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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of text messaging in conflict situations among roommates as well as within unique situations that only roommates are faced with. For that reason, a review of the literature was done on conflict, sensitive issues, and text messaging. A final goal of the study was to focus on the role of group text messaging specifically.

The study investigated two questions: how do roommates understand the role of text messaging in managing their relationship and how do they actually use text messaging to manage their relationships. Therefore, the study involved two parts: first, a group of roommates participated in a 60-minute focus group about their use of text messaging. Then, more than 1,000 text messages were collected over a three-month period from this same group of roommates. The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data revealed several findings. First, the study found that roommates do not resort to the use of group text in times of conflict. The main cause of roommates resorting to other means of communication resulted from the roommates’ desire to save face. The study’s second finding was that group text messaging is seen as more face-threatening than handling conflict through individual text messages. Third, the study found that the roommates do discuss sensitive issues via a group text. The distinction the roommates made between conflict and sensitive issues shows that there are indeed situations that are not considered conflict but yet still cause some level of discomfort. Finally, the study found that the roommates’ thoughts about how they used the group text message
reflected their actual use of group text. The limitations of the study are addressed and suggestions are given for future research.
Chapter One: Introduction

It was my senior year of college and the day that I had long anticipated had finally arrived: the day that I moved into a house with six of my closest friends. This was the day that my friends also became my roommates. All summer long we had been in constant communication via a group text message about how excited we were for the upcoming year. Once we moved in together, the group text message started to serve a new purpose. Although we still used it to keep in constant contact, it was also used for other topics including plans for the weekend, people’s whereabouts, and paying rent. I quickly came to realize that my roommates and I resorted to text messaging more often than face-to-face communication when discussing more serious issues (such as money or a conflict). One specific example of this was when one of my roommates and I had gotten into a disagreement during a trip to the mountains. Although we were in constant face-to-face communication all weekend. It was once we got home that I received a text message from her addressing the tension she felt between us as well as offering an apology. I texted her back with an explanation for my behavior and sent her an apology as well. Two short texts was all it took for this conflict to be resolved. Feelings of awkwardness and tension that I usually feel when discussing conflict face-to-face were absent. This made me realize how handling conflict over text messaging was much simpler and did not involve the same emotions that discussing conflict face-to-face does.

This thesis is a case study exploring how a group of roommates use group text messaging in general and also in relation to discussions of conflict and sensitive
issues. In Chapter 2, I provide an overview of the literature pertaining to conflict, face, and sensitive issues, and convey how text messaging is a dominant part of our culture and how its role in conflict should be considered. The chapter ends by presenting the research questions. In Chapter 3, an explanation of the methods that were chosen to collect data are given. Chapter 4 addresses the first research question and presents the findings from the focus group interview on roommates’ perceptions of text messaging. Next, Chapter 5 addressed the second research question and presents the findings on group text messaging among roommates. Finally, Chapter 6 discusses the overall study as well as the study’s conclusions.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Past Research on Conflict

Conflict can be found anywhere and everywhere; it is inevitable. It is a part of every relationship and serves an important purpose in our relationships. In some cases conflict can have negative consequences, but in others conflict can be an opportunity not only to strengthen the relationship but also to grow as an individual. Conflict has been studied in many different contexts such as in organizations, small groups, families, interpersonal relationships, and many more (Witteman, 1992). There are also many aspects of conflict. For the purpose of this paper I will focus on facework, management of conflict, and conflict communication in interpersonal conflicts.

Conflict can be defined in many different ways. The definition of conflict is influenced by many factors including the context of the conflict and the parties involved. In general conflict can be defined as "a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party" (Wall & Callister, 1995, p. 517). The word “perceives” is particularly important to the definition of conflict because without perception (by at least one party) conflict would not exist. Conflict can occur between many different types of people. This paper focuses on interpersonal relationships. The definition of interpersonal conflict also varies, and has been defined in many different ways by scholars. For the purpose of this paper I will use Wall and Calister’s (1995)
following definition of interpersonal conflict: “at the interpersonal level an individual comes into conflict with others” (p. 516).

Conflict management leads to the use of particular conflict styles. Conflict style “refers to general tendencies or modes of patterned responses to conflict in a variety of antagonistic interactive situations” (Ting-Toomey, Oetzel, & Yee-Jung, 2001, p. 88). There are several, models of conflict styles. Ting-Toomey and her colleagues (2001) defined five styles of conflict based on two dimensions: concern for self and concern for others. Concern for self is the degree to which you try and satisfy your own interests. In contrast, concern for others involves the degree to which you try and incorporate others’ interests. The face negotiation theory is used to explain these different conflict management styles. The face negotiation theory provides “the conceptual linkage between culture variability (e.g., individualism-collectivism), conflict styles, and facework behaviors using the concept of face” (Ting-Toomey et al., 2001, p. 89). The five styles for handling interpersonal conflict that were derived based on these two dimensions are the following: integrating, compromising, dominating, obliging, and avoiding. The integrating style involves high concern for self and other, the compromising style has moderate concern for self and other, the dominating style has high concern for self and low concern for others, obliging as a style has low concern for self and high concern for other, and finally the avoiding style has low concern for self and others.

Next, there has been research done on how role, status, and sex affected the styles of handling conflict with superiors, subordinates, and peers. In Rahim’s (1983) experiment of 1,219 random executives (varying in education level and
industry) he found that obliging was the conflict style used most often with bosses. Integrating and compromising were used most often when conflict occurred between subordinates and peers. As far as the effect of sex, he found that in general, despite the relationship (superior, subordinate, or peer), females were more integrating, avoiding, and compromising, and less obliging than males. However different results were found in Barsky’s (2002) research in regard to the effects of role status. Barsky examined conflict within the unique structure of a university. In his experiment, hierarchy is defined as one of the main issues causing conflict, which he discovered in turn led to avoidant styles of handling conflict. Participants reported using avoidance when hierarchy was present. An example of avoidant conflict style in this research was students avoiding expressing feelings of being mistreated by their professor rather than confronting the professor about it. My study will conduct research on a peer group of all females. Therefore I will take into account the findings from these studies to assume the elimination of the effect of gender and hierarchy on what conflict styles are used.

