction with the display of emotions. Studies have shown varying results as to the degree to which women and men express emotions differently and for what purposes. While extensive research on emotions has been studied in certain settings, the sociology of emotions is too new to have explored them all. It is particularly compelling to study emotions in places where a multitude of emotions are brought to the surface, during times of transition. Little research has been done on the portrayal of emotions on

college campuses. Therefore, my research strives to answer some of these aforementioned questions.

Before delving into previous research in the field of the sociology of emotions, it is important to discuss the conflicting ideas of *true authentic emotions.* There is a debate in academia as to whether there are true emotions at all. Sociologists argue that although everyone may experience the same emotions in different situations, the social rules and regulations are so complicated that it is difficult to distinguish what is really true. That being said, we all live in a place of social encounters and interactions. Mead asserts:

> A self which is so evidently a social individual that it can exist only in a group of social individuals is as much a result of the process of evolution as other biological forms…a self can arise only where there is a social process within which this self has had its initiation. (Mead 1956: 39, 41)

Because we are socially constructed beings, we can never know how people acknowledge and understand their own emotions; we are all "in touch" with our emotions in different ways. There is no essential self that is independent from the social world because there are *feeling rules* (see Hochschild below) in every setting that pre-date our presence. Therefore, the notion of an authentic emotion is challenged because our self is reconfigured in our environment.

Salmela (2005) examines sincerity versus emotional authenticity in terms of normativity. Sincerity is a psychological concept, while authenticity is a "normative notion that relates to personal authorization" (Salmela 2005:227). He raises the question of whether one should feel a certain way independently from what one actually feels "deep inside." He understands the complicacy of authentic emotions because emotions do not always support "real beliefs" or "actual valuational attitudes" (Salmela 2005:210). This is correlated with two emotional phenomena: recalcitrant and managed emotions.

Recalcitrant emotions can be unavoidable; they are those emotions that we experience regardless of our beliefs. Managed emotions are based on fitting in to the appropriateness of a situation, because each interpersonal relationship "demands observation of delicate 'feeling rules' (Salmela 2005:213). It is impossible to decipher between authentic and factitious emotions when we claim that all emotions are managed through societal norms. According to sociologists, there are no "pure emotions" that come to the surface in humans without external influences.

Presentation of Self in Everyday Life

Symbolic interactionists focus on the sending and interpreting of gestures as meaningful symbols (Turner 2005). During an interaction, people interpret the gestures of a peer as a form of mutual role-taking, placing themselves in the role of the other. In order to have an efficacious exchange, individuals have a conversation with the intent of maintaining a smooth flow of communication. According to symbolic interactionists, through the active process of interactions and evaluations, people role-take and ultimately develop a solidified sense of self; individuals evolve through education and social exposure. They can then understand what others expect of them through the process of confirmation or disconfirmation. In all aspects of our lives, people are taught to abide by whatever the norms are through socialization. Individuals learn how to succeed in their community through the process of socialization. Daily interactions are critical in order to solidify a sense of self (Turner 2005).

Gestures are symbols of communication within human behavior. George Herbert Mead (1956) discussed vocal gestures as part of a common attitude, "one which all assume under certain habitual situations. Through the use of language…[and] significant

symbol…the individual does take the attitude of others…so that he finds himself taking the same attitude toward himself that the community takes" (Mead 1956:34). By communicating with one another, we expect to receive a particular response. Mead's theory asserts that individuals role-take and interpret mutual expressions; he coined the term *significant/conventional gestures*. People can put themselves in the other person's place, and ultimately anticipate the way that person will act. A huge component to interaction, he argues, is evaluation. People solidify their sense of self, based on the *social act,* or the idea that an individual is modified through the interactions with another. The self takes on the attitude of those around him/her, understanding the responsibilities of community life (Mead 1956). Although Mead didn't directly focus on emotions as influencing the self, his ideas can be utilized as a foundation for later theorists.

Erving Goffman (1959) utilized aspects of Mead's ideas, but Goffman focused more on the emotional approach to interactions. He looked at the cultural implications and causes for a change in the presentation of self. While Mead saw the individual as changing his/her presentation of self, based on how s/he sees others viewing him/her, Goffman looked at it through a larger societal context. Goffman (1959) was the founder of the dramaturgical approach of emotions. Dramaturgical theorists base their concepts on the idea that social interaction is like a theater with a script, stage, audience, and actors. The script is defined by the given culture, and all actors are acquainted with the norms, values, and beliefs encoded in a community. When people interact with one another, they are presenting themselves to the others as if the others are the audience members while also acting as audience members for others. Actors put on a performance based on how they want others to perceive them (Goffman 1974).

Goffman (1959) argued that true authentic interactions don't occur frequently. Rather, "the 'true' or 'real' attitudes, beliefs, and emotions of the individual can be ascertained only indirectly, through his avowals or through what appears to be involuntary expressive behavior" (Goffman 1959:1). Sometimes, an individual expresses him/herself in a specific manner simply because his/her group requires it. More often, though, people act and react according the rules because if every person expressed his/her emotions in each situation, there would constantly be discord. Goffman argued that although harmony is an optimistic ideal, it is not necessary. That being said, individuals are expected to suppress their emotions in order to optimize maximum cooperation. Hiding our true emotions with the goal of maintaining a cooperative communication level creates what Goffman called a *working consensus* (Goffman 1959:4). Working consensuses vary depending on the setting, but are understood to occur in all interactions.

While the dramaturgical approach attributes theater to our lives where the individuals are actors, people are also strategists, constantly interpreting their surroundings. Goffman (1959) viewed society through the lens of theatrical performance, looking at how "the individual in ordinary situations presents himself and his activity to others, the ways in which he guides and controls the impression they form of him, and the kinds of things he may and may not do while sustaining his performance before them" (Goffman 1959:1). People alter their mannerisms and expressions based on those around them. In Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience,* he discusses the *social frame,* when people regulate their interactions, deciding what is important and what should be excluded from conversation. Each social frame has rules;

people obtain *suppressible diversions,* or "comfort actions," keeping their "fronts in order," while concealing their genuine emotions (Goffman 1974).

Within these social frames, people strive to maintain *face.* In Goffman's (1955) article *On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction,* he described the term *face* as a "positive social value" that people project in order to maintain relationships with others. People *have face* when they uphold their values and beliefs, while being supported by external judgments. Those who maintain face feel confident, self-assured, and secure. But when a person loses face, s/he feels inferior, embarrassed, and ashamed. People strive to help one anther maintain face because "[they] are disinclined to witness the defacement of others" (Goffman 1955:227), wanting to avoid being considered heartless. People can save face through face-work, or social interactions, learning the codes and rules of their surroundings. They can avoid situations that jeopardize their face, or if their face is being threatened, they can attempt to rectify it.

