

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY

WHY CAN'T WE BE FRIENDS?
AN INVESTIGATION OF CONFLICT BETWEEN COLLEGE ROOMMATES

ALEXA ECHEVARRIA
SUMMER 2016

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Criminology and Psychology
with honors in Criminology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Dr. Richard Felson
Professor of Criminology
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Stacy Silver
Professor of Sociology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

I studied conflicts with roommates experienced by college students. The analyses are based on a survey of 193 students (73 male, 98 female) who were asked how often conflicts occurred and what happened during the conflicts with their roommates. To my knowledge, this is the first study examining conflicts between college roommates. I examined variables that predicted whether respondents had grievances, whether they expressed their grievances, and whether they expressed anger during the conflict. The study focused on the following variables: gender, the subject of grievances, the involvement of alcohol, and whether or not there was third-party mediation. Results suggested that women report having grievances with their roommate without voicing them more often than men, and that the subject matter of grievances does not significantly vary between genders. The most common conflicts between both genders had to do with cleanliness. It was also found that the presence of alcohol increased the likelihood of verbal aggression during a conflict once a grievance was expressed. It was also found that third-party were more likely to mediate when anger was openly expressed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	3
The Expression of Grievances	3
Gender	6
Involvement of alcohol	11
Third-Party Mediation	12
Chapter 3 Data and Methods	14
Sample	14
Justification of Sample	14
Measures	15
Chapter 4 Results	19
Univariate Statistics	20
Involvement of Alcohol	21
Instances of peer mediation	21
Frequency of grievances and anger	22
Presence of aggression	23
Presence of anger	24
Bivariate Statistics	25
Gender and frequencies of grievances and anger	25
Gender and aggression	27
Gender and subject of grievance	29
Alcohol and presence of aggression	30
Mediation of a third-party and expression of anger	31
Mediation of third-party and involvement of alcohol	32
Chapter 5 Discussion	34
Univariate Results	34
Bivariate Results	37
Gender	37
Involvement of alcohol	39
Third-party mediation	39
Implications for future research	40

Appendix A T-test: gender and frequencies of grievance42
BIBLIOGRAPHY 44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Frequency of subject grievance.....	20
Table 2.1: Frequency of alcohol involvement in voiced and unvoiced grievances.....	21
Table 3.1: Frequency of third-party presence and mediation.....	21
Table 4.1: Frequencies of grievance expression and anger presence.....	22
Table 5.1: Frequencies of aggressive responses.....	23
Table 6.1: Frequency of expression of anger in voiced grievance.....	24
Table 7.1: Frequency of voiced and unvoiced grievances in the last six months by gender.....	25
Table 7.2: Frequency of respondent and roommate becoming angry at each other in the last six months by gender.....	25
Table 8.1: Presence of physical aggression by gender.....	27
Table 8.2: Presence of aggressive behavior in respondent's roommate by gender.....	28
Table 9.1: Subject of grievance by gender (voiced).....	29
Table 10.1: Involvement of alcohol by instance of verbal aggression.....	30
Table 10.2: The expression of anger by the involvement of alcohol.....	31
Table 11.1: Presence of anger by mediation of a third-party.....	31
Table 11.2: Involvement of alcohol by mediation of a third party.....	32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Richard Felson, for his invaluable time and guidance throughout this process. For help throughout my undergraduate career and experience with the honors college, I would like to thank Dr. Stacy Silver who profoundly taught me the fundamentals of writing a thesis. I would also like to thank my mother and father for their support and their belief in me.

Chapter 1

Introduction

To my knowledge, conflict between college-age roommates is an area that has never been studied in the literature on the conflicts of cohabiters. A majority of the literature concerning cohabiters is focused on cohabiting couples in romantic relationships. My research focuses on grievances and conflicts specifically pertaining to college-aged students cohabiting with one or more roommates either in an apartment or dormitory setting. The primary goal of this research is to investigate causes behind roommate conflicts, the frequency of grievances (both voiced and unvoiced) in roommate relationships, and common behaviors during these voiced grievances. Variables measured include but are not limited to: 1) the frequency of conflict the participant experiences with their roommates in the course of the last six months; 2) a more detailed view of one specific instance where a grievance was voiced directly to the roommate; 3) whether or not anger was expressed during this voiced conflict; 4) one instance where the grievance was not voiced to the roommate; 5) whether or not the incident was followed by threats, physical violence, verbal violence, or forms of direct or indirect aggression; 6) and finally situational factors concerning a specific instance when a roommate conflict occurred such as whether or not alcohol was involved or if there was a third-party present during the incident.

While research concerning the conflicts of cohabiting couples is quite salient and extensive, the research concerning the conflicts and grievances of cohabiting college-age roommates is sparse. The college age is unique in the fact that it is generally the bridge between dependency and adult responsibilities. The alcohol rates among the college student population

has also been found to be quite high, with two out of five students being classified as “heavy drinkers”, with heavy drinking being defined as having more than five drinks in a row in the past two weeks (O’Malley and Johnston 2015). The combination of the lack of parental supervision, the culture of alcohol, and new social situations encountered by a college student with mostly peers of their own age provides a unique environment to observe the behavior of those students living with each other for the first time.

Through analyzing the results of the present study I hope to answer the following questions: 1) How does the frequency of voiced versus unvoiced grievances differ in roommate relationships? 2) In what cases do those that are voiced include an anger response from either party? 3) Does the gender of the respondent or his/her roommate have an effect on whether or not a grievance is voiced or whether anger is expressed? 4) Is there a difference between genders in the content of the grievance? 5) Does the presence of alcohol and/or a third-party have an effect on the severity of the outcome of said conflict? By answering these questions, further research may obtain a better understanding of the unique relationship between cohabiting college-age roommates.

The findings of this research could be used to discover methods of resolving roommate conflicts, and may give mental health professionals working with this population more knowledge about these situations. This research could be helpful to make the transitioning process from high school to college a smoother one by giving resident assistants and university counselors more useful and functional resources for their students to use if experiencing negative roommate relationships. By shedding light on this topic, the ease into college life for a student may become more seamless. Investigating the circumstances when a person chooses whether or not to voice a grievance could allow professionals to teach students or university staff how to

appropriately voice these grievances instead of letting them build up to an outburst. Discovering why people will choose to voice these grievances or remain silent could add to the knowledge of what would be worth fighting about. It would also be pertinent to find gender differences in these results as to offer different services for female roommates as compared to male roommates. The specificity of this particular college-age population will help to potentially introduce new and valuable insight as to underlying differences that conflicts of cohabiting college students may have from those of the rest of the population.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The Expression of Grievances

The transition to college life is a significant source of stress in the life of a college student, especially a first-year student (Ross 1999). In the same study, it was found that 61% of those students surveyed concerning common stressors reported roommate conflict as a source of stress. Since there is little modern research investigating the nature of roommate relationships or conflicts within them, this present study will help shed light on the factors that can affect the outcomes and nature of these interpersonal conflicts as to help to reduce instances of these conflicts in the future or lessen the severity of the outcome.