Research has been done focusing particularly on avoidant conflict styles. Belk and Snell’s (1998) study focused on avoidance strategies used in intimate relationships. They created a typology of 24 avoidance strategies that then could be understood in terms of two dimensions: bilateral (versus unilateral) and compliance (versus noncompliance). Bilateral was defined as involved interpersonal interaction, for example, persuasion. Unilateral was defined as one-sided behaviors such as withdrawal. Some of these strategies included: complying, compromising, ignoring, and directly refusing. Their study also revealed which personality traits
and levels of felt intimacy were associated with the type of conflict strategy that was used based on the bilateral and compliance scales. The personality trait “desirable expressiveness” was found to be associated with the bilateral measure. This means that people with a high desire to express themselves would use conflict styles such as discussing the reasons for conflict, or compromise. As for the effects of attraction (loving/liking) on what avoidant strategies were used it was found that bilateral and compliance avoid strategies were used more for higher ratings of attraction. My study will pay close attention to any information that is disclosed through the focus group interview pertaining to personality traits and felt levels of intimacy to see if these factors influence the means of communication an individual chooses when discussing conflict or sensitive issues.

There has been research done on how the causes of conflict determine the conflict style that is used. Sillars (1980) proposed that individuals’ attributions of the conflict would influence the style of communication they choose when dealing with the situation. He did not use the five-type model but instead addressed three main conflict strategies: passive indirect, distributive, and integrative. Passive indirect strategies involve not discussing the problem at all. Some examples of passive indirect strategies include avoiding the issue or the person, or simply letting the issue resolve itself. Distributive strategies acknowledge that there is a conflict and discussion about the conflict takes place. Example of this are requesting, demanding, or persuading that the other person changes his/her behavior or outlook. Integrative strategies also acknowledge and discuss the conflict but not with the intention of seeking concessions. An example of this is problem solving.
Sillars’s (1980) study of college dormitory roommates found that integrative strategies were more likely to be used when responsibility for the conflict were attributed to self while distributive strategies was more likely used when the cause of conflict was attributed to roommates. His study also showed that integrative conflict strategies led to higher rates of roommate satisfaction as well as a higher likelihood of the conflict being resolved. Passive-indirect conflict strategies were negatively correlated with roommate satisfaction and likelihood of the conflict being resolved. Sillars’s study is particularly useful to my study because of his focus on roommates, but it lacks findings of what conflict styles are used when means other than face-to-face communication are used.

Witteman’s (1986) study also revealed the importance of how the conflict is perceived on the type of conflict style that is utilized. Witteman used a different model of conflict styles that is based on Putnam and Wilson's (1982) Organizational Conflict Communication Instrument (OCCI) that defines three conflict management styles: solution orientation, control, and non-confrontation. Actions in solution orientation are aimed at solving the problem or coming to a compromise. Control can be considered forceful and occurs when the individual is concerned with controlling the interaction and arguing for their position. Non-confrontation is a way to indirectly respond to conflict by doing things such as avoiding the conflict altogether. Non-confrontation was then further categorized into withdrawing and smoothing type of non-confrontation.

Withdrawing lacked a conflict discussion and is associated with high levels of uncertainty. Smoothing is defined by a desired to engage in conversation about the
conflict with the other person involved. These conflict styles in turn produced certain conflict management communication. The conflict styles Witteman (1986) used were integrative, distributive, and avoidance. This study investigated three types of relationships: lover/significant other, best friends/friend, roommate/acquaintance/co-work. The data showed that the perceptions of the situation had more of an effect on all the styles except for the nonconfrontation/smoothing style than the initiating factors of the conflict did. Witteman’s (1986) analysis of roommates and friends is important to my study. It is interesting that he paired roommates in different category than friends. My study aims to integrate these two categorizes to explain what happens when a roommate is also a friend.

Ploeger et al.’s (2008) study also pointed out the effects of relationship types on the different conflict styles that are used in terms of reported solidarity felt by an individual in regards to the relationship. This study focused on triadic friendships. The relationships this study focused on were: 1) between an individual and their close friend, 2) between an individual and a friend of their close friend who the individual does not like, and 3) the friendship triad as a whole. The study used a style typology based on Guerrero, Andersen, and Afifi (2007). Instead of five styles, this typology defined six. These six are broken into direct styles (competitive fighting, compromising, and collaborating) and indirect styles (indirect fighting, avoiding, and yielding) (Ploeger et al., 2008). An example of competitive fighting includes personal criticisms and threats. Compromising includes suggesting a trade-off and one person must give something up in comparison to collaborating where both people come up with a creative solution and both people’s goals are met.
An example of indirect fighting is ignoring the other person. Avoiding is similar to how it has been defined in studies mentioned above and includes actions such as denying there is a conflict. Yielding is closely related to what others have defined as passive and includes actions such as downplaying disagreement.

Ploeger et al.’s (2008) study recruited a very specific group to fill out an online questionnaire. The requirement for the participants of this study was that they had to be in a nonromantic same-sex friendship triad where they had a close friend who had a friend that the participant did not like. The research found that higher levels of solidarity (towards the participants’ close friend) led to the use of compromising and collaborative conflict styles, while lower levels of solidarity led to indirect fighting and avoiding conflict styles. Because compromising and collaborative conflict styles require more effort, the prediction that people put in more effort in managing conflict with their close friend is proven true by these results. In regard to the next type of relationship (the individual and the friend in the triad who they do not like) although the individual was disliked, yielding, compromising, and collaboration were the styles used when higher levels of solidarity were felt towards the disliked individual. Finally, in the last type of relationship (the triadic friendship as a whole) yielding conflict styles was used when the individual felt higher levels of solidarity with the disliked individual, but when high level of solidarity were felt by the individual towards the close friend, the compromising conflict styles was used within the triad. Interestingly enough this study also revealed that the length of relationship with the close friend or the disliked individual did not affect which conflict style was used.
The prediction that people put in more effort in managing conflict with their close friend is proven true by this experiment due to this correlation. The findings from this study may have proved a valid explanation for why conflict and sensitive issues are handled differently between different combinations of roommates. My study will extend Ploeger et al. (2007) study from focusing on triads to groups of roommates.

Furthermore, a concept called “conflictalk” was created to fulfill the need for a “conflict management message style survey developed at the youth and adolescent levels” (Kimsey & Fuller, 2003, p. 70). The idea behind conflictalk is that adolescents will be more skilled at managing conflict if they can use their language to express emotions in conflict (conflict styles). The conflict management style that the conflictalk instrument was based on was The Ross-De Wine Conflict Management Message Style (CMMS) instrument which identifies three message types: self-oriented, issue-oriented, and other-oriented. The Ross-DeWine CMMS has been proven to be a valid instrument for measuring conflict styles of adults. Conflictalk also identifies three conflict styles: self-focus, problem-focus- and other-focus. Self-focused was defined by acting aggressively and trying to get their own way. Some examples of self-focused expressions are: “Shut up! You’re wrong! I’m not going to listen.” Problem-focus included acting cooperatively and trying to figure out the best solution for the problem. Expressions include: “What’s going on? We need to talk.” Finally, other-focused involves acting passively and being concerned with the others happiness. An example of this is: “I’m no good at this. I just don’t know how to make you feel better.” The results showed that conflictalk is
a valid instrument for measuring conflict styles for elementary and middle school
students, and has some potential for student in grades nine through twelve. This
study shows how measuring conflict differs by age. In my study I will take into
account the age of my participants and how this may affect my gauge of the different
conflict styles being used.