Obviously, in every interactional experience, opinions are shared. But words can have many different meanings. If people were to listen to the words out of context, the words may be misconstrued. But, "ordinarily what the participants bring…of their past involvements to the current one, as well as context of gestures, other words, and objects in the current environment, combine to rule out all effectively different meanings" (Goffman 1974:441). The individual prejudges the situation so as not to offend others. However, Goffman recognized the feelings of limitations a person can feel when narrating a story due to the "obligatory limits definitionally associated with a particular frame…of everyday behavior" (Goffman 1974:573). This does not mean that a person is permanently half-concealed, but rather, constantly changing his/her behavior. Ultimately,

Goffman based his theory on gestures communicated among interactions within a larger structural and cultural context (Turner 2005).

To conclude a discussion of Goffman's (1955, 1959, 1974) understanding of emotions, it is important to mention his use of *expression rules,* as ways people mask their own feelings. The rules convince people to emote in a particular way because they want to control the impressions they give. This way, their colleagues will view them in a more favorable and positive light. In Goffman's terminology, actors must express appropriate emotions based on their audience; actors must understand the role they play and therefore, should emote to please the crowd (Goffman 1959). Later sociologists tested and extended these theories.

Presentation of Emotions: Feeling Rules

Arlie Hochschild (1975, 1979, 1983) utilized aspects of Erving Goffman's work while understanding the limitations of his theories; she thought Goffman's approach made people seem too passive. Goffman (1959) saw that actors were able to manage their outer impressions, but not their inner feelings. Rather than simply understanding the "tried-for outer appearances," it is crucial to understand the power of the social (Hochschild 1979). Hochschild supplements Goffman's argument by stating that appropriate emotion does not only mean one must abide by the rules, but it is actually the process of changing one's internal feelings (Hochschild 1983). Emotion is constantly subject to management; the individual works at self-inducing feelings to "render them 'appropriate' to a situation" (Hochschild 1979:551).

Hochschild's argument focuses on the idea that societies dictate the *emotion culture*, meaning the way people are supposed to feel in various situations. We can study

how social factors promote primary behaviors and feelings (nonreflective), but more effective is to examine *secondary acts* because humans are self-reflective creatures. Secondary acts are social factors that affect what people think and do about what they feel, rather than solely looking at how social factors affect their thoughts. In any situation, humans often "compare and measure experience against an expectation often idealized" (Hochschild 1979:565). Although we can live with some dissonance between the idealized and how we genuinely feel, it is uncomfortable so we try to reduce the discord based on our understanding of the feeling rules.

Hochschild (1979) coined the terms *display rules* and *feeling rules* as two types of emotional norms. Display rules refer to the idea that there are obligations as to how one should *express* emotions. For example, there is a display rule at weddings that brides should be natural and unforced, despite the fact that in actuality, weddings are very tiring occasions and the bride may be feeling uncomfortable and nervous. Feeling rules explain how one should *feel* and *experience* interactions. These feeling rules occur everywhere in society: in academic, personal, and work settings. They ultimately regulate the intensity of emotions, the direction (positive or negative) of the emotion, and the duration of the emotion. Social institutions create these rules, so if a person feels an emotion that is counter to the cultural norms, s/he must find a different way to express it (Hochschild 1983). For example, when people receive news of a death, they are excused and able to be emotional sometimes. After that period passed, they are expected to be fully present in their work and family lives again. People in power maintain the feeling rules, prescribing how everyone should view situations. Hochschild's feeling rules, like Goffman's

expression rules, essentially dictate the outward expressions people display (Turner 2005).

Hochschild (1983) interprets Mead's (1956, 1959) discussion of gestures by separating it into two elements: there is an exchange of *display acts*, or surface acting, as well as an exchange of *emotion work*, or deep acting (Hochschild 1979). Individuals surface act by shaping their outward emotions to deceive others. When people obey the display rules, they are surface acting because they consciously change their appearance, putting on a happy face, for example, to fit in with norms. Deep acting, on the other hand, occurs when people induce a real feeling within themselves (Hochschild 1983).

Supporting Hochschild's (1979, 1983) idea of surface acting, Cahill and Eggleston (1994) conducted research looking at how wheelchair users manage emotions in public. In conjunction with Hochschild, they found that wheelchair users act tactfully as to what emotions they portray because people instantly view them differently due to their physical handicap. Because they often find themselves in uncomfortable situations, they feel compelled to remain poised to reduce others' anxiety or tension. Wheelchair users "expressively mask their own emotions so as to manage others'" (Cahill 1994:304). Even when they feel angry, expression rules proscribe them from expressing anger; they put on a façade of indifference, but often this is solely a constructed appearance.

Hochschild's (1979) second element of gestures is *emotion work,* or *emotion management,* as a way for individuals to deal with cultural rules. People in each community struggle with their feelings and have feelings that don't fit the current situation, but are able to manage them through emotion work or emotion management. Emotion work explains the process people go through if their emotions are not in line

with cultural norms. It is the act of changing an emotion or feeling, but it refers to the effort put in, not necessarily the outcome. Hochschild clarifies that emotion work differs from control or suppression in that it works to shape feelings, rather than attempting to inhibit any feeling. It should be noted that emotion work can be done by the self for the self, by the self for others, or by others upon the self. There are three forms of emotion work people go through to better integrate into society: bodily, expressive, and cognitive. Bodily emotion work involves people changing their physiological responses to a situation, such as trying to breathe slowly. Expressive emotion work occurs when a person tries to change his/her gestures to try to change the genuine inner feelings, such as trying to smile. And lastly, cognitive work exists when a person thinks of previous experiences that bring up a particular emotion in order to exude the relevant emotion for the setting (Hochschild 1979).

Emotion work is most common when people confront emotion ideologies and rules and when people must express emotions that don't coincide with their authentic feelings. Although all people go through these various types of emotion work, Hochschild argues that if there is a constant dissonance between our authentic emotions and how we emote, we develop a sense of alienation and self-estrangement. She sees an increase of emotion work taking place in recent years, because our society maintains complex social systems with hierarchies of authority. Many careers, such as salespeople, flight attendants, and lawyers require the production of inauthentic emotions in order to please customers. People in these professions must elicit emotions in other people while exercising a high level of control over their own emotions (Hochschild 1983). People are

more likely to suppress their authentic emotions in industrial and postindustrial societies, because there is more pressure to abide by the script put upon us.