There are many sources of stress in the college roommate relationship, and whether or not the sources of these grievances are voiced or unvoiced to a respective roommate depends on

a variety of factors. In a study by Ross (1999) which surveyed 100 college students (20 males, 80 females) concerning common sources of every-day stress, it was reported that 71% of those who responded listed financial difficulties as a significant source of stress in their lives, and 50% listed “messy living conditions” as a source of stress. Although these items were asked on an individual level and not how they are related to conflict, like problems organizing the paying of bills and rent, these percentages imply how concerned they are for the following items, with financial stressors ranking slightly higher in this particular study. Knowing this, one might expect there to be conflicts more often involving topics that students are more stressed about.

Through many of these stresses and interactions with others, conflict is almost inevitable. One of the theories that implies stress as a reason for conflict is the frustration-aggression approach of conflict and violence. Berkowitz revised the original theory of frustration-aggression, originally proposed by Dollard in 1939, by suggesting that aggression results from the interaction between an emotional state, and cues from one’s environment (Berkowitz 1989). Berkowitz describes frustration as the interference of a goal due to an external factor, and according to the theory an aggressive response is predicted to follow the implication of this barrier. Conflict between cohabiting roommates can commonly be seen as two individuals fighting for their own best interests with another individual blocking the result. In terms of the current research, the subject matter of the conflict can signify a blocked goal or a source of frustration that may provoke the participant into becoming angry. The frustration-aggression approach can help to explain why certain subjects of grievances result in the voiced expression of the grievance and others do not. It can also help explain why whether or not anger would be present in the voiced expression of the grievance.

The whether or not a grievance is voiced can also be determined by the cost of expressing said grievance. If the problem is something petty, an individual may choose to remain silent, although they are bothered by the event. Those who choose not to express grievances could be afraid of ruining a relationship with their roommate (Tedeschi & Felson 1994). Given this rationalization of either action or inaction, the results of the present study can add data to which types of grievances are worth voicing and which are not. This way, different subjects of stressors can be assigned their own amount of importance. One other concept to better understand why someone may or may not have voiced a grievance to their roommate can be seen through the “straw that broke the camel’s back” phenomenon, stated by Tedeschi and Felson (1994). This suggests that the last minor injustice that the grievant experiences may be enough for them to evoke a strong response. This could happen after a long and enduring series of grievances when the grievant simply “snaps” and lashes out against the source of the grievance. This is similar to components of the frustration-aggression hypothesis that suggest that the build up of frustrations in this manner will lead the grievant to lash out against their offender (Dollard 1939).

Another theory concerning whether or not a person chooses to express a grievance is the rational choice theory originally proposed by Cornish & Clarke (1987). This theory proposes that when deciding to commit a crime the actor will calculate the potential costs and benefits of that action. This is applied by Tedeschi and Felson (1994) to reasons for why an actor may become aggressive toward another person- there is a decision to become aggressive after a weighing of consequences. In this decision, the actor may use past experiences in order to determine whether or not taking action and voicing the grievance is worth it. The grievant could be afraid of backlash if the grievance is voiced.

Social factors also may lead a particular individual to voicing or not voicing a complaint. If a grievance is not voiced, the grievant could feel that they are not standing up for themselves, and the voicing of the complaint is a type of “face-saving” used to defend the pride of the grievant. On the contrary, displaying the voiced grievance may be seen to violate politeness norms, especially if anger or aggression is openly displayed. This may cause a grievant to refrain from saying anything to the person causing it (Tedeschi & Felson 1994).

By studying the actions used throughout the conflict and afterward, the subject matter of the conflict, and the emotional responses from the students has on the outcomes of various conflict, we can better understand what affects the likelihood of whether or not a grievance is expressed or if the grievant chooses to remain silent. Knowledge of the content of grievances can also help to shed light on unique stresses of living together, and how conflicts between people who live together may differ from conflicts involving those who do not live together.

Gender

Also included in this study is the independent variable of gender, used to see the effect that gender may have on the various dependent variables in this study. Items to be measured against gender include the general frequency of whether or not a grievance is voiced or not, the frequency of anger expression between roommates, the instances involving alcohol that have a voiced and unvoiced complaint, third-party intervention when a complaint is voiced, and the subject matter of conflict in both voiced and unvoiced instances. Males and females may have a different outlook on appropriate times and ways to express grievances than males because of gender socialization.

Brougham et al. (2009) surveyed a sample of 166 college men and women, in an effort to discover common sources of coping mechanisms between males and females. The study found that females reported an overall higher level of stress than their male counterparts. Females in the study also used a greater amount of emotion-focused coping strategies than the males. Common coping mechanisms in females included expressing one's feelings, seeking emotional support, and positive reframing. It was also found that a common method of emotion-focused coping found among men was disengagement through the use of alcohol. Looking at the results of these previous findings it seems that females are more likely voice their complaints when confronted with a problem in an attempt to solve it.

A similar result can be found in a study by Hudd et al. (2000) in a survey concerning stress in college-age students and certain ways these students experienced stress. One finding replicated the result from the Brougham et al. (2009) study that found that females are more likely to experience frequent stress than males, with 63.8% of females who answered the survey reporting frequent stress experienced. Of the males who answered the survey, only 36.3% of them reported experiencing frequent stress.

Males have been typically found to be more stoic creatures (Addis & Mahalik 2003), refraining from outward emotional expression toward others. In many cultures, one of the only emotions that a male can appropriately express is anger (Jansz 2000). Stoicism is culturally an integral part of the male culture, with a male not wanting to voice his complaints and to "deal with it". This social demand for stoicism could affect whether or not a respondent's complaint or grievance is voiced toward a roommate. Men are typically applauded in society for their toughness and hardiness, with those traits being integral parts of the construct of masculinity. This has also been seen to reduce the likelihood of help-seeking behaviors in men (Addis &

Mahalik 2003). Instead of outwardly expressing a complaint to his roommate, which may suggest a weakness, he may choose to remain silent.

Women, on the other hand, are generally perceived to complain more often than men (Boxer 1996). This could be seen in the present study as women having a higher instance of voicing their complaints to their roommates. Another norm present in the socialization of women is the norm of politeness and conflict aversion (Holmes 2013). This standard for being polite is held in higher regard for women, and if seen violating this norm a woman could be seen as not being “lady-like”. When presented with a potential conflict, as indicated by voicing a complaint, women may refrain from engaging in this behavior out of fear that they are seen as being too aggressive. These two behaviors of women may conflict with each other, and have an effect on the overall results of the study.

There have also been numerous studies concerning why women and men may complain respectively. Wolfe and Powell (2006) conducted a study to determine the instrumental reasons why men and women would complain in certain situations and when they would complain. In a small sample of nine participants in three different discussion groups, instances of complaining were monitored among these three groups throughout the course of an elaborative writing project. Following the project, two conversations of thirty minutes in length were observed by the experimenters and it is in these time periods where instances of complaints were recorded. It was found that the women in the study tended to complain in order to indirectly request an action, whereas males would complain with the purpose to excuse their own behavior or make themselves seem superior. This particular study, however, found that the frequency of complaining in general did not vary between men and women. One weakness of this particular study is that the sample size was incredibly small to generalize this result to the entirety of one

gender or another. In the present study, the instances of the two genders who voice and do not voice a complaint and for what reason will be reached with a greater number of respondents, therefore increasing the study's internal validity.