The different styles of conflict management and conflict communication are
important to understand when interpreting the actions and discourse of individuals
in a conflict situation. But often times there are situations that are more subtle and
cannot necessarily be categorized as conflict. We can refer to these as sensitive
issues. Sensitive issues are not considered conflict (although in some situations the
discussion of sensitive issues may cause conflict) but rather issues that may bring
about uneasiness or some degree of tension when discussed.

Pudlinski’s (2005) study analyzed sensitive issues through the discourse that
occurred over a peer support line. The support line was “designed to let callers talk
and perhaps discuss problematic issues before they become serious” (Pudlinski,
2005, p. 269). He discussed sensitive issues through what he called “troubles
tellings.” From his study eight methods were derived that expressed empathy
and/or sympathy. These included: “1) emotive reactions 2) assessments 3) naming
author’s feelings 4) formulating the gist of the trouble 5) using an idiom, 6)
expressing one’s own feelings about another’s trouble 7) reporting one’s own
reaction and 8) sharing a similar experience of similar feelings” (p. 270). Pudlinkski
also found that these methods differed among four dimensions: “1) depth of
understanding of the other’s trouble 2) depth of understanding of other’s feelings 3)
ability to normalize the other's feelings and 4) amount of shared similarity of feelings” (p. 284). These dimensions allow for the expression of empathy and/or sympathy to be generalized and applied to other situations. Understanding of how empathy and/or sympathy are expressed can be applied to roommates' reactions to discussion of sensitive issues. Is empathy and/or sympathy expressed by roommates while discussing sensitive issues or does the relationship roommates share cause for a less empathetic and/or sympathetic actions? Also Pudlinski's study failed to address how empathy and/or sympathy can be expressed through other mediums other than discourse such as through writing or a text message.

Goldsmith (2010) observed the sensitive issue of giving advice. Sometimes giving advice can be seen as a face-threatening response. Goldsmith conducted two studies. The purpose of the first study was to create a typology of topics in troubles talk that took into consideration the individuals, their relationships, and the problems themselves. This was done by asking undergraduate students to describe their responses to different hypothetical situations. The typology revealed that emotions, problems, actions, hearer, relationship, speaker, and conversation were all represented in a similar way as a response to some else's troubles-talk. From there Goldsmith conducted a second study that showed how these responses served as topics that people turn to in order to perform facework when giving advice to a person who is talking about his or her troubles. Students were given a questionnaire after reading a narrative about a student (of the same sex) that was nervous about giving a speech in class the next day. Following the narrative was one of the 109 messages derived from study 1. Students were asked to rate their
agreement of statements about the message. The study revealed that people relied most on the content of the expression when determining its face regard. When taking into account the content expressions such as “think of it like a conversation,” “you’re a good speaker,” and “I get nervous” were all responses associated with positive face. The only expression that was associated with negative face was “I can’t believe you’re nervous.”

Although there has been research done on sensitive issues there is still little known about sensitive issues that arise between roommates as well as the topics of these sensitive issues. There has been a lack of research regarding these issues that are unique to roommates. My research sets out to examine what topics roommates discuss in their texting and which of them are seen as sensitive.

**Face**

When thinking about conflict behavior, it is very important to realize the influences of face. Ting-Toomey & Kurogi (1998) defined face as “a claimed sense of favorable social self-worth that a persona wants others to have of her or him” (p. 187). A simpler definition given by Lulofs and Cahn (2000) is “people’s image of themselves” (p. 294). Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) go on to point out the vulnerability of face. Face can be enhanced (face supporting) or threatened (face-attacking). Conflict and conflict management almost always cause face to be threatened, and in response people perform facework. Facework “refers to a set of communicative behaviors that people use to regulate their social dignity and to support or challenge the other’s social dignity” (p. 188). Communicative behaviors are used to either maintain face, save face, attack face, or support face. Face
maintenance involves improving face therefore it is less vulnerable to face attack. Face-saving happens when you are responding to attack and you must repair your image that has been damaged by this attack. Face-attacking is used as an offense when others attack you. Face-supporting is boosting someone’s image in order to fulfill his or her face needs. Positive face is the “desire people have to be liked and respected by those important to them” and negative face “is the desire people have to be free from constraints and impositions” (Lulofs & Cahn, 2000, p. 295). Positive and negative face are the two types of face needs.

Face and facework as concepts are not culture specific, but the meaning of face and how we enact facework is influenced by culture (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Communicative behavior is a direct result of the concept of self, therefore face. Ting-Toomey & Kurogi present an updated version of the face-negotiation theory, which will be explained later in this chapter. The face-negotiation theory is one way to understand the conflict process. It uses the dimension of individualism-collectivism to explain why the meaning of face varies across cultures. The authors pointed out the differences in values between individualist and collectivism cultures. Individualist cultures value personal identity over group identity and are more concerned with self-esteem issues. Collectivist countries on the other hand, value the entire group identity over the individual identity and are concerned with mutual-face concerns; they also value ingroup interests over individual interests. These values are present in every aspect of the culture such as in the workplace, the home environment, within family and friends, etc. Ting-Toomey and Kurogi’s (1998) proposal for a new definition of face-work negotiation was an effort to
answer the question if face-work strategies vary along the concept of temporality, “does the face message function to proactively protect against potential face threats or to retroactively restore perceived face loss?” (p. 191). This question aims to reveal preventative and restorative facework strategies that are used in order to ease face threats or restore face loss. Two assumptions of the updated face-negotiation theory that directly relate to my study are one: despite culture, people try to maintain and negotiate face in all communication situations, and two: face is highly vulnerable in interpersonal situations. The assumptions of the face-negotiation theory can help us understand why roommates act in certain ways while handling conflict.

Further research has been done on the face-negotiation theory that has focused on the underlying assumptions that face explains the influence of culture on conflict behavior. This study uses dominating, integrating and avoiding, which were found as the underlying categories for a variety of distinct conflict styles. Participants of this study were university students from China, Japan, Germany and the United States. These countries were used to represent collectivist (China and Japan) and individualist (United States and Germany) cultures. The results supported that conflict styles are directly affected by cultural individualism-collectivism in the cases of avoiding and integrating conflict styles but not the dominating style. More specifically, people from collectivist cultures tend to use more avoiding and less integrating styles compared to members of an individualist culture. Furthermore, other- and self-face concerns are higher among those
members in a collectivist culture then those of an individualistic culture. (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2003).