There have been minimal relevant empirical studies focusing on emotional authenticity and display rules, but a couple of studies pertinent to this research involve the public display of emotions and genuine emotions. Tsai, Knutson, and Fung (2006) focused on how cultural differences create varying levels of acceptability in emotional display. The authors introduced the affect valuation theory (AVT) that supports their predictions that ideal affect and actual affect differ. Additionally, cultural norms create the notion of ideal emotions, what Hochschild calls feeling rules. Ideal affects are of highest value; they are the societal goals for how we should feel.

An additional study (Matsumoto, Nakagawa, and Yoo 2008) tested two emotional regulation processes: reappraisal and suppression. Suppression occurs when a person inhibits his/her emotions in order to correctly conduct his/her expressions. Reappraisal, on the other hand, is when a person changes the content of his/her thoughts after expressing an emotion, and therefore, regulates his/her emotions. The authors found that in cultures stressing a high degree of social order, individuals tended to suppress their emotions. In cultures that did not emphasize social order, lower scores of suppression and reappraisal were more common. They also found that suppression inhibited strong relationships from forming.

As seen throughout the past century, it is common for people to suppress emotions and only emote according to societal rules. People go through emotional labor "to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others" (Hochschild 1983:7). Emotional labor allows

individuals to express emotions in an appropriate publicly observable state. As seen in the previously mentioned empirical studies (Matsumoto et al. 2008 and Tsai et al. 2006), people are actually encouraged to suppress their emotions, despite the negative outcomes it can create, emotionally and physiologically. Various studies have been completed testing bodily effects of suppression. Just one example is Petrie, Booth, and Pennebaker's (1998) study, drawing blood from participants to test the immunological effects of those who expressed their emotions compared to others who suppressed them. Participants who suppressed their emotional thoughts had reduced lymphocyte populations as well as an increase of the sympathetic nervous system activation. A decreased lymphocyte count results in a higher susceptibility to infection. They found that suppression does not have a strong effect short-term, but rather, changes in immune functionality can compromise health long-term.

There is also research on how mental health issues can occur due to suppression, not only affecting the individual, but also society. Thoits (1985) discussed the role of emotional deviance as a potential precursor to mental illness. When individuals act defiantly and are unable to manage their emotions, internal disturbances can occur. Not only that, but individuals are labeled by society if they act "differently." Using Pugliesi's (1981) study, Thoits concluded that: "emotional deviance…may play an important part in the recognition and labeling of mental illness" (Thoits 1985:225). It should be noted that Thoits used the term *mentally ill* loosely, including even mild disorders such as neuroses or situational stress reactions. In order to reduce the likelihood of being labeled as mentally ill, people try to express appropriate emotions, or induce proper feelings to display publicly.

Gender and Emotions

Theorists (Hochschild 1983; Pierce 1995; Shields 2002; Turner 2005) have varying opinions about how gender and emotions are correlated. According to Hochschild's (1983) normative theory, women are seen to be more emotional in society, but because of this, are also better able to manage their inner feelings than men. Women tend to do more emotional work because they have to maintain a positive attitude in service work. Additionally, women are more adaptive and cooperative than men, and they are seen as the caretakers who are more well-suited to care for the psychological needs of others who are unable to care for themselves, such as children (Hochschild 1983).

Arlie Hochschild (1983) discusses the idea that women are subordinated, but particularly in the nineteenth century, when women were highly dependent on their spouses, maintaining little power, authority, and status. Because they were of lower status, they used their feelings as a resource to offer and give in return to men for monetary income. The ideal emotion was and still is the *manly emotion*, or the well-managed display of emotions. In previous centuries, men could emote brutishness and inexplicable anger. According to Shields (2002), it is now ideal to have an emotional deficiency and suppress emotions as a man. For them, showing emotions questions their masculinity by exposing their vulnerabilities and feelings because those are signs of femininity and weakness. Although manly emotions are still seen to be ideal today, they are not seen as an innate quality of men, but rather something one should work towards. The socialization of acting "manly" has created a normalized ideal of how men should

act. Shields (2002) argues that the problem of inexpressivity is a problem imposed on men, generated by society.

Additionally, women are held to different standards in the same context as men regarding what is appropriate to express (Shields 2002). Women and men have different expectations for portraying their feelings and behaviors according to societal standards. Women are expected to express positive emotion to others, while men don't have any negative consequences if they choose not to show positive emotion. That being said, the idea that women are truly "more emotional" than men was questioned after William Kephart's (1967) study was completed. He found that some women use the expression of their emotions as a way to deliberately manipulate others. For example, these women knew that if they exhibited a large emotional response, like crying to their husbands, they would likely get a reaction that benefits them. Out of 250 students at UCLA, 45 percent of women and only 20 percent of men intentionally showed their emotions to get their way. The skill of displaying emotions has been investigated and some argue that women's emotions have been mislabeled as natural, rather than something they consciously create (Hochschild 1983).

Emotions are only valued if deemed "appropriate." Women see emotions, particularly anger, as upsetting because they think about the interpersonal aspect of relationships. Shields (2002) explains that when women express anger, it is received as a sign of instability. Because women are seen to be more emotional, their feelings are invalidated. Men, on the other hand, view anger as an uncontrollable emotion caused externally. If men express anger, one assumes there is a concrete cause and it is deemed

as rational. To them, emotion is acceptable if it is shown through "passion in the service of reason" (Shields 2002:118).

Emotions on College Campuses

Each environment and community maintains a certain emotion culture, meaning some emotions are more socially acceptable to convey than others. People are most content when their emotional reactions line up with reactions that are considered *normal*. While past research has explored the emotion culture of particular environments, there is little research completed on the emotionality of college students. Based on other research, we can predict that college students struggle with the expression of authentic emotion, as everyone else does. But college students have additional challenges because they are going through a major life transition.

An empirical study (Srivastava, McGonigal, Tamir, John, and Gross 2009) was conducted to examine expressive suppression, which is when one inhibits the overt expression of emotion. The study focused on an overwhelming and uncomfortable time, when students are transitioning to college. They found that not only does suppressing emotions impact internal experiences, but it also affects social functioning in the external world in three key ways. Firstly, it dissociates the person's "internal emotional experience" from others (Srivastava et al. 2009:895). Secondly, if the suppressor is unable to successfully suppress all undesired emotions, the others may feel as though s/he is being inauthentic, a concept called *leakage.* That being said, while suppressors struggle to form meaningful close relationships, they do not arouse negative emotions in others. And lastly, it has been shown that suppression is cognitively exhausting. If a person is spending time thinking about suppressing emotions, s/he may struggle to engage and

appropriately respond during social interactions. Suppression causes lower social support, a lesser ability to maintain close relationships, and a lower social satisfaction. Ultimately, expressive behavior is critical in interactions, so suppressing emotions inhibits the maintenance of social bonds.