Previous research has also demonstrated differences in aggressive responses between genders, with regards to both indirect and direct forms of aggression. There is evidence, however, that females are more likely to use indirect aggression while males typically use direct aggression. Items on the questionnaire of the current study inquire whether or not actions were used during the conflict such as name-calling, threats (both physical and not physical), physical force, and whether or not the participant or their roommate was ignoring one another. In a study by Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992) children and teenagers in different cohorts with groups ranging from ages eight, eleven, and fifteen were rated on their personal aggressive behaviors through peer nominations and self-ratings. Based on these results it was found that females more often used forms of indirect aggression in all age groups. The results suggest that these forms of indirect aggression were already quite prominent in the eleven-year-olds. The groups that most commonly responded with listing direct forms of aggression were males of all age groups.

Although the present study concerns college-age students, there has been other evidence showing that this trend tends to be present in older populations as well. In a study by Bjorkqvist, Österman, and Lagerspetz (1994) the researchers attempted to see if adult males exhibited more forms of indirect aggression than they did in adolescence. The previous study demonstrated a gradual development in the instance of indirect aggression throughout female development, and researchers were curious to see if a similar change occurred in males since males typically develop later than females. In this study, 333 employees, (162 males and 176 females) at a

particular company were given a work-harassment scale created by the researchers to complete, with the subscales concerning rational-appearing aggression. Rational-appearing aggression was considered by the researchers to be a more direct form of aggression and included behaviors such as interrupting and criticizing, and social manipulation being the main concern. The results of the study found that women were more likely to exhibit social manipulation and males were more likely to exhibit rational-appearing aggression. This population, again, does not directly address the college-age population and includes a sample of adults of varying ages. However; due to the consistencies between this study and the previous study I assume it is safe to assume that males and females of the college-age population will exhibit behaviors consistent with either age group. This can be seen from results that both adolescent, teen, and adult females will be more likely to exhibit indirect forms of aggression and that adolescent, teen, and adult males will be more likely to exhibit more direct forms of aggression.

Concerning the trends of general aggression, there has been some debate as to whether or not one group has a greater propensity for general aggression than the other. Instances of general aggression include both direct and indirect forms. In a meta-analysis comparing the frequency of general displays of aggression between genders, it was found that there is no statistically significant difference in the frequency of aggression between males and females (Hyde 1984). 5% of the variation in aggression scores were due to gender differences, meaning that 95% of variation was due to within-gender variation. This contrasted the result found by Maccoby and Jacklin (1976) that concluded that gender differences in aggression are “well-established”.

Specifically, with regards to aggression as a result of provocation, a study by Bettencourt and Miller (1996) observed the difference between males and females as to aggressive situations without provocation as compared to situations with provocation. It was found that under

controlled and unprovoked circumstances, men were more likely to exhibit aggressive behavior, but under conditions where each participant was provoked, the gender difference in this area decreased. In other words, when under threat women became just as likely as men to respond using aggression.

Involvement of Alcohol

Links between alcohol and aggression have already been made in previous research and literature. An example of one of these theories is one by Pernanen (1976) which proposes that alcohol decreases the number of cues to which a person can attend. This, in turn may affect the intoxicated individual's perception of the situation and cause them to act aggressively. Other theories such as by Chermack and Taylor (1993) suggest that those individuals who are intoxicated register only the most salient cues which, more often than not, are those that would warrant an aggressive response. It can also be suggested that inhibitory cues are more easily ignored than those cues that would provoke an aggressive response, and this is why there would be more of an instance of aggression in those that were intoxicated.

An experiment by Zeichner and Pihl (1979) was done concerning whether or not a sober or intoxicated participant would back down from a conflict based on the severity of the consequences if they engaged. Seventy-two participants ages 18-35 were randomly assigned to one of six conditions, with one third of them being assigned to a condition of drinking alcoholic beverages, another third of the participants being assigned to drinking a placebo, and the final third receiving no beverage at all. Following this the participants were asked to shock a false confederate. Within the conditions of drinking, individuals would be provided with aversive

contingencies that were either equaling their initial force or of a random contingency. The study found that the inebriated group was significantly more aggressive than the non-inebriated group. Not only that, but it was also found that there was no difference in severity of response between the two conditions of aversive contingency in the inebriated group. It was proposed that this ignorance of consequences of being aggressive was because alcohol disrupted information processing and hindered the evaluation of potential consequences of one's actions.

In a meta-analysis analyzing 49 studies by Ito, Miller, and Pollock (1996), along with the effects that alcohol has on an individual's inhibitory controls, the study also looked at the effect alcohol had on social psychological moderating variables that could play a role when it came to the increase of aggression in the presence of alcohol. The three variables observed were provocation, frustration, and self-focused attention. Through the analyses it was found that the aggressiveness in an intoxicated person increased as a function of frustration, which again is defined as the blocking of one's goal-directed behavior. However; aggressiveness of an intoxicated individual was found to decrease as a function of provocation and self-focused attention.

Third-Party Mediation

There have been multiple studies investigating the effect of a third-party present during a conflict and its severity, and when the third party may intervene in a positive or negative manner. Borden and Taylor (1973) conducted an experiment in which 40 males were asked to administer a level of shock to a false subject in a lab setting, with one condition having confederates attempt to influence the participant into administering a greater shock and another where the

confederates influence the participant to administering a less severe shock to the false subject.

All of the subjects were first tested alone to determine initial level of shock. In the cases where a shock of greater severity was pushed by the confederates, the participant was found to shock the false subject with a more severe shock than when tested alone. When the shock of lesser intensity was advocated by the confederates, a shock of lesser intensity was used. This result can illustrate the value of having peer presence of mediation at the time of a conflict, and how this may possibly affect the outcome of a situation.

A study by Parks, Osgood, Felson, Wells, and Graham (2013) observed third-party mediation in barroom conflicts, and various situational variables were studied with regard to whether or not a third-party intervened in a conflict. The instance of intervention was observed on the following situational variables indicative of danger: basis of severity, level of intoxication, and whether or not the aggression was mutual. 806 incidents were observed and recorded over the course of 503 nights at 87 bars in Toronto and observers attempted to record the previously mentioned variables that would have played a role in whether or not a third-party intervened in the conflict. Through their findings, it was found that the third-party became involved if: the level of aggression in the conflict was more severe and if the participants in the dispute were more intoxicated. In observing the results of this study, the present study will see if these results are replicated for the instances that a third-party mediates the conflict.

Chapter 3

Data and Methods

Sample

This study was conducted with the approval of the Pennsylvania State University's Office of Research Protection (Protocol # 00004483). The data for this study was collected through self-report based on a survey distributed to 193 undergraduate students at the Pennsylvania State University. Of these, 22 results had to be discounted due to instances of non-response in areas crucial to data collection, thus potentially hindering the results of the study. Of the 171 undergraduate students that remained, 73 students were male and 98 students were female. All respondents were currently taking one of two sections of an entry-level criminology course (CRIM 100) consisting of students ranging in all class levels (freshman to senior). The survey was distributed in class and the responses were recorded on Scantrons. The data was recorded and coded first into Microsoft Excel manually, then imported onto SPSS software on Penn State University computers. All of the participants were of the college-age group, or 18-25.