Park and Guan (2009) applied the face negotiation theory to find out if the face type (negative or positive) that is threatened causes people to be more apologetic (an integrating facework). The two cultures they compared were the American and Chinese. They defined face-threatening acts as “acts that violate or fail to satisfy face needs” (p. 245). By using American and Chinese participants, individualist and collectivist cultures can be compared. Values of an individualist culture (such as personal autonomy and freedom of action) are more closely associated with negative face needs than those of a collectivist culture. This study also took into consideration the effect the type of relationship (stranger vs. friend) had on perceptions of the offending act and the degree to which it caused face threat. The results showed that both cultures found that more face threat was caused by an offending action if it was done to a stranger rather than to a friend, but the relationship type did not have an influence on whether the act threatened negative or positive face needs. Also they found that the closer the relationship type, the less threatening a face-threat act was in both cultures, even though the act threatened negative face needs or positive face needs.

Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Yokochi, Masumoto, and Takai (2000) pointed out the influence of facework behaviors during conflict on communication competence. Communication competence is how an individual feels about the interaction. They define it as “an assessment of the quality of interaction” (p. 398). They pointed out how understanding how people negotiate face during conflict can lead to effective
and appropriate conflict management in personal relationships. A variety of facework behaviors can be grouped together and reflect the three loci of face: other, mutual, and self, as well as three types of conflict styles: avoiding, integrating, and dominating. But even though conflict styles are reflective of self-, other-, and mutual-face, facework is not the same thing as conflicts styles. Drawing on previous research Oetzel et al. (2000) pointed out how the loci of face and types of conflict styles are related. Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) found that other-face correlated positively with avoiding conflict styles, mutual-face correlated positively with integrating conflict styles, and self-face correlated positively with dominating conflict styles.

Using the previous research, the aim of Oetzel et al.’s (2000) study was to create a typology of facework behavior in interpersonal conflicts between best friend and relative strangers within two different cultures (American and Japanese). The participants in their study were 237 undergraduate students from a large university in the United States and 49 undergraduate students from a university in Japan. They were given a questionnaire that investigated how face was negotiated during conflicts with friends as well as strangers, and out of the results of this questionnaire a typology was created.

The typology of face behaviors was divided into 13 clusters. The 13 face behaviors, a definition of the face behaviors, and example of each face behaviors as followed: The first face behavior is aggression, which is defined as abuse or putting the other person down. Telling the other he/she is wrong or stupid or calling another person mean names are examples. Second is to apologize, defined as
admitting that you made a mistake and telling the other. An example is saying that you're sorry. Third is avoid defined as withdrawing from the other person. An example is trying not to see or make contact with the other person. Fourth is compromise, defined as giving a little and getting a little. An example of this strategy is using the idea of giving a little and taking a little. The fifth strategy is considering the other; this is defined as taking into consideration the other person’s feelings to show that person respect. Sixth: defend self, defined as defending one’s side without giving in; generally in the response to a perceived attack. An example of this face behavior is not admitting you were wrong but instead insisting you were right. Seventh is to express feelings, which is defined as expressing how one is feeling without defending or attacking the other. An example would be explaining how you are feeling. Eighth is the face strategy to give in, which is defined by accommodating the other person and letting that person win. An example is backing down to solve the problem. Ninth, is to involve a third party; this means that you involving an outside person to help to resolve the issue. An example would be wanting a mediator to be involved. A tenth face strategy is to pretend that you are not upset or hurt by what has happened. Eleventh is private discussion, and an example would be not arguing with the other person in public. The twelfth face strategy is to remain calm. Finally, the thirteenth face behavior is talk about the problem, which is defined as directly discussing the issues of the conflict with the other person. An example would be working with the other person to find a mutually acceptable solution.
In order to validate this typology Oetzel et al. (2000) then had the participants rate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the behaviors from each category. The results produced three factors that were consistent with previous research of how conflict styles and face concerns in the face-negotiation theory are categorized. The three conflict styles were dominating, avoiding, and integrating facework. By having the participants rank the appropriateness and effectiveness of the categories, they revealed the connection between type of facework and the level of competence associated with it. Results showed that integrating facework behaviors were considered competent, avoiding facework behaviors were neutral, and dominating facework behaviors were considered incompetent (Oetzel et al., 2000).

The different styles of conflict and the concept of face are important when interpreting people’s actions in conflict situations. But what has failed to be discovered is what role text messaging plays in conflict. This inattention to texting is understandable as text messaging is a relatively new technology, but texting has become a staple of interpersonal communication, and it is important to consider its usage. Is text messaging used when resolving conflict? Why may text messaging not be used to manage conflict? Does text messaging threaten face or save face? It would also be valuable to better understand sensitive issues between roommates. Although roommates face conflict, they encounter issues that are more subtle and not necessarily categorized as conflict. What role does text messaging serve among roommates managing sensitive moments? My research sets out to observe these situations and how text messaging is used in these situations or not. One way of
answering these questions is by the actual analysis of text messages, which my study sets out to do.

**Text Messaging**

As American citizens living in the 21st century, there is no denying the influential role technology plays in people's everyday lives. As a result of these changes, even though text messaging may be a relatively new technology, it has become a vital part of people's everyday communication. The vast increase in the use of text messaging has changed how we communicate as well as how certain situations are handled. Research has revealed many purposes that text messaging serves. Purposes include safety and security of personal information, the ability to stay connected to others, and feelings of belonging. For this thesis the purpose of text messaging that I will focus on is the use of text messaging in practices of micro-coordination and hyper-coordination. Wood and Duck (2006) and Tell (2012) provide similar definitions of micro-coordination. Wood and Duck (2006) refer to micro-coordination as “the logistical coordination of activities” (p. 105). Tell (2012) states: “sociologist have coined a term for these freewheeling, mobile-lubricated social interactions: micro-coordination” (p. 1). An example of this would be coordinating where and when you are going to meet with a friend for lunch. Micro-coordination through text messaging accounts for flexibility and allows plans to be changed in an instant. Hyper-coordination refers to the emotional aspects of communication as well as the norms around what is deemed appropriate when using text messaging as a form of communication. Hyper-coordination assumes that
text messaging is being used for purposes beyond what is achieved through the use of text messaging for micro-coordination.