Srivastava et al. (2009) mentioned John and Gross's (2004) study that explored how suppression affects relationships, finding that suppression tendencies decrease throughout adulthood. On the other hand, Srivastava et al. (2009) found that levels of suppression actually increase during transitional periods, such as college students, who are in the early maturation process of developing into adults. As both studies would suggest, the fact that these students are young may exacerbate the likelihood of suppression in this huge transitional phase (Srivastava et al 2009). This is likely due to the challenges that arise in new places, while being forced to develop a new social network. Upon arrival to college, individuals leave the safety net of their family and friends and enter into an unfamiliar world. During transitional periods "they [students] restructure their environments through selective and evocative transactions that, in turn, reinforce the individual differences that guided the restructuring" (Srivastava et al 2009:895). People who guard and hide their emotions may struggle to make close friends. But people who develop a few close relationships quickly will have fewer opportunities to share their feelings, which may "create an environmental feedback loop that serves to solidify and maintain the individual's initial tendency to suppress" (Srivastava et al 2009:895). Further research must be done to examine the mutually reinforcing results of suppression, especially in times of major life transition. Students may be terrified of attending college because change is frightening; new students don't know who to trust or

befriend. But in the midst of the stress, students put on and create a self in order to create a new identity.

By examining this stressful period of transition, my research focuses on observing feelings rules and the expression of emotions at two liberal arts colleges, Carleton College and Colorado College. Carleton College is particularly interesting for two reasons: in 2011, it was ranked second highest for alumni giving at 60 percent and in 2012, it was ranked the second happiest college in the country (Hopkins 2005). If we use Carleton's extraordinarily high rate of alumni giving as one indicator of students' happiness, we could predict that students enjoy their college experience and remember it long after graduation. As a student at Colorado College, I have heard outsiders perceive the students extremely happy compared to other campuses they have visited. Colorado College has also previously been ranked one of the top happiest schools in the nation.

Additionally according to US News Rankings (2012), both schools have extremely high retention rates for freshmen at 96 percent. Both colleges maintain pride with their high retention rates because it implies their students are happy. But despite the high ranking and reputation both have, it must be that not everyone is always happy. I am interested in uncovering, within these known-to-be happy colleges, how these college students really feel. Who is really happy and under what conditions? Where do people feel comfortable expressing certain emotions? Using Goffman's understanding of the presentation of self and Hochschild's explanation of feeling rules, what are these colleges really like and how do they compare? I am curious to see whether students feel as though they can openly express their emotions, or if the feeling rules on the respective campuses

inhibit them from doing so. I hope to have a better understanding of how students truly feel about their college experience at both Colorado College and Carleton College.

METHODS

I collected quantitative and qualitative data between January and February 2013, using a convenient sample of undergraduate students from two small liberal arts colleges, Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota and Colorado College in Colorado Springs, Colorado. I sent out a survey (Appendix A) to Carleton students by using their school listserv, the Noon News Bulletin. Chairs of randomly selected departments were also asked to send out the survey, and two were willing, history and sociology. I contacted friends through Facebook, asking for names of Carleton students who I then contacted directly. Other friends agreed to send out the survey to their Carleton friends and various listservs. To retrieve data at Colorado College, the same survey link (Appendix A) was posted on the Colorado College student listserv as well as Facebook. The survey generally took three to five minutes to complete.

Due to limited time and resources, it would have been difficult to seek a random sample. Therefore, these results cannot be generalized to the whole student population at these colleges. At the same time, a large number of students responded to the survey so the results are compelling. See Table 1 below for specifics of survey participants.

Table 1: Percents (n) of respondents

Class	**Carleton College**	**Colorado College**
Freshmen	10 (9)	20 (33)
Sophomore	12 (10)	13 (22)
Junior	37 (32)	19 (32)
Senior	41 (35)	48 (81)
Gender		
Female	71 (61)	79 (134)
Male	29 (25)	21 (34)
Total	100 (86)	100 (168)

In addition to the survey collected from 257 college students, I conducted six focus groups: three at Carleton College and three at Colorado College (See Appendices B and C). Participants were found among those who volunteered to participate by entering their contact information at the bottom of the survey. Although most focus group participants completed the survey, some had been invited by peers as well. Based on convenience and accessibility, the groups varied in size between two and seven students, with a total of 15 students from Colorado College and 13 students from Carleton College. They discussed the results of the survey as well as their opinions on the ways in which students emote on their college campuses. The survey data provided a foundation of knowledge on which to base the focus group questions, while the focus groups were opportunities to clarify and further understand the survey responses.

FINDINGS

Similarities between Colorado College and Carleton College

Students at both of these small liberal arts colleges expressed many similarities in their college experience. Firstly, all participants had similar reasons for attending their schools, such as the great sense of community and the welcoming atmosphere. They also, however, acknowledged the presence of a pressure to be happy, as well as a necessity and desire to avoid expressing negative[1] emotions in public. Finally, the last similarity was surprising because it varied from the literature: males and females were equally comfortable expressing every emotion except for happiness, where males felt less comfortable.

As the survey depicted and the focus groups reinforced, students at both colleges felt positive towards their campuses. Students felt immediately welcomed as they entered

[1] I use the term *negative* to mean emotions that are not accepted in the surrounding environment.

into these accepting communities. They were most enthused by the student communities, describing them as accepting, passionate, down-to-earth, quirky, intellectual, and unique. One senior from Carleton quoted a professor who said, "How can you have a place like this in a place like this?" talking about the idea that Carleton is a bubble of happy students despite the cold harsh winters and rural location. Others agreed that there is no single word to describe the whole student body. A Carleton College junior said: "People here are really themselves…they pride themselves in whatever they do, being different." While students at both schools felt their campus population was unique, they also agreed that being true to your own feelings and acting out-of-the-box was encouraged.

Pressure to be happy. Students at both colleges understood that people are supposed to be happy; both environments encourage them to portray happiness. While they were unable to pinpoint how or why they feel they should be happy, they knew that it was a "feeling rule," while also acknowledging that students are not judged if they are sad in most situations. Though it is not surprising, students agreed that at parties, people should be highly social and express constant excitement. One Colorado College senior explained that there is a social standard and it is not the norm to appear uncomfortable at a party. Of course, the purpose of any party is to socialize and have fun.