Justification of Sample

The results of this study will only be generalizable to the population of college-age students currently living in the college environment, living either the dormitories on campus or in an apartment or house relatively close to campus. Only students that had currently cohabited

with at least one other college-age roommate were included in the valid results. Those without roommates were excluded from the data.

Limitations of this study include any nonresponse from a survey participant, and instances where questionnaires were not filled to completion. It is also possible that a particular student misinterpreted a question or accidentally skipped a question that they should have included. The data in this survey will only be generalizable to college-age students cohabiting with another college-age student at a large state university. This population has rarely been studied in previous research and I believe that further exploration in this area would be beneficial to current research on aggression, and the roles gender, alcohol, and third party mediation play in aggressive behaviors.

Measures

Independent concepts

The questionnaire is split up into multiple sections. The first section asks about general frequencies of voiced and unvoiced grievances, the second asks details about a particular scenario when a grievance was not voiced to the respondent's roommate, and the third asks details about a particular scenario in which a grievance was directly voiced to the respondent's roommate. There are similar questions asked in both the section concerning the voiced grievance and the section concerning the unvoiced grievance.

The independent variables used for measurement include the gender of the respondent, the subject matter of the conflict, whether a third party was present or intervened during a conflict, and whether or not alcohol was present during both the voiced and unvoiced grievances.

One independent concept to be studied is gender. This respondent is simply asked at the end of the questionnaire whether or not they are male or female.

A second independent variable concerns the subject matter of the conflict. There are two items that ask about the subject matter for the two separate grievances- one that was voiced and another that was not voiced to the roommate. In these two items, the questions ask, “Which of the following behaviors did you complain about?” for the section concerning the voiced grievance and “Which of the following behaviors of your roommate MOST annoyed you?” concerning the unvoiced grievance. Potential responses to these questions were a list of multiple choice responses in which the respondent could only select one response. Responses included: not cleaning up, the people he/she bring over, something related to money, not doing their share of the responsibilities, not respecting your space, criticizing you, and none of the above. These particular responses were included as a result of an informal preliminary interview of people with roommates inquiring the most common topics of conflict in their relationship.

The presence and mediation of a third party is another independent variable that will be measured through a series of three questions on the questionnaire. The first is a question asking “was a third-party present” in the two different cases of a voiced grievance and an unvoiced grievance. The other question is derived from the section concerning the voiced grievance which asks whether or not a third-party “intervened” during the course of the conflict.

The presence of alcohol will be measured by asking the respondent the level of intoxication they were experiencing at the time of the voiced grievance versus unvoiced grievance. An item also asks about the roommate’s level of intoxication. The options of intoxication level range between extremely intoxicated, somewhat intoxicated, and not intoxicated. This data was then recoded by using responses from two separate questions in the

survey, stated in each item as “were you high on alcohol at the time?” and “was your roommate high on alcohol at the time?”. The original responses of “somewhat intoxicated” and “extremely intoxicated” were recoded together as a new variable called “alcohol present”. The response of “no” was recoded as “alcohol absent”. This recoding is used to determine the general presence of alcohol within a conflict.

Dependent concepts

The dependent concepts that were operationalized were captured beneath the term “severity of conflict outcomes.” This term was broken down into three dependent variables: 1) frequency of voiced and unvoiced grievances, 2) types of aggression used, and 3) presence of anger during a voiced complaint.

To accurately measure the frequency of types of grievance, the questionnaire included questions that generally framed what types of grievances that could be experienced by these pairs of roommates and asked how frequently they occurred. In this particular case I was interested in: 1) when there was a grievance, but it was not voiced to the roommate, 2) when there was a grievance and it was voiced to the roommate and 3) when the respondent and their roommate became angry with each other. To measure this frequency of conflict, the following questions were posed: 1) “In the last six months, how often have you been annoyed with your roommate and voiced a complaint?” with the answers on an ordinal scale varying among never, rarely, sometimes, and always. 2) “In the last six months, how often have you been annoyed with a roommate and not said anything?” Which would also be answered by the respondent in choosing between never, rarely, sometimes, and often. And finally 3) “In the last six months, how often did you and your roommate become angry with each other?” with again, the responses

varying from never, rarely, sometimes, and often. The reason these three items are included is to determine how often the respondent voices their grievances and how often they are not voiced to the roommate. The last item is used to determine the frequency of anger expression in a roommate relationship, in order to see how often that particular form of outward expression is used.

To determine types of aggression used, the questionnaire included a series of multiple choice questions inquiring about different behaviors at the time of the conflict and immediately after the conflict. In these items, instances of physical aggression, verbal aggression, direct aggression, and indirect aggression were measured. The questions posed in the questionnaire regarding these topics include: “which of the following happened during the incident?” with responses for physical aggression including: I pushed or hit my roommate, my roommate pushed or hit me, both, and neither. The same format of responses is used when asking about verbal aggression except the action “pushed or hit” is replaced with “insulted”. When asking about indirect versus direct forms of aggression the survey asks, “Which of the following occurred after the incident was over?” with potential responses being: my roommate was openly aggressive toward me, my roommate was indirectly aggressive toward me, both or neither.

The presence of anger during the section of the questionnaire concerning a voiced complaint is asked in one item: “Was anger expressed during this incident?” This data will be coded as anger being present or not present in this voiced situation.

Chapter 4

Results

Through SPSS software and statistical analyses, univariate and bivariate measures were used to read the frequencies of each variable as well as the results of the cross-tabulations. These were used to determine relationships between the dependent and independent variables included in this study. To observe the statistical significance of these relationships, measures including chi-square and t-tests were used on the cross-tabulations and correlations. All of the variables used in the present study were in the categorical and ordinal level and will be tested using measures that pertain to each.

When splitting up the data into frequencies and the crosstabs, the total number of participants will vary depending on what variable is being observed. For example, for those questions concerning instances when the participant was asked about a scenario when they voiced a complaint to their roommate, the total number of respondents will be 105 participants because that amount of participants indicated as having an instance when they openly voiced a complaint to their roommates. The missing cases from the original valid total refer to those who did not fill out that section because they were told to skip it if it did not apply to them. There were also sections where the respondent was asked to recount instances when grievances were unvoiced. This data accounted for 153 instances out of the original total of 171 valid responses.

Univariate Statistics

Table 1.1: Frequency of subject of grievance

Subject of grievance	Type of Incident	
	Voiced	Unvoiced
Not cleaning up	27.6%	32.9%
People he/she bring over	14.3%	11.8%
Financial	8.6%	4.6%
Not doing responsibilities	13.3%	9.2%
Not respecting your space	8.6%	11.8%
Criticizing you	17.1%	17.1%
Other	10.5%	12.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

The above frequencies demonstrate the distribution of reasons for the respondent's grievance with their roommate for both the voiced and the unvoiced (Table 1.1) sections of the questionnaire. It appears that the most common reason for the respondent having a grievance with their roommate in both the voiced and the unvoiced conditions is due to issues regarding their roommate not cleaning up, with the frequency in the unvoiced condition being 29.2% and the frequency in the voiced condition being 32.9%. The second most common response for each of the items was that their roommate had criticized them, with the frequency in both the unvoiced scenarios and the voiced scenarios being 17.1% of the total number of responses for each of those sections.