Tell (2012) focuses on how micro-coordination through text messaging is used to cancel plans. She discusses several accounts where people will receive text messages such as “sorry can’t make it tonight” or “dinner going long” either right before the time the event was supposed to take place or even after they have already gotten to the restaurant or place where they where the event or activity was to take place. The short, last minute nature of the text messages referring to a change or cancellation of plans is what constitutes them as practices of micro-coordination. Text messaging has made it easier for people to become “flakes.” With text messaging “the face-to-face consequences of being a flake have all but disappeared” (Tell, 2012, p. 1). Cancelling via text message has become an acceptable way to cancel or change plans. Because of this micro-coordination it makes it easier for people to make or rearrange plans based on the events that are occurring in that moment such as being stuck in traffic, or having a meeting run longer than expected. Tell’s study reveals that people do not feel badly when they text someone to cancel, but if they were to call and cancel plans over the phone, they realize that saying their reason for cancelling outloud sounds a lot worse. The use of micro-coordination and hyper-coordination through text messaging can be seen in many different situations, but has not been applied to roommate’s use of text messaging. It would be intriguing to discover how roommates uses text messaging to micro-coordinate and/or hyper-coordinate in certain situations.

This leads me to pose the following research questions:
RQ1: What factors influence certain conflict and sensitive issues being addressed over text message while others are not?

RQ2: What does a group text message among roommates look like?
Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study is to see how text messaging is used among a group of roommates and to investigate its role in the discussion of conflict and sensitive issues. First, I explain the process of collecting and analyzing the qualitative data through the focus group interview. Then, I explain the collection and analysis of the combined quantitative-qualitative data through the roommates’ group text message.

Focus Group Analysis

The first part of my study collected focus group interview data. Focus groups are one qualitative method used to collect data. One of the main strengths of focus groups, as Morgan (2002) pointed out, is that they represent the views of a large group of people compared to interviews or surveys where only a small set of people are represented. Morgan also pointed out that focus groups bridge social and cultural differences, giving rise to people that are not part of mainstream society. Focus groups are often used to complement other research methods, but can also be used as a sole method of research. One of the most important parts of a focus group is the moderator. The moderator performs that action of moderating the focus group during discussion but Morgan (2002) believes they should also be the one who recruits the participants for the focus group, prepare the questions that facilitate the focus group discussion, as well as analyze and prepare the results of the focus group.
The success of the focus group relies heavily on the moderator. The nature of a focus group is meant to be relaxed and informal. It is suggested that the moderator starts the focus group by asking a couple of questions to “break the ice” and set the relaxed atmosphere. Focus groups have a “semi-structured” format. Ideally when a moderator poses a question the participants’ response to the question should spark discussion that ideally addresses several other questions through open discussion between participants. Morgan argues that an ideal focus group is one that is less structured where “the moderator would have to ask only first and last questions” (p. 149). Lindlof and Taylor (2011) believe that the size of a focus group should be six to twelve people and last anywhere from thirty minutes to two hours.

I chose to conduct a focus group as one of my methods of data collection because I believe that the open-ended nature of focus groups would provide me with better data. I believe this because the discussion that takes place during a focus group is a result of participants reacting and building on each other’s responses. This is an advantage over a one-on-one interview where the participants respond only to the question that is asked by the interviewer. I also chose to use this method because I believe that its “semi-structured” format produces a relaxed environment which is not only appropriate for a group of preexisting roommates who are also close friends but is also conducive to producing successful results.

I believe conducting a focus group will allow me to understand whether roommates share the same views of conflict and sensitive situations. I also believe it will help me gain insight into how roommates understand their use of text
messaging in certain situations and what role text messaging serves, particularly when they are solving conflict or addressing sensitive issues with their other roommates. Finally, it will allow me to compare how roommates talk about how they think they use text messaging in addressing roommate conflict and sensitive issues to their actual use of text messaging.

The focus group for my research was composed of the seven women who are friends and live in a house together (my six roommates and myself). During the focus group I took on the role of the moderator. The focus group took place at the house in which my roommates and I live. It lasted for approximately 60 minutes and was voice recorded. Because the participants already knew each other there was no need for introductions, therefore I started the focus group by giving a brief explanation of my study, then I ask a question about the average amount of text sent per day by the average American in order to engage the interests of my participants, then I followed this with four types of questions that are defined by Lindlof and Taylor (2011) as “example,” “posing the ideal,” “compare-contrast,” and “photo-elicitation method” questions. Please reference Appendix B for the complete interview schedule.

Once completed, I transcribed the full focus group interview. Please see Appendix C for the full interview transcription. Pseudonyms were given to the participants as well as any other people that were mentioned during the interview in order to protect confidentiality. I transcribed the interview with much detail, including pauses, overlap, etc. Because I did not conduct my analysis based on these details, I did not include this level of detail in the excerpts within the thesis. I did
this in order to make the excerpts from the interviews reader friendly. In analyzing the focus group I looked for themes that arise throughout the process of discussing conflict, sensitive issues, and text messaging.

**Text Messaging Analysis**

The text message analysis was a combined quantitative-qualitative analysis. Quantitatively I provided an overview of the text message traffic among the seven roommates over a three-month time period (August – September, 2013).

I gathered the actual text messages of the group text between seven roommates by downloading an online software that transferred the messages from my phone to my computer. From there I copied and pasted the text messages from the group text into a Word document. From the word document I printed them out in hard copy form.

I coded these messages for two reasons. First, I wanted to get a general idea of what a group text message among roommates looked like. Second, I wanted to observe how roommates’ actual uses of text messaging. I paralleled my coding methods to the methods used by Tracy, Dusen, and Robinson's (1987) study of “'Good’ and 'Bad' Criticism.” I first created a codebook that I would code each text message by. Each category was assigned a letter to correspond with the column letter in the Excel spreadsheet where I would record the coding results. The codebook contains the following nine categories: A) Message # B) Roommate, C) Kind, D) Topic, E) Emoji, F) Picture, G) Time, H) Complaint and, I) Question. For each category a number was assigned to correspond with the subcategories. For
example, under the “kind” category 1=initiation 2=response 3=both 4= correction and 5=can’t tell. Please see Appendix D for complete coding book.

Further explanation as well as examples of these categories will be given later in the “findings” section. After the coding book was complete, I created an excel spreadsheet to record the corresponding numbers with each text message under the eight categories. From there I created tables of raw frequencies and percentages for the eight categories. Then, I used the pivot table function in Excel to compare categories. An example of two categories for which I used a pivot table was the “kind” and “topic” categories. From there I used the tables and the content of the text messages to formulate patterns between roommates as well as between the different categories.

I also conducted a qualitative analysis of the text messages. I did this by reading through all of the messages. While reading through the text messages, I made note of repeating patterns and interesting examples.