While this idea is common in non-college environments as well, what is notable is the type of pressure students expressed; older adults have pressures, but fewer are social. As one example, they are less likely to be peer pressured into attending a party if they are not feeling up for it, but rather, they may feel the need to go for other reasons such as impressing a boss. In college, for those who have friends who like to attend parties, it is more important to show you are having fun than to assert yourself and simply not go.

Some said they felt pressure to go out on weekends, regardless of whether they really wanted to. A senior Carleton student said:

> It is not appropriate to be sad on the weekends. No one wants to deal with you if you are sad person on the weekends so don't be sad. Just pretend you are happy and if you are at a party, don't cry. Even if I am sad, I still feel pressure to go out.

At the same time that students are creating their identities, they are also succumbing to social pressures in order to be a certain kind of person: happy and social. While students of all ages at both schools felt that pressure, it seemed more prevalent to the seniors at Carleton than the Colorado College seniors, most likely because the Carleton students are surrounded by their friends all four years rather than living off campus, as is more common at Colorado College. Carleton students expressed that it is easier to yield to pressure when friends physically surround them. Senior year is ultimately less distinct at Carleton due to the housing situation and therefore, they feel similar social pressures as they did freshmen year. It is important to note that when students' opinions varied on this, it was linked to their friends' group mentality. One junior at Carleton explained that her group of friends don't go to parties and rather, they enjoy "chill intimate nights with friends." Because this female has solidified her group of friends and none of them enjoy the party scene, they feel no pressure to attend parties.

There was discrepancy regarding where this pressure came from. Some thought it came from the idealized notion that college is supposed to be the best time of one's life. Participants were brought up knowing that they would attend college and many people talk about their college experience as the best years so far. Despite the hardships college students' experience, whether it is the fairly mundane rejection from a graduate school to a more serious death of a family member, they are supposed to put their issues aside and

put on a happy front. One Colorado College student explained that students can emote negative emotions for a few days, but then peers expect them to "get over it".

Additional pressure arose because students recognized that they are privileged to be able to attend college. One Colorado College senior said: "Being depressed is so stigmatized because everything seems so great in my life…everything should be working out for me, but why am I still unhappy? It doesn't make sense to me." Students felt upset when minor events, such as a break up or a failed test, inhibited them from fully engaging in the college experience. Others agreed that students' issues are downplayed and they are seen as ungrateful if they aren't happy. A Carleton College junior said that people think they should be taking advantage of every opportunity, while attempting to hide any unhappiness. So when there are only a few students who are struggling to find a place in their communities, others don't know how to react. As noted in the literature review, both colleges maintain high retention rates and on both campuses, very few students assert general unhappiness with the college as a whole. There is no research as to whether transfer rates are directly correlated to happiness, but we can infer that students are at least satisfied with their college experience due to the low transfer rates. A Colorado College sophomore said: "At this school, if you aren't happy, it's like, what's wrong with you?" A Carleton junior agreed:

> My friends who aren't happy feel imposed upon to be happy because everyone else is…people wonder why you wouldn't be happy. People complain about silly things like school and dining halls, but it's different when it's about being at Carleton. That's when people don't respond well. They don't know how to handle people who don't always love it.

Others at Carleton also acknowledged that due to the reputation of being at a happy school, students are always expected to be happy. A Colorado College senior agreed that

to be a part of the CC community, you must be outwardly expressing happiness. People struggle to know how to support those students who are not as excited and engaged with the college experience.

While it was unanimously agreed that the pressure exists, uncertainty remains as to where the pressure comes from. Some mentioned the role of the media and movies in our society as it dictates ideals of how we should and should not feel. One senior Colorado College student said that many movies, such as *Animal House* and *Accepted,* create an image that college students should be carefree and fun, painting a picture that for many, is simply untrue. Others described feeling the pressure from themselves. They want to be happy, simply because feeling sad is not a positive feeling. Students were asked to rank the top three most prevalent pressures they feel and according to survey results, pressure from "ourselves" was the highest; 33 percent of respondents selected that they felt pressure from themselves as one of their top three choices.

Symbolic interactionists would argue that the pressure people feel from themselves is formed through interactions. George Herbert Mead (1934) understood the self as reflexive, meaning that it is both a subject and an object. People experience themselves indirectly based on other peoples' perspectives.

> For he enters his own experience as a self or individual, not directly or indirectly, not by becoming a subject to himself, but only in so far as he first becomes an object to himself…and he becomes an object to himself only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment…in which both he and they are involved. (Mead 1934: 138)

In a time of transition, college students are trying to create positive experiences for themselves with a goal of creating a self. During this formation, students often succumb to the social pressures of attending parties even if they are feeling down; this is one way

of trying to feel positive about their experience. Regardless of whether students think they feel internal or external pressures, their genuine emotions are always experienced within the context.

Avoiding negative emotions in public. Students discussed a multitude of reasons to avoid expressing negative emotions, particularly sadness and anger. They claimed that it is usually acceptable to talk about these emotions with particular friends, but distinguished between talking about them versus acting on them. As supported by the literature, females in my focus groups expressed that they feared burdening others and were therefore likely to internalize their negative emotions. Students agreed that because others often seem happy, they didn't want to intrude on their happiness. They were afraid to make others unhappy by sharing their own unhappiness. It is understood that happiness can and should be expressed to others, while sadness should be kept to oneself; happiness is widely accepted, whereas sadness must be expressed only in specific areas and situations. One senior Colorado College student said that happiness is for the public sphere and sadness is for the private sphere. She thought that it was socially understood that if you are sad, you don't impose that on others. People who are feeling sad don't tend to vocalize their feelings. As one Colorado College senior said: "No one is running around yelling 'I'm just feeling mediocre!'" By suppressing their sad feelings, students are managing how others view them. A senior at Colorado College said: "It's impression management. I never want to be overly emotional in front of people. I think a lot of people feel that." This supports Goffman's (1955) idea of saving face. If students express too much emotion in public, they are losing face, which is highly undesirable. But if students avoid expressing their negative emotions, people will view them as happy,

which is the ideal emotion. While impression management occurs in all communities, there is a minor difference here. In college, students are starting over, beginning to recreate their selves as adults. In such a big time of transition, students are trying to create positive first impressions. Compared to big schools where there are many dining halls, academic buildings, and residence halls, these small colleges force students to interact intimately with the same small groups, over and over again. Therefore, maintaining positive impressions is crucial starting from day one of freshmen year,

In addition to avoiding the fear of burdening friends, people want to be self-reliant in the hopes that they can solve their problems by themselves. This creates a disconnect between how people are actually feeling and their outward expressions. A senior at Colorado College said:

> I can't be as authentic as I should be because I have to be there for other people who have other issues so I have to discount my own emotions because I have created this persona in my head. We have this expectation that we should be able to figure everything out…it is hard to admit we are not capable.