The least common response of both voiced and unvoiced conflicts was found to be financial reasons. According to this data, it seems that no specific type of grievance will lead a person to voice it.

Involvement of Alcohol

Table 2.1 Frequency of alcohol involvement in voiced and unvoiced grievances

	Type of incident	
	Voiced	Unvoiced
Alcohol not involved	83.8%	87.5%
Alcohol involved	16.2%	12.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

The tables above list the total instances where alcohol was involved during both voiced and unvoiced grievances (Table 2.1).

In the instance of the unvoiced grievance, it appears as if alcohol was present in 12.5% of those cases involving an unvoiced grievance. In the scenario inquiring about the voiced grievance, alcohol was present in 16.2% of these cases.

Instances of Peer Mediation

Table 3.1: Frequency of third-party presence and mediation

	Voiced
There were no third-parties present	43.7%
No, a third-party did not mediate	40.8%
Yes, a third-party mediated	15.5%
Total	100.0%

In this frequency table (Table 3.1), the total frequency of third-party presence and mediation is shown out of the total number

of cases when a grievance was voiced to the roommate. Of the total number of those cases, 15.5% of those instances had the mediation of a third-party. However; in order to see the total percentage of cases where a third-party intervened of those cases when a third party was present, the data where a third party was not present can be excluded. The total number of cases where a third party is present totals 58 cases, and of these cases 16 of the respondents indicated that a

third-party did mediate. Therefore 27.6% of the cases where a third party was present reported that a third-party did mediate in the conflict.

Frequency of Grievances and Anger

Table 4.1: Frequencies of grievance expression and anger presence

Frequency of expression	Voiced complaints	Unvoiced complaints	Getting angry at each other
Never	37.4%	11.1%	49.4%
Rarely	23.4%	18.7%	21.2%
Sometimes	26.9%	29.8%	21.8%
Often	12.3%	40.4%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The data listed above cite the frequencies of the following items inquiring about the general occurrences of the following conditions over the course of the last six months: when the respondent had a grievance with their roommate but did not say anything, when the respondent had a grievance with their roommate and chose to voice it to their roommate, and when the respondent and their roommate became angry with each other (Table 4.1).

According to the responses, the majority (40.4%) of the total reported not voicing a grievance to their roommate “often”. The least commonly reported of the unvoiced complaints was “never” containing 11.1% of all responses. The responses of “sometimes” and “rarely” were 29.8% and 18.7% respectively of the total data.

As for the data concerning the grievances directly voiced to the respondent’s roommate, the most common responses within this data set is seen to have the opposite trend of the unvoiced grievances, with the majority (37.4%) of total responses reported that they have

“never” openly voiced a grievance to their roommate. 12.3% of all respondents answered “often” to this item, which is the least common response for this item. According to this result, it seems that roommates are more likely to have a grievance and not voice it, than to voice a grievance to their roommate.

Finally, the frequencies concerning the instances when the respondent and their roommate became angry at each other were tabulated (Table 4.1). The most common response is similar again to the results seen in the frequency of unvoiced grievances, with almost half of the respondents, 49.5%, responding that they have never been angry with each other. The least common response is “often” with a total of 7.6% of the original sample.

Presence of aggression

Table 5.1: Frequencies of aggressive responses

Type of aggressive response		
Presence of verbal aggression	No insults were made	71.4%
	Either/both parties made insults	28.6%
	Total	100.0%
Presence of physical aggression	No physical aggression was used	96.2%
	Physical aggression was present	3.8%
	Total	100.0%
Presence of Direct/Indirect aggression	No aggression was used	77.9%
	My roommate was directly aggressive toward me	1.9%
	My roommate was indirectly aggressive toward me	18.3%
	My roommate was both directly and indirectly aggressive toward me	1.9%
	Total	100.0%

The above frequencies describe the proportion of instances when various forms of aggression were used during the respondent's voiced conflict with their roommate. The results of the item of the questionnaire concerning verbal aggression display that in 28.6% of the cases of a voiced grievance, either or both parties exchanged insults (Table 5.1). The behavior of "insulting" is considered for the purpose of this study to be a form of verbal aggression.

Physical aggression was reported by 3.8% of respondents in the case of the voiced grievance, making up only four of the 104 valid cases. It seems that a large majority of these cases did not involve forms of physical aggression from either party.

The respondents were also asked of their roommates' direct and indirect aggressive behaviors following the voiced grievance (Table 5.1). The general frequencies of each behavior indicate that no aggression was present in 77.9% of the total voiced cases, direct aggression was used in 1.9% of those cases, indirect aggression was present in 18.3% of those cases, and 1.9% indicated that both direct and indirect forms of aggression were used. When determining the total of each case, the percentage of respondents who answered "both" to this item will be combined with the percentage of either direct or indirect aggression present, making cases of direct aggression 3.8% of total cases and cases of indirect aggression 20.2% of total cases.

Presence of Anger

Table 6.1: Frequency of presence of anger in voiced grievance

Expression of anger	
Neither party expressed anger	34.3%
Either respondent or roommate expressed anger	65.7%
Total	100.0%

Another frequency tabulated was the general presence of anger in the voiced grievance by either

the respondent or their roommate (Table 6.1). According to these results, anger was expressed in 65.7% of cases involving a voiced grievance.

Bivariate Statistics

Gender and Frequencies of Grievances and Anger

Table 7.1: Frequency of voiced and unvoiced grievances by gender

		Type of incident			
		Unvoiced		Voiced	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Frequency	Never	15.1%	8.2%	39.7%	35.7%
	Rarely	23.3%	15.3%	23.3%	23.5%
	Sometimes	35.6%	25.5%	19.2%	32.7%
	Often	26.0%	51.0%	17.8%	8.2%

Table 7.2: Frequency of respondent and roommate becoming angry at each other in the last 6 months v. gender of respondent

		Gender of respondent	
		Male	Female
Frequency	Never	47.9%	50.0%
	Rarely	21.9%	20.4%
	Sometimes	24.7%	20.4%
	Often	5.5%	9.2%

The cross-tabulations above (Table 7.1; Table 7.2) depict the breakdown of the reported frequencies for the following: when the respondent has a grievance with their roommate and it is not voiced, when the respondent does voice the grievance to their roommate, and the instances

where the respondent and their roommate became angry at each other as compared to the gender of the respondent.

In the item of the questionnaire concerning how often the respondent has had a grievance with their roommate without voicing it (Table 7.1), 51.0% of females responded that they often have grievances with their roommates that are unvoiced, while only 26.0% of males listed often for that same question. The most common response for males in this item was “sometimes” with this making up 35.6% of the male responses. Values were assigned to each of the responses to determine the mean response in each category (never = 0, rarely = 1, sometimes = 2, often = 3). The mean for females not voicing a grievance is 2.19, slightly more frequent than “sometimes”. The male mean for not voicing a grievance is 1.71, between “rarely” and “sometimes”. When comparing the means of the male and female responses by using a t-test, the sig. value of 0.664 means that the variability between males and females are about the same. The 2-tailed sig. value of 0.003 (sig. 2-tailed < 0.05 is significant) demonstrates that there is indeed a significant difference in males and females within this result (refer to Appendix A). Females demonstrate a higher average of not voicing grievances to their roommates than their male counterparts.