After applying these methods of data collection, I then began to address my research questions. In the next chapter I will present my main findings to the research questions I posed.
Chapter Four

Findings: Roommates’ Perceptions

In this chapter I will address my first research question of what factors influence the topics of conflict and sensitive issues being addressed over text messaging. There are four main factors that influence when text messaging is used to address conflict and sensitive issues and when it is not. In this chapter I discuss each of them. The determining factors that influenced the use of text messaging (or not) were the interpersonal relationships between the sender and receiver, the ability for an individual to overcome text messaging limitations, the individual’s personal construction and understanding of the nature of text messaging and the assumptions an individual makes about what outcomes text messaging may cause. In this chapter I will address each of these factors illustrating them with data from the focus group interview and explaining what I see as the significance.

Interpersonal Relationships

One main observation that emerged from the focus group interview was that the participants’ answers to the questions were not limited to the experiences or relationships they had with their current roommates. In many cases the participants brought up examples that were based on experiences with past roommates, boyfriends, and other friends. Also, a few of the questions raised issues that some participants had never experienced firsthand which forced their responses to be hypothetical.
In this section I will demonstrate how an individual’s understanding of her interpersonal relationships influences an individual’s decision to use text messaging as a means to communicate a conflict or sensitive issue. By using excerpts from the focus group interview, I will demonstrate the differences in communication based on the understanding of the interpersonal relationship.

Below is an excerpt from the interview where the moderator asked what the participants would do if their roommates were being loud after a roommate has requested the person to be quiet. The first response, excerpt 1, is an example of an answer based on a past roommate experience and the second, excerpt 2, is an answer based on a current roommate experience:

Excerpt 1
JC: I don’t know what I would do. That has happened to me. That happened to me a lot sophomore year. And nobody listen to me like and I just like pouted and like just tried to fall asleep.

Excerpt 2
ET: Yeah I tend to text when I was like sick upstairs. “Hey can you guys be quiet?” And no one answered. And I was like gosh darn it.

Excerpts 4 and 5 are answers to a situation (excerpt 3) that none of the roommates had experienced firsthand and had to answer from a hypothetical standpoint:

Excerpt 3
IR: Imagine your roommate asks you in person to borrow your brand new dress that you’ve never worn before you splurged and spent your entire last pay check in order to buy this dress because it was just so cute you couldn’t resist last time your roommate borrowed your shirt she left it a stain on it you don’t want your roommate borrowing your dress how do you tell her that she can’t borrow your dress?

Excerpt 4
**SC:** I would say it’s brand new and maybe you can wait until after I’ve worn it a few times.

Excerpt 5

**SS:** Say that I was planning on wearing it this weekend maybe you can borrow a different dress.

The following excerpt 7 is an example of a participant answering the question (excerpt 6) based on an experience with her boyfriend:

Excerpt 6

**IR:** So what do you think about like the permanent aspect of like a text messages? Like versus words cause like once you send a text message like it’s pretty permanent [SC: yeah] and you can like always go back and look at it yeah. [JC: Reread] I don’t know what do you guys think about that in conflict?

Excerpt 7

**SS:** I think like I’ve had a couple like text fights like with C, and it’s just it’s bad. I think I don’t know cause I do look back on it. It also kind of gives you clarity like when you look back on it. Like the next couple days. Like in the moment you look back on it and it kind of feeds the fire and it like makes you more angry and you’re like “yeah I’m so right.” Like this is just getting me more fired up and you just keep like go- feeding off it.

The fact that participants were able to draw on experiences outside the group of roommates signifies how interpersonal relationships influence if text messaging is used to discuss conflict or sensitive issues. First, the fact that the participants were able to draw on past roommate experiences were due to the age of the participants. All of the participants in this study were senior-year college students. Therefore, they have had three year of experience having one or more roommates. If the study was conducted with younger participants they may not have had as much previous experience to draw on and more of the answers would have probably been from a hypothetical standpoint. That the participants drew
from a number of personal experiences is significant because it supports the statement that conflict is inevitable, and part of all interpersonal relationships. The questions asked about conflict and sensitive issues were applicable to a variety of different people and time periods in the participants’ experiences. This supports the claim that conflict and sensitive issues are not limited to roommates but present in all situations and relationships. My findings show that although conflict is present in all situations and relationships; it is handled based on the individual’s assessment of the current situation and relationship. The individual’s assessment may relate back to the idea that conflict styles are influenced by the amount of concern for self and for others. The results also show that there are many other factors that are taken into consideration. The variability between situation and interpersonal relationship shows how conflict and sensitive issues are not always dealt with consistently. Furthermore it shows that conflict and sensitive issues may not be handled consistently even within the same situation and relationship. As with conflict styles, determining the medium in which to communicate conflict or a sensitive issue requires an individual to undergo a unique process.

One possible explanation for so many of the answers being based off of relationships outside the group of current roommates is that the roommates felt comfortable addressing conflict and sensitive issues that were not directly related to someone in the room. Because the interview was conducted with all the current roommates present, the participants may have hesitated to address an issue that had occurred between themselves in order to save face. This shows how discussion of conflict or sensitive issues can threaten face and how it is easier to save face when
the issues being discussed do not pertain to someone you are talking with face-to-face.

Another observation that emerged was that the participants’ answers often times depended on whom the conflict or sensitive issue was being discussed with. Often times the participants would handle the situation one way with one person and a different way with another person. Excerpt 8 is an example of a response that illustrates this phenomenon:

```
Excerpt 8
AC: It’s so depending on each individual person.
IR: Like your relationship with them?
AC: Just like if living with a new person. It would totally depend on what that person is like. But I feel like most of the time I would communicate things with them totally in person just because text messaging isn’t always like submitted. You know it’s not always absorbed the same way.
JC: Like with E I hard- I barely knew her when I moved in with her sophomore year. And like we like we would never text. So it would have been really bizarre for me to out of the blue text her something, especially if it wasn’t particularly nice or like friendly.
```

This excerpt shows the responses of roommates when they were asked how they would handle getting space from another roommate if they didn’t know the roommate that well and if they weren’t friends with the roommate prior to becoming their roommate. AC’s response demonstrates how interpersonal relationships are a major factor when determining how a situation is handled in relationship to text messaging. JC’s answer demonstrates a personal experience and how based on her interpersonal relationship with a particular roommate in the past she would not use text messaging. Participants formed multiple responses taking into account their interpersonal relationships. This revealed how the interpersonal
relationship is a key factor in determining if text messaging is used to address conflict or sensitive issues or not.

**Attempts to Overcome Text Message Limitations**

One re-occurring theme throughout the focus group interview was the limitations of text messaging. The main limitations that were mentioned were lack of tone, inability to express emotions, not being able to take back what was said, and not being able to see the other person’s reaction. These limitations seemed to be associated with situations where text messaging had the most face threatening potential. Throughout the focus group interview many of these aspects of text messaging were mentioned as reasons why text messaging would be an inappropriate means of communication for certain situations.