With ambitious, "go-getter" mentalities, students seemed to struggle with the idea of reaching out to others for external help and resources because it might show that they lack the ability to handle their own situations. Additionally, in college, students are developing into adults, striving to figure out when it is acceptable to ask for help.

Emoting negatively in public creates issues for the people involved as well as spectators. When someone expresses extreme emotion in public, others tend to make assumptions as to the causes behind their actions. One Colorado College senior said that she assumes it's really bad if someone can't hold back his/her

tears. In this context, participants made a distinction between anger and sadness, with anger being even less acceptable in public. Another Colorado College senior said that she gets very uncomfortable when people are angry because anger affects everyone nearby. Students simply don't know how to respond when someone is emoting negatively.

Gender and emotions among college students. Although previous research has explored the vast differences between genders emoting in family and work settings, my research on college campuses has shown otherwise. I was surprised to discover that amongst participants, males and females had similar responses regarding the emotions they felt comfortable expressing in certain locations. In the focus groups, males claimed that they felt comfortable expressing "most of the emotions in most of the places listed on the survey." A senior male at Carleton College explained that the difference in gender between expectations at Carleton is small. He attributed it to the fact that there are no frats or sororities so there was no pressure to be manly or girly. Liberal arts colleges seem to maintain a welcoming and open environment to those who want to express their individual emotions, regardless of gender.

The only emotion that showed statistically significant differences between genders was happiness, as seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Percent (n) comfortable expressing happiness by gender

Gender	With peers	With faculty	With opposite sex
Males	89 (53)	86 (51)	89 (53)
Females	97 (188)	95 (184)	97 (188)
Cramer's V	.141*	.138*	.141*

Determined using chi square test P values: * = <.05; ** =<.01; *** = <.001

It is intriguing that males felt less comfortable than females expressing happiness in these three situations: with peers, with faculty, and with the opposite sex. This is consistent with previous research. As the literature has shown, women tend to more openly express their feelings with others, whether positive or negative.

Emoting throughout Identity Formation at Colorado College and Carleton College

While many aspects of Colorado College and Carleton College are similar and there was minimal gender differentiation, an unexpected theme of difference arose: first-year students compared to all other students feared expressing some emotions in particular situations. For example, only 38 percent of freshmen were comfortable expressing sadness with faculty, one-on-one, compared to 66 percent of upperclassmen. Focus group participants tackled this finding, exploring some possible reasons why.

Supportive of the literature, students arriving at college tend to feel overwhelmed, self-conscious, and scared as they go through one of the biggest transitional phases of their lives. There is added pressure due to the image of the ideal freshmen, one who tries to appear strong and confident. In reality, incoming freshmen are very confused and timid; this dissonance provides further stress during an already difficult time. Students reminisced about their new student orientation period. One Colorado College freshman said, “I was so fucking scared, but you have to be on your game and you can’t show that.” Others claimed that they cried whenever they had a moment of free time. As a new student on campus, students felt vulnerable. They felt as though they should keep their opinions to themselves so as not to offend others; they were hyper aware of how they acted because they had no idea what the acceptable standards and norms were. This idea

is supported through Srivastava et al.'s (2009) study, which explained that students are likely to suppress their emotions during this distressing transitional phase.

The survey results correlated with what participants of focus groups explained about their freshmen year experiences. Freshmen are more timid when they arrive at college because they are trying to find the people with whom they can best connect. Showing sadness can be a sign of weakness, which freshmen try to avoid. A senior at Colorado College said: "There are a lot of rules freshmen year. You are at 'Camp College' and you don't cry at camp." Although we understand camp as a place for children to have fun while developing and growing, this comment is ironic. Many people cry at camp, just like many cry at college. Transitioning to college and leaving home to attend camp are similar in that people are forced to interact with and befriend strangers. Students discussed the prevalence of homesickness and they felt as though they should not express their homesickness because they didn't want to burden their friends with these emotions that could not be easily remedied. Others whose families lived near campus were able to quell their feelings of homesickness and therefore, also did not want to express their unhappiness to make others feel worse. The difference between college and camp is that at college, students are older and in the process of forming an adult self, discovering who they want to be and where they want to go with their lives. This added pressure creates a dynamic where sadness due to homesickness is even less acceptable.

Not only was sadness less expressed amongst freshmen, but they were also much less likely to display signs of anger in multiple settings, as described in Table 3.

Table 3: Percents (n) comfortable expressing anger by year

Year	Class	With peers	With opposite sex
Freshmen	21 (9)	60 (25)	57 (24)
Sophomore	59 (19)	91 (29)	81 (26)
Junior	30 (19)	75 (48)	77 (49)
Senior	39 (45)	84 (97)	80 (93)
Cramer's V	.226**	.234**	.195***

Determined using chi square test P values: * = <.05; ** =<.01; *** = <.001

On average, freshmen felt more uncomfortable expressing anger than any other student. While we know anger is frowned upon on an individual level, it also is on a larger scale. One Colorado College senior said: "There is a persona where if you are angry, you are so antithetical to the CC chill scene." Because anger makes spectators more uncomfortable than sadness, freshmen seemed unsure how to emote when they had angry feelings. Freshmen try to act as though they are always in control and to them, acting angry is a sign of lack of control. Additionally, freshmen relationships are fragile. Anger could push others away, as people tend to have negative reactions when witnessing a person acting angrily. While students are trying to build and develop relationships, they are unlikely to tell a peer that they are angry. A freshman at Colorado College said: "Expressing anger is something I don't want to do because I am making first impressions. Whether or not it is serious, people will think I am a bitch. So I am not going to talk to someone even if they piss me off." Freshmen are in the process of creating deep and meaningful relationships with some people, which is a challenge because they have only known each other for a short period of time. To add more obstacles, freshmen are trying to create themselves. From a symbolic interactionist perspective, freshmen monitor their actions and emotional expressions more than upperclassmen because they are in an earlier developmental stage of creating their self. Looking back at Table 3, there is, however, an unusual spike in the expression of anger with sophomores compared to all other students. This could be due

the fact that they have not yet figured out where or how they fit in to the particular college. They are in the challenging process of creating their own identity, but nothing has been solidified yet.