There is no difference between genders in the frequencies of the responses “never”, “rarely”, “sometimes”, and “often” in the instances where the respondent openly voices their grievances to their roommate (Table 7.2). The mean response for females voicing a grievance is 1.13 while the mean response for males is 1.15, both of which are slightly above “rarely”. Through the results of a t-test, the 2-tailed sig. value of 0.913 does not appear to yield any statistical significance, being greater than 0.05. The sig. value of the t-test is 0.160, indicating that the variability between males and females are about the same (refer to Appendix A). There

does not appear to be any significant difference between males and females according to this result.

In Table 7.2, it appears that there is no statistical significance between males and females in the reported frequency of the respondent and their roommate becoming angry with each other. The mean response for both females and males was found to be 0.89, equating to a response between “never” and “rarely”. A gender difference is not seen in the instance of the respondent becoming angry at their roommate. This can be seen through the results of a t-test test, where the values of sig. and 2-tailed sig. are above 0.05, being 0.546 and 0.944 respectively (refer to Appendix A).

Gender and Aggression

Table 8.1: Presence of physical aggression v. gender of respondent

Presence of aggression		Gender of respondent		Total
		Male	Female	
Physical aggression	Physical aggression was not present	90.9%	100.0%	96.2%
	Physical aggression was present	9.1%	0.0%	3.8%
Verbal aggression	Insults were not used	65.9%	75.4%	71.4%
	Insults were present	34.1%	24.6%	28.6%

Table 8.2: Presence of aggressive behavior in respondent's roommate v. gender of respondent

Presence of aggression	Gender of respondent		Total
	Male	Female	
No aggression was present	69.8%	83.6%	77.9%
Direct aggression was used	4.7%	0.0%	1.9%
Indirect aggression was used	23.3%	14.8%	18.3%
Both direct and indirect aggression was used	2.3%	1.6%	1.9%

The above cross-tabulations are used to attempt to find evidence of a correlation between gender and the instance of aggression in the cases of voiced grievances, including physical aggression (Table 8.1), verbal aggression (Table 8.1), and direct and indirect forms of aggression (Table 8.2).

When observing cases of voiced grievances, physical aggression only was present in four of the one hundred and four cases. However; all of the cases where physical violence was present was in the subgroup of males. There was found to be statistical significance in this respect, with 9.1% of males in the voiced grievance condition stating that physical aggression was used and 0.0% of females in the same condition using physical aggression. There is no statistical significance in the difference between male and female aggression for the cases of the voiced conflicts, with the Chi-square value being 5.673 and the p-value being 0.071. However; this p-value is close to the recommended value for significance.

When observing gender differences in verbal aggression by measuring instances involving insults, it can be seen that 24.6% of females used insults in the instance of their voiced grievance to their roommates, and 34.1% of males used insults. The difference between these two groups does not appear to hold any statistical significance, with a Chi-square value of 1.131.

In the cases of direct v. indirect aggression (Table 8.2), there are no statistically significant results in the distribution of responses against gender. The most common response amongst both males and females was “no aggression was used” with the percentage of males and females being 69.8% and 86.3% respectively. According to the data, males used indirect aggression in 23.3% of male voiced grievances while females used indirect aggression in 14.8% of voiced grievances for females. There were no females that reported using direct aggression, and only 4.7% of males reported using direct aggression.

Gender and Subject of Grievance

Table 9.1: Gender v. subject of grievance (voiced scenario)

Type of incident	Subject of grievance	Gender of respondent		Total
		Male	Female	
Unvoiced Scenario	Not cleaning up	27.3%	27.9%	27.6%
	People he/she bring over	4.5 %	21.3%	14.3%
	Financial	3.6%	4.9%	8.6%
	Not doing responsibilities	5.9%	11.5%	13.3%
	Not respecting space	6.8%	9.8%	8.6%
	Criticizing you	15.9%	18.0%	17.1%
	Other	15.9%	6.6%	10.5%
Voiced Scenario	Not cleaning up	33.3%	32.6%	32.9%
	People he/she bring over	2.7%	1.3%	11.8%
	Financial	6.3%	3.4%	4.6%
	Not doing responsibilities	11.1%	7.9%	13.3%
	Not respecting space	9.5%	13.5%	8.6%
	Criticizing you	11.1%	21.3%	17.1%
	Other	15.9%	10.1%	10.5%

The subject of the grievance in both the voiced and unvoiced scenarios is broken down by gender. In the case of those grievances that were voiced, there is one case of a significant difference, with females more often than males appearing to voice grievances that concern the people their roommate brings over. 21.3% of females list this as the subject of the voiced grievance, which only 4.5% of males listed this as a reason. The result is very close to, but does not meet the criteria for, significance with a p-value of 0.11.

In the scenario of the grievance that was not voiced there appears to be no significant statistical difference between the reasons males and females have a grievance with their roommate.

Alcohol and Presence of Aggression

Table 10.1: The involvement of alcohol v. instance of verbal aggression

		Involvement of alcohol		Total
		No alcohol involved	Alcohol involved	
Presence of verbal aggression	Verbal aggression not present	77.0%	41.2%	71.2%
	Verbal aggression present	23.0%	58.8%	28.8%

The above crosstab describes the instances of alcohol involvement of voiced conflicts and the proportions of those when alcohol was involved and when alcohol was not involved that contained forms of aggression. There was not enough data in the sample that contained cases of physical aggression in order to determine any relationship between physical aggression and involvement of alcohol. However; the presence of insults with regard to the presence of alcohol

was high enough to collect data. In the instances where alcohol was involved, 58.8% of these cases had verbal aggression present. Of the cases where alcohol was not present, 23.0% of the respondents reported the presence of insults in their voiced grievance. The p-value for this relationship is below 0.05 and is determined to be significant.

Table 10.2: The expression of anger by the involvement of alcohol

		Involvement of alcohol		Total
		No alcohol involved	Alcohol involved	
Was anger present?	Anger not present	34.5%	29.4%	33.7%
	Anger present	65.5%	70.6%	66.3%

This cross-tabulation demonstrates the relationship between alcohol involvement and whether or not anger was present during a voiced grievance (Table 10.2). Through these results it does not seem that there is any relationship between the two, with 70.6% of conflicts involving alcohol having anger present in the expressed grievance and 65.5% of those conflicts not involving alcohol also citing the expression of anger. Through the chi-square value of 0.164 it can be seen that these results seem to have no statistical significance.

Mediation of a Third Party and Expression of Anger

Table 11.1: Presence of anger by mediation of a third party

		Did a third party mediate the conflict?		Total
		No	Yes	
Was anger present?	No, anger was not present	21.4%	0.0%	15.5%
	Yes, anger was present	78.6%	100.0%	84.5%

In this particular cross-tabulation, the cases where a third-party was not present in the variable “third party mediation” were excluded in order to obtain statistics from solely those who reported having a third party present during the voiced grievance (Table 11.1). Thus the total number of respondents for this observation is 58 respondents. Of the cases where there was third party mediation, 100.0% of the respondents reported the expression of anger during the conflict. Of the cases where there was not third party mediation, 78.6% reported the presence of anger. The results seem to hold some statistical significance due to the high proportion of conflicts that were mediated containing an expression of anger. The chi-square value for this cross-tabulation is 4.058 with the p-value being less than 0.05, indicating that this result is significant.