Although text messaging was seen to have limitations, the roommates also conveyed solutions to these limitations. The roommates addressed the ways that tone or emotion can be conveyed over text message. Some of the responses included punctuation, spelling, length of text message, allotted time before responding to a text message, and Emoji (picture characters). The attempts to overcome the limitations seemed to be a way to save face. The following excerpt, excerpt 9, exemplified how Emoji is used to demonstrate that a conflict that had been addressed in a text message had been resolved and was completed:

Excerpt 9

**JC:** I would like to cons- construe that something’s like over with a funny and light hearted. I would like use a “haha” and emoji probably. Just be like “oh everything back to normal now.” So that I wouldn’t feel weird with them when I saw them later.

**SS:** yeah

**MT:** yeah:

**AC:** It’s gotta follow up with a smiley face
The participant’s answers took into account ways that text messaging limitations would hinder the situation, therefore leading the person to alternative means of communication. If text messaging limitations were not seen as an issue or the elements that text messaging provides would suffice in place of these limitations, then the situation would be addressed using text messaging. The consistent pattern of actions that the roommates reported reveals the process roommates undergo in assessing the limitations of text messaging in determining if conflict or sensitive issues would be discussed over text messaging. Implementing this process demonstrates the participants’ values of addressing conflict and sensitive issues in an appropriate and respectful manner as well as her concern to save face and to avoid being face threatening. Their concerns to handle the situation appropriately and respectfully shows how in cases of addressing conflict and sensitive issues individuals strive not only to save face but to act in ways that will lead to resolution of the conflict rather than exacerbation of it. The roommates clearly demonstrate the value of conflict being resolved in a manner that is not going to further exacerbate the problem but rather in a way that both parties involved in the conflict would feel satisfied. This is why they took into account that the limitations of text messaging were going to influence the interaction of the parties involved in the conflict. The mode of communication that an individual decides to take when addressing conflict or sensitive issues is derived from their desire to resolve the conflict and to avoid exacerbation of the conflict.
Personal Construction and Understanding of the Nature of Text Messaging

Text messaging is a mode of communication that has evolved immensely within the past couple of years and will continue to evolve in the future. A common theme that was brought up in the focus group interview was the many influences the evolution of text messages has had on how people perceive text messaging.

The group of roommates reported the following as general characteristic of text messaging: “informal,” “passive aggressive,” “easy,” “less serious,” and “permanent.” When addressing the group text messages the roommates reported the following as characteristics of the group text: “overwhelming,” “laid back,” and “a way to stay connected.” There were both connections and distinctions the roommates made between text messaging between individuals and the group texts. There were also several instances where the roommates reported that they would address an issue over an individual text but not within the group text message. The roommates report of how they use individual and group text differently reveals how individuals’ understanding of text messaging and the different types of text messages influence their choice to address an issue over text messages or not. The following excerpt, excerpt 10, from JC demonstrates this phenomenon:

Excerpt 10

Yeah, I think it would be way worse in the group text if they did that because then you would have to be shiesty in front of everyone and you’d just seem like selfish. Or if they didn’t know the context cause like maybe your roommate knew like if you came home and told them about the whole scenario and then now everybody in the whole house would know and they’d be like “God what a jerk just let her borrow it.”

Excerpt 10, as well as the fact that people view and utilize individual text messages differently from group text messages, reveals individuals’ desires to save face. The
participants’ answer from the interview shows her interpretation that addressing an issue over a group text is potentially more face threatening than addressing it through an individual text message. The difference between a group text and an individual text was not only noticed by individuals but also was used as a factor in determining how they were going to go about addressing an issue or not. This factor is taken into account out of an individual’s desire to save face. To determine how a conflict or sensitive issue is addressed, an individual is going to choose the mode of communication that is going to be the most face saving. A group text message seems to be associated with having the most potential face threat. This serves as a possible explanation to why individuals may avoid using group text when addressing conflict or a sensitive situation.

**Assumptions of Outcomes Text Messaging Causes**

In the focus group interview there were many answers that involved addressing the potential outcome if a situation were to be addressed over text messaging. Because of the inability to express tone over text messages, the roommates reported a high level of concern to avoid the text messages they sent being misinterpreted or misunderstood. Excerpt 11 is an example of a participant voicing her concern of the outcome of a text messaging being sent to address the sensitive issue of borrowing:

**Excerpt 11**

**AC:** Or like when we use our tones to make it like not a big deal. That over text messaging if I said those words verbatim they’d be like maybe even offended.
Excerpt 11 exemplified the participants taking into account how using text messaging may cause a certain outcome. It was shown that in many but not all instances that the outcomes were usually undesirable. These outcomes were formulated based on past personal experiences. The roommates were able to predict these outcomes because of their experience with text messaging. Because text messaging has been a prominent part of the roommates’ experience of for several years they are able to draw on past experiences in order to make future outcomes more desirable. This shows how an individual’s past experience with discussing conflict and sensitive issues influences their decision to use or not use text messaging as a way to discuss conflict and sensitive issues in the present situation or in future situations. An individual’s past experience allows her to formulate assumptions to how using text messaging will lead to desirable or undesirable outcomes. Therefore, if an individual has not had success in creating desirable outcomes by addressing conflict and sensitive issues over text, she will be less likely to use text messaging as a mode of communication to address these topic in the future.

The focus group interview showed that these assumptions have helped constructed under which circumstances text messaging is used to create a desirable outcome. It also showed which situations using text messaging is likely to create an undesirable outcome. For example, the group agreed that that sending a text to ask a roommate to be quieter would be acceptable, but using a text message to tell a roommate you need space from her was not acceptable. Roommate MT stated: “that’s a face to face thing.” First, the roommates’ patterns to address certain
conflict or sensitive issues over text messaging and avoid addressing others showed their desire to create desirable outcomes. They wanted to take the course of action that would be the most likely to create the best outcome. Next, the pattern also shows the face-work being done by the roommates in order to maintain face or save face. Also, the pattern shows that individuals have shared and observed somewhat of the same experiences of text messaging, revealing that text messaging is experienced in a similar way by people. In turn, people draw on this mutual understanding and experience of text messaging to determine which situations should be discussed over text messages and which should not.

Making any type of assumption also poses the risk of the assumption being wrong. Although individuals may stray from addressing certain conflict or sensitive issues over text messages, they in turn limit their available resources for solving conflict. One roommate revealed that text messaging was preferred over no communication at all. But if an individual presumes that using text messaging will result in an undesirable outcome and are not willing to turn to another mode of communication, the assumption may cause the conflict or sensitive issues to not be addressed at all. In this case, the assumption may be why conflict and sensitive issues are avoided or not discussed at all.