Throughout the college experience, students create connections with faculty and peers, which are the foundation to a comfortable environment where students feel more supported and less judged. Upperclassmen claimed that they could act more according to their feelings. One said: "It doesn't matter if I am supposed to be mad. I am mad!" Because they have strong relationships with both faculty and peers who know their typical dispositions, expressing anger is not an all-encompassing and generalizable emotion. Upperclassmen understand that if they express anger, they will not be abandoned or ridiculed. Seniors are confident that their relationships will hold strong through challenges and obstacles and are therefore more inclined to act in accordance to their feelings, while also understanding what is allowed in expected in particular environments.

Additionally, self-confidence tends to increase throughout college, when students recognize their college as "their place" where they can "do what they want." Upperclassmen said they were more inclined to express their opinions in class, taking initiative in their own education. They didn't fear saying the wrong thing to professors or in class. Similarly, through simple exposure and life experience, upperclassmen felt more comfortable expressing their emotions. The combined sense of belonging and the realization that they can succeed decreases the idea of an ideal throughout college. They felt more confident with who they are because they maintained more awareness of their identities, being mindful of what their emotions were influenced by; therefore, they were

more likely to know how to control them in a socially acceptable way. As one senior Colorado College student said: "Upperclassmen tend to settle in more to who we are and the habits we have. We know what to expect. We are more okay with who we are. We pursue what we want because we are aware of what we want." It was agreed that upperclassmen are able to be more honest with their emotions without worrying about negative repercussions as they are more at ease with their established group of friends.

CONCLUSION

Students at both colleges expressed their satisfaction with their overall experiences, feeling accepted and connected to faculty and peers. Students were fully aware of the challenges some face with regards to emotions, but most students seemed to have found a niche where they felt comfortable acting in conjunction with their emotions. Although there was little variance between the two colleges and between men and women, it was clear that there was a striking difference in the way freshmen felt and acted compared to other students.

Another distinction arose in my research, creating an interesting nuance to Srivastava et al.'s (2009) study. There was an influx of emotional expressivity of anger during sophomore year. See Table 4.

Table 4: Freshmen vs. Sophomore emotional expressivity

Freshmen	Sophomores
Suppression of sadness	Expression of anger
Recipients of information	Responders to information
Transition period	Maturation period (early)

Freshmen suppress their emotions in fear of projecting a negative image of themselves onto others. In the early transition process, they receive information, gain knowledge, and learn standards from their surroundings, causing them to be more inclined to suppress

their emotions while in the new environment. Sophomores, on the other hand, feel more comfortable expressing negative emotions, and they have not likely figured out when and where one should emote negatively.

The word "sophomoric" has a noteworthy parallel to understanding the behavior of sophomores. According to the Merriam Webster Dictionary, sophomoric is an adjective describing one who is "conceited and overconfident of knowledge but poorly informed and immature" (Merriam-Webster 2013). This seems like an accurate description of students in their second year of college who realistically don't yet know who they are, but are rebelling against what they have been taught as freshmen. For example, sophomores have evolving friend groups and aren't academically situated (i.e. no major declared yet etc). Additionally, sophomores have less institutionalized support than freshmen but feel overly confident that they know what the social standards are. This may be a cause for the anger that erupts sophomore year.

While some suppression may be necessary for success, freshmen seem to suppress too frequently, while sophomores display an abundance of negative emotion, even in inappropriate settings. After sophomore year, juniors and seniors settle into the college routine, trusting their friends, creating relationships with faculty, and establishing their academic interests. They have ultimately reached a more balanced sense of identity and self, reacting to events more appropriately. Therefore, we do not see a slow process of maturation (John and Gross 2004) throughout the four years, but rather suppression of sadness followed by a brief period of lack of suppression through anger (Srivastava 2009). Furthermore, my research has illustrated the rapid emotional change that occurs

during sophomore year, which eventually stabilizes as students progress through the identity formation process.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Because my research is limited, future research should be conducted to examine other colleges to verify that many of these findings can be generalized. In particular, it would be interesting to explore bigger schools and women's colleges, where there may be different standards and "feeling rules." Additionally, military schools may enhance this research because individual identities are destroyed and intentionally recreated by the institution itself.

The idea of emotion management could also be linked to higher education literature. By having a deeper understanding of the types of emotional stress students feel each year, high education institutions would be better able to serve the needs of students. For example, advisors may be needed during times throughout college that are not yet known. Based on my research, one could infer that sophomores may require more support than they are receiving.

And lastly, looking at the research regarding how freshmen and sophomores emote negative emotions, future studies could explore how misconduct on college campuses is impacted. How do misconduct issues differ between the various years of college? What are the causes behind acting against societal rules? Who is most likely to causes issues on college campuses? This study would help college administration foster a deeper understanding of student misconduct concerns.

REFERENCES

Cahill, Spencer E. and Robin Eggleston. 1994. "Managing Emotions in Public: The Case of the Wheelchair Users." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57: 300-12.

Goffman, Erving. 1955. "On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction." Pp. 224-249, edited by B. G. Blount. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie R. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85: 551-75.

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

Hopkins, Katy. 2011. *Alumni's Top 10 Most Loved Schools: More Graduates Show Their School Spirit with Donations at these Schools than at any Others.* Retrieved on December 26 2012. http://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/2011/09/15/alumnis-top-10-most-loved-schools

John, Oliver P. and James Gross. 2004. "Healthy and Unhealthy Emotion Regulation and the Dynamics of Feelings: Personality Processes, Individual Differences, and Lifespan Development." *Journal of Personality* 72: 1301-1334.

Matsumoto, David, Seung Hee Yoo and Sanae Nakagawa. 2008. "Culture, Emotion Regulation, and Adjustment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94: 925-37.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1956. *The Psychology of George Herbert Mead.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 2013. Merriam-Webster, Inc. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sophomoric

Petrie, Keith J., Booth, Roger J., and James Pennebaker. 1998. "The Immunological Effects of Thought Suppression." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75: 1264-72.

Pfuetze, Paul E. 1954. *Self, Society, Existence.* New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Pierce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Salmela, Mikko. 2005. "What is Emotional Authenticity?" *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior.* Helsinki: University of Helsinki Finland.

Shields, Stephanie A. 2002. *Speaking From the Heart: Gender and the Social Meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, Kevin. 2012. "Colorado College President's Double Duty Benefits Class." *The Denver Post,* February 19.

Srivastava, Sanjay, Maya Tamir, Kelly M. McGonigal, Oliver P. John and James J. Gross. 2009. "The Social Costs of Emotional Suppression: A Prospective Study of the Transition to College." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96: 883-97.

Thoits, Peggy A. 1985. "Self-Labeling Processes in Mental Illness: The Role of Emotional Deviance." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 221-49.

Tsai, Jeanne L., Brian Knuston, and Helen H. Fung. 2006. "Cultural Variation in Affect Valuation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90: 288-307.