Mediation of Third Party and Involvement of Alcohol

Table 11.2: Involvement of alcohol by mediation of a third-party

		Did a third party mediate the conflict?		Total
		No	Yes	
Was alcohol involved?	No alcohol was involved	88.1%	68.8%	82.8%
	Alcohol was involved	11.9%	31.3%	17.2%

The results from this cross-tabulation seek to compare the relationship of third party mediation and whether or not alcohol was involved (Table 11.2). Again, similar to the previous crosstab the sample size will only observe those cases where a third-party was present, thus excluding all cases of the voiced grievance condition where a third-party was not present.

Of those cases where a third-party did mediate the conflict, 31.3% of the cases involved alcohol. Of the cases where a third-party did not mediate the conflict, 11.9% of the cases involved alcohol. According to the chi-square value of 3.039, it does not appear that any

of the values in this cross-tabulation have any statistical significance. However; the p-value of 0.081 is very close to the value recommended to determine significance of 0.05.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Univariate Results

It is worth discussing the univariate analyses since many of the variables investigated have rarely been tabulated in previous research.

It seems that the most common reason for having a grievance with a roommate is that their roommate is “not cleaning up”. This made up approximately 30% of all responses from both the case of the voiced and unvoiced grievance, and was listed as being a reason for the grievance more often than the other response choices. Cleanliness is not a problem that would be encountered by people not living together. Seeing cleanliness being listed as a frequent problem amongst roommates illustrates the specific struggles of people living together. Living together seems to provide more opportunity for conflict. However; it does seem that a person is just as likely to have an unvoiced grievance concerning cleanliness as they are to have a voiced grievance concerning cleanliness.

Being criticized is listed as the next common response with this making 17.1% of reasons for voiced and unvoiced grievances. Having a grievance for being criticized is not content restricted to people who live together--it can also be a grievance held with others. Perhaps in the case of roommate relationships having a grievance for being criticized is more common because of the constant exposure to that individual and their criticisms. As described by Tedeschi and Felson (1994) it can be a “straw that broke the camel’s back” situation, where constantly being

around their criticism causes them to have a grievance, or to voice their grievance. It would be interesting to compare the content of grievances in roommate relationships to the content of grievances in regular friendships, where the person does not live with this person. This can be used to see if there is any difference in the frequency of grievance for being criticized. If there is, one may believe that it is due to the constant exposure to the criticism.

The least common response among both voiced and unvoiced grievances was reported as “financial reasons”. My initial hypothesis that more voiced grievances will concern finances was not supported by the data. Perhaps financial matters are either not an issue with this sample of students. It could also be that financial matters are generally well-communicated between roommates, and are not considered to be conflicts. With this new data it is now possible to discover common sources of grievances among college students. This information may provide universities with knowledge required to teach students how to diffuse conflict with their roommates--by first discovering common underlying causes of these conflicts.

Another distribution of frequencies worth noting is the frequency in which the respondent will either 1) Have a grievance with their roommate and not voice it, 2) Have a grievance with their roommate and voice it, and 3) Have them and their roommate become angry at each other. According to the data, there are many instances where a roommate will not voice a grievance to their roommate (Table 4.1). This can be seen through the distribution of responses in both the items “How often are you annoyed with your roommate and not said anything to the roommate?” and “How often have you been annoyed at your roommate and voiced a complaint?” with respondents most often citing “often” for the first question and “never” for the second.

It seems that people are more likely to have a grievance with a roommate and not voice it than to voice a grievance to their roommate. This could be due to the fear of ruining a relationship or the fear of retaliation as described in Tedeschi & Felson (1994). When taking into considerations reasons to voice a complaint or to remain silent, people may more often find that the potential consequences of confrontation outweigh the benefits and would instead choose to “deal with it”.

When looking at the instances where various types of aggression were used, it was found that verbal aggression was used more often than physical aggression, with the rates being 28.6% and 3.8% respectively. In the case of direct and indirect forms of aggression, cases of indirect aggression (20.2%) outnumber the cases of direct aggression (3.8%). The instance of physical aggression was incredibly low, and it seems that this tactic is not common in roommate relationships. This low rate of physical violence can also be described by there being too much risk in engaging in these violent behaviors. The risk of damaging the relationship is even more likely in these more extreme methods of dealing with conflict. People may see verbal aggression as a less risky and more appropriate way of responding to a conflict than physical aggression, and that is why it's more common. A similar deduction can be made in observing the differences in direct versus indirect aggression. Direct aggression is present in very few of the voiced grievances, but indirect aggression is present in one-fifth of the voiced cases. A person may perceive indirect aggression as not being as costly as direct aggression, but still yielding positive results. Another interesting investigation would be why people would choose to use different forms of aggression. Another potential extension of this study could involve whether or not people will use similar strategies with friends that they do not live with, or even complete strangers. If a difference is seen there, perhaps it can be said that the nature of the roommate relationship affects the strategy used throughout the conflict.

Bivariate Results

Gender

Through the investigation comparing how men and women compare to each other in their voiced and unvoiced grievances as well as the frequencies of each, many of the dependent variables investigated did yield to have significant statistical results.

Males and females appeared to show no significant difference in the frequency at which they voice grievances to their roommates and the frequency of them and their roommate becoming angry at each other. The gender difference is seen in the frequency of unvoiced grievances: women were found to be significantly more likely than men to have a grievance with their roommate and not voice it to their roommate. In other words, women are more likely to report an unvoiced grievance. This could mean that they are more likely to leave a grievance unvoiced or it could also mean that women have more grievances. This result contradicts previous research findings that women complain more often than men (Boxer 1996). There are a variety of explanations for this gender difference. It could be that men do not see this behavior as complaining, but as a means to an end, and to get what they want. Men are more commonly known as the more aggressive sex, and this may cause them to more often openly voice a grievance when confronted with it. Another theory could be that they do not want to seem like they are pushed around, and may take the opportunity to express their reasons for having a grievance to assert their dominance and save face. One reason that women may be more likely to not voice a grievance is due to their socialization of politeness and avoiding conflict. Women are socialized to be polite, and voicing grievances may provide an opportunity for conflict.

Another statistically significant result concerning gender concerns the instances of aggression. According to the data recorded from the voiced grievances, men are more likely to use physical violence than women, a result which does not come as a surprise because it has previously been found that men have more of a propensity toward physical aggression than women. No statistically significant results were seen in gender differences between the uses of verbal aggression, or cases of direct or indirect aggression. The lack of difference between genders in the case of verbal aggression does come as a surprise, considering insulting another party is usually directly aggressive. It would be interesting to compare what men and women perceived as “insults”- perhaps one gender categorizes certain responses as being insults while another does not, and vice versa.