Turner, Jonathan H. 1999. "Toward a General Sociological Theory of Emotions." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 29: 133-61.

Turner, Jonathan H., and Jan E. Stets. 2005. *The Sociology of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

US News and World Report. 2011. *10 Colleges with the Most Alumni Donors.* Retrieved January 21, 2013. http://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/the-short-list-college/articles/2012/12/18/10-colleges-with-the-most-alumni-donors

US News and World Report. 2012. *Freshmen Retention Rates.* Retrieved on January 21, 2013. http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities/freshmen-least-most-likely-return

APPENDIX A

Survey for Colorado College and Carleton College Students

You are being invited to participate in my research study looking at the emotion culture at liberal arts colleges. The survey should take 5-10 minutes. There are no known or anticipated risks. If necessary, please skip any question that you feel you cannot answer. By completing the survey, you are indicating your consent.

1. Where do you attend school:
    a. Carleton College
    b. Colorado College
2. Year:
    a. Freshman
    b. Sophomore
    c. Junior
    d. Senior
    e. Other: _____
3. Gender:
    a. Male
    b. Female
    c. Other: _____
4. Race (circle all that apply):
    a. White/Caucasian
    b. Black/African American
    c. Hispanic
    d. Asian/Asian American
    e. American Indian or Alaska Native
    f. Other: _____
5. Major
    a. Sociology
    b. Anthropology
    c. Religion
    d. History
    e. English
    f. Sociology
    g. Psychology
    h. Political Science
    i. Environmental Science
    j. Undeclared
    k. Other: _____
6. Please only answer if you are on your college campus: On a scale from 1 to 10, please rank how happy you are today (1=miserable, 5=content, 10=I have never felt so happy!).
7. Please only answer if you are on your college campus: Are you happier today than usual?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Don't know

8. On a scale from 1 to 10, please rank how happy you think students (on average) are at your college (1=miserable, 5=content, 10=I have never felt so happy!).
9. In the table below, please check the boxes of which emotions you think are acceptable to express in each location.

	Dorm room/apartment	Class	With peers	With faculty (one on one)	At a party	With a person of the opposite sex
Happiness						
Joy						
Sadness						
Fear						
Anger						
Disgust						
Love						

10. Who dictates how we should feel on college campuses? Rank top 3.
    a. Friends
    b. Professors
    c. Classmates
    d. Ourselves
    e. No one
    f. Other: _____
11. Do you tell people you are happier than you genuinely are?
    a. Never
    b. Rarely
    c. Sometimes
    d. Often
    e. All the time
    f. N/A
12. Do you suppress your genuine emotions?
    a. Never
    b. Rarely
    c. Sometimes
    d. Often
    e. All the time
    f. N/A
13. Do you think other students say they are happier than they genuinely are?
    a. Never
    b. Rarely
    c. Sometimes

   d. Often
   e. All the time
   f. N/A
14. Do you think students suppress their genuine emotions?
   a. Never
   b. Rarely
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often
   e. All the time
   f. N/A
15. Who do you think can more acceptably express their genuine emotions?
   a. Females
   b. Males
   c. Both
   d. Neither
16. Do you ever foresee yourself giving the college money post-graduation?
   a. Definitely will not
   b. Probably will not
   c. Don't know
   d. Probably will
   e. Definitely will

Thank you for taking my survey! I will be visiting Carleton College on February 19th. If you are interested and willing to participate in a focus group pertaining to the questions in this survey, please type your email below and I will contact you. There will be a draw for 1 $20 gift card for people who participate in a focus group. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact me at lauren.schneider@coloradocollege.edu.

Email: _____

APPENDIX B

Focus Group Questions For Colorado College Students

I also plan to explain Hochschild's theory on "feeling rules" and the idea that in our society, we have certain ways we are supposed to act, due to societal norms.

1. Why did you decide to attend Colorado College?
2. Do you think students at CC are genuinely happy? Why or why not?
    a. Do you think we are, on average, happier than most college students? Why?
3. Has CC lived up to your expectations academically and socially? How?
    a. How does CC support you in you academics and extra curricular activities?
4. After hearing about feeling rules, can you explain to me what you think the feeling rules are at Colorado College?
    a. Were you aware of these before you came or has your awareness of the feeling rules changed throughout your time here?
    b. Are there emotions that are simply unacceptable to display in public? (*I will have a better idea after my survey is sent out).*
    c. Do you think freshmen have a different idea of what the emotional 'norms' are on campus versus the seniors? Why or why not?
    d. Do you think students display inauthentic emotions regularly? If so, why do they feel the need to do that?
5. Who defines the feeling rules at CC and why?
6. Why do you think CC has acquired the name "Camp College?"
    a. How are we unique in the way our students feel and express emotions?
7. How do you think students abide by or resist these feeling rules?
8. (*In 2012, 18% of alumni gave back to the school. This is ranked last place in the other 19 "peer schools").* Have you thought about giving to CC after graduation? Why or why not?
    a. How do you think the low alumni giving rate is connected to emotion rules and feelings about one's time at CC?

APPENDIX C

Focus Groups Questions For Carleton College Students

1. Why did you decide to attend Carleton College?
    a. Were you aware the Carleton College was ranked #2 in Newsweek in 2012 for the happiest college in the nation?
        i. If so, did that influence your decision to come here (only applicable if talking to freshmen)?
        ii. Does it deserve that title? Why or why not?
2. Do you think students at Carleton are genuinely happy? Why or why not?
3. Has Carleton lived up to your expectations academically and socially? How?
    a. How does Carleton support you in you academics and extra curricular activities?

I am going to share some of the results of the survey. I also plan to explain Hochschild's theory on "feeling rules" and the idea that in our society, we have certain ways we are supposed to act, due to societal norms.

4. After hearing about feeling rules, can you explain to me what you think the feeling rules are at Carleton College?
    a. How/when were you aware of these feeling rules?
    b. Are there emotions that are simply unacceptable to display in public? (*I will have a better idea after my survey is sent out)*.
    c. Do you think freshmen have a different idea of what the emotional 'norms' are on campus versus the seniors? Why or why not?
    d. Do you think students display inauthentic emotions regularly? If so, why do they feel the need to do that?
5. Who defines the feeling rules at Carleton and why?
6. How is Carleton unique in the way our students feel and express emotions?
7. How do you think students abide by or resist these feeling rules?
8. Are you aware that 60% of graduates give back to Carleton? (*In 2008, they were ranked #1 for alumni giving rate at 63%).* Have you thought about giving to Carleton after graduation? Why or why not?