When observing the subject matter or the grievance, the gender of the respondent did not seem to have an effect on the content of the grievance. The only result that was close to having significance was a greater frequency of females answering “the people he/she brings over” as a response to the subject of the voiced grievance. However; this did not meet the criteria of the p-value being below 0.05 and therefore is not determined as having statistical significance. Although it was not statistically significant, it was close enough to significance that further research in this area would be needed to see if a relationship exists between the gender of a respondent and the likelihood that they will have a grievance concerning the people their roommate brings over.

Involvement of Alcohol

The presence of verbal aggression, is found to have a direct relationship to whether or not alcohol is present. In the cases observed, there was a higher instance of verbal aggression found in those cases where alcohol was involved. This result is not surprising because of the previous research concerning relationship between the presence of alcohol and the escalation of aggression. Alcohol could inhibit decision-making capabilities when one is deciding what to do during a conflict. Perhaps this lack of inhibitory control will make someone more likely to use verbal aggression after not carefully considering the consequences of engaging in this behavior.

There did not seem to be a significant relationship between the involvement of alcohol and the presence of anger in the scenario of a voiced grievance. According to the data, there is an equal likelihood of anger being present with or without the involvement of alcohol. This is somewhat of a surprising result considering the previous research on alcohol and its relationship to the escalation of conflict. People were just as likely to be angry when alcohol was present than when it was absent. The effect of alcohol on inhibitions may not affect the emotions expressed, but perhaps the determination of what action is appropriate to use. More research needs to be conducted in the relationship between alcohol, actions taken throughout a conflict, and presence of anger in order to further establish a correlation.

Third Party Mediation

There seems to be more of a likelihood of third party mediation in the cases that display anger. 100.0% of the cases where a third party mediated involved anger, while 78.6% of the cases where a third party did not mediate involved anger. According to this result, a third party

seems to be significantly more likely to mediate when anger is present, which supports the finding Parks, Osgood, Felson, Wells, and Graham (2013) that found that a third party will be more likely to intervene if the conflict is deemed as being more serious. For those cases involving third party presence, it seems that anger expression is an indicator of a conflict's level of seriousness.

There does not seem to be a relationship between the presence of alcohol and likelihood of peer mediation in a conflict. This could be because students of this age do not believe that alcohol is a factor that determines the level of seriousness of a conflict, and will choose to not intervene. It could also mean that the presence of alcohol does not necessarily dictate the level of seriousness of the conflict. The finding, however, is very close to being statistically significant, with its p-value being slightly above the criteria meant for significance.

Implications for future research

Potential weaknesses of this study include the limited sample size, specifically with regard to the subject matter of the grievance. Since there were seven potential responses, the distribution was quite spread out with the number of responses in each category. Having a larger sample size may assist in obtaining more accurate measurements. Potential errors also include the non-response from the twenty-two respondents who had characteristics that excluded them from the data, such as not indicating a gender or not having a roommate.

Given the results of the present study, further research can be done concerning why certain conditions are likely to precipitate into aggression or openly expressed anger and others

are not. Perhaps further research into asking peoples' motivations for expressing anger or voicing complaints can shed further light onto conflicts between roommates. These new discoveries could help in the field of university counseling when handling the expression of grievances between roommates and friends and to teach students how to best deal with these dilemmas, thus adding to the already expansive field of mental health. Hopefully with more knowledge about this topic, students can have a less stressful experience at school and make their experience more positive.

	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.366	.546	-.071	169	.944	-.0110	.1558	-.3186	.2966
Equal variances not assumed			-.072	160.193	.943	-.0110	.1544	-.3159	.2938

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American psychologist, 58*(1), 5.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. "Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation"
Psychological Bulletin, 106(1), Jul 1989, 59-73.
- Bettencourt, B., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 119*(3), 422.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive behavior, 18*(2), 117-127.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. M. (1994). Sex differences in covert aggression among adults. *Aggressive behavior, 20*(1), 27-33.
- Borden, R. J., & Taylor, S. P. (1973). The social instigation and control of physical aggression. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 3*(4), 354-361.
- Boxer, D. (1996). Ethnographic interviewing as a research tool in speech act analysis: The case of complaints. *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language, 217-239*.
- Brougham, R. R., Zail, C. M., Mendoza, C. M., & Miller, J. R. (2009). Stress, sex differences, and coping strategies among college students. *Current Psychology, 28*(2), 85-97.

- Cohen, A. R. (1964). Social norms, arbitrariness of frustration, and status of the agent of frustration in the frustration-aggression hypothesis. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51*(2), 222-226.
- Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). Frustration and aggression.
- Felson, R. B., Osgood, D. W., Horney, J., & Wiernik, C. (2012). Having a bad month: General versus specific effects of stress on crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 28*(2), 347-363.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men and politeness*. Routledge.
- Hudd, S. S., Dumlao, J., Erdmann-Sager, D., Murray, D., Phan, E., Soukas, N., & Yokozuka, N. (2000). STRESS AT COLLEGE: EFFECTS ON HEALTH HABITS, HEALTH STATUS AND SELF-ESTEEM. *College Student Journal, 34*(2), 217.
- Ito, T. A., Miller, N., & Pollock, V. E. (1996). Alcohol and aggression: a meta-analysis on the moderating effects of inhibitory cues, triggering events, and self-focused attention. *Psychological bulletin, 120*(1), 60.
- Jansz, J. (2000). Masculine identity and restrictive emotionality. *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives, 166-186*.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- O'Malley, P. M., & Johnston, L. D. (2002). Epidemiology of alcohol and other drug use among American college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement, (14)*, 23-39.

Parks, M. J., Osgood, D. W., Felson, R. B., Wells, S., & Graham, K. (2013). Third party

involvement in barroom conflicts. *Aggressive behavior*, 39(4), 257-268.

Pernanen, K. (1976). Alcohol and Crimes of Violence. *Social Aspects of Alcoholism*, 4, 351-444.

Ross, S. E., Niebling, B. C., & Heckert, T. M. (1999). Sources of stress among college students.

Social psychology, 61(5), 841-846.

Tedeschi, James T., and Richard B. Felson. (1994). *Violence, Aggression & Coercive Actions*.

Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Zeichner, A., & Pihl, R. O. (1979). Effects of alcohol and behavior contingencies on human

aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 88(2), 153.

ACADEMIC VITA

Alexa Echevarria
Aechevarria5150@gmail.com

Education: Pennsylvania State University, University Park
Major(s) and Minor(s): Criminology (BA), Psychology (BA), French Language
(minor)
Honors: Criminology

Thesis Title: Why can't we be friends? An investigation of conflict between
college roommates
Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Richard Felson

Work Experience

Date: January 2015 - Present
Title: Personal Trainer
Description: Help clients reach their health and fitness goals
Institution/Company: Penn State Strength and Fitness
State College, PA
Supervisor's Name: Shawn Fix

Professional Memberships:

Community Service Involvement:

Penn State Panhellenic Dance Marathon Volunteer
Dates: Fall 2012 – Present
Role: president of organization involved in fundraising (Penn State
Equestrian Team)

International Education:

Studied abroad Summer 2015 (Aix-en-Provence, France)

Language Proficiency: Spanish/French