Making an assumption about the likely results of addressing a conflict or sensitive issue over a text message proved a dominant factor affecting roommates’ decisions about whether to text. The process of using past experiences to make future decision is a process humans do somewhat naturally. It is interesting how this practical skill carries over into the technological world and how this leads to
advantages and disadvantages when discussing and solving conflict and sensitive issues. Although using past experiences to make an assumption about possible outcomes can be useful in creating desirable outcomes, it can also cause an individual to limit their resources and for conflict and sensitive issues to not be addressed or discussed at all.

**Conclusion**

The data revealed that interpersonal relationships between the sender and receiver, the ability for an individual to overcome text messaging limitations, the individual's personal construction and understanding of the nature of text messaging and the assumptions an individual makes about what outcomes text messaging may cause were the four determinants of whether conflict and sensitive issues were addressed over text message or not. These determining factors are all used in the process an individual undergoes when deciding how to handle conflict and sensitive issues. The process has been derived from past experiences and serves as a device for individuals to act in ways that will save face and lead to the resolution of conflict. Taking these determinants into consideration shows us many things. First, we can see why conflict may be seen more in individual texts than in group texts. Second, we can explain the amount of conflict that is seen being addressed over text message. Third, we can see which sensitive issues are more likely to be addressed in a group message. Finally, these four determinants reveal a consistent understanding of what is acceptable to address over text messaging. The focus group interview provides a sense of how roommates think about text
messaging, conflict, and sensitive issues. In the next chapter I look at what the group actually did in their group text message.
Chapter Five

Findings: Group Text Messaging Among Roommates

In this chapter I address my second research question regarding what a group text message looked like among the group of roommates. I draw from the coded data derived from a group text that occurred over a three-month period. I first address the general nature of a group text between roommates. The data revealed that in general group text purposes are ever-changing, the members of the group text demonstrate different texting patterns, and elements other than written language are used to communicate within the group text. Then in the final section I address the group text message and its relation to conflict and sensitive issues.

Formats, Purposes and Topics of Group Texting

Across the three months the roommates sent a total of 1,161 messages. In these messages there were four kinds of text messages the roommates sent (see Table 1).

Table 1: Kind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can not Tell</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding to a previous text was the kind of text message that was sent by the roommates the most (54.8%) followed by an initiated text message (32.7%). A text message was defined as an initiation if it posed a new topic and/or was unrelated to
previous conversation/text messages. The following are examples of initiated text messages: “Anyone feel like picking up a lady at 4ish?” and “Anyone seen my wallet hahah?” A text message was coded as a response if it answered a question or addressed a topic that had been mentions in previous text messages. A text “We owe 5,500 total” that followed “Did it say the amount for rent?” was coded as a response.

The large number of text messages that were responses conveyed how the roommates understood the group text as serving the two main purposes of initiating or responding to a topic. The fact that there were more response texts sent than initiated, demonstrates that the roommates found an important part of participating in the group text was to respond to previously initiated topics. The larger number of response text messages is most likely a unique factor in group messages. Since there are multiple people included in the text, usually more than one person is going to respond to the previous text messages. The larger amount of response-type text messages illustrates that responding to a previous text message is both appropriate and expected within a group text. When a roommate initiates a topic she does so with the expectation that one or more person within the group is going to respond. Although that is not always the case, the results from the data show that more times than not, that is the pattern of events that occurs within a group text messages.

There were eight main topics that roommates talked about (see Table 2).
Table 2: Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills/Property</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Check/Status Update</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting Help</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Content</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topic the roommates discussed most in the group text were “expressive content” (19.6%). Examples of this topic are “I like it” and, “Hotay yay good thank you!” The topics of “location check/status update” (19.5%) (for example “Where’s everybody at??”) and “other” (19.1%) (for example “hollahollaa”) were almost discussed as much among the roommates as “expressive content.” The least discussed topic was “bills/property” (8.1%). Two examples of this topic are “Yoyoyo rent is due today apparently?” and, “Internet is on and poppin.” The results indicated that there was no one topic the roommates discussed that was overwhelmingly prevalent a majority of the time. This distribution of messages topics reveals that the roommates found that the purpose of the group text message to serve as a means to address multiple topics. Also, because the “other” category fell within the top three most discussed topics, it is clear the topic categories discussed by the group ranged widely and were not limited.

The roommates sent different kinds of text messages based on the topics that were discussed (see Table 3).
### Table 3: Topics and Kind of Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Bills/Property</th>
<th>Location Check/Status Update</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Solicit Help</th>
<th>Borrow</th>
<th>Express Content</th>
<th>Mult</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Text Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can not tell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show the top two topics that the roommates initiated the most text messages about were “location check/status update” and “other.” “Soliciting help” and, “borrowing” were the two topics the roommates initiated the least amount of text messages about. Examples of “soliciting help” are asking for a ride, asking for a key when they forgot theirs, or asking for information or answer to a question, etc. For example: “Anyone know where the laundry key is?” and “Anyone know where the art exhibit is?” The “borrowing” topic is composed of borrowing food, money, clothes, cars, etc. The following are text messages from this category: “Anyone on campus that I can borrow their buff card for printing at the lib before 3??” and “Anybody home up front can I borrow some milk?”

This table also revealed that the roommates responded to certain topics more than others. The topic the group responded to most was “expressive content” and the topic they responded to least was “borrowing”. This table conveyed that the purpose of the group text varies based on what topics were initiated. It also shows
how the members of the group text messages determined the purpose of the group text based on their actions and their involvement within the group text.

Tables 4 and 5 show the difference in texting traffic between the three months. The group sent the most text messages during the month of October (57%) but sent the most texts per day during August.

Table 4: Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Times and Message sent per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Message Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two tables display how the purpose of the group text differed by time.

Table 6 and 7 show the raw frequencies of the number of complaints that were made within the group text and also the number of questions.

Table 6: Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or More</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of a text message containing a complaint about a person is “people are wack, so sad.” Complaints were only present 4% of the time and questions were present 23% of the time showing how the text messages could serve as a source of complaining or asking questions. This demonstrates that this group of roommates understood the purpose of the group text to be a possible source for complaining or posing questions. However, because complaints and questions were not present frequently, it shows that the roommates did not see these functions as the main purpose. Table 8 displays which topics the roommates asked questions about. The table further demonstrates that when the group text message was used to pose questions, questions addressed certain topics more than others.

Table 8: Topic and Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Number Of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills/Property</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Check/Status Update</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting Help</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Content</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows that “location check/status update” and “plans” (for example “I have to go to dinner with my fam haha”) were the topic categories the roommates asked the most questions about, while “other” and “expressive content” were the two topics the group asked the least amount of questions about.

Overall, the results showed that the group text served multiple purposes. It was found that the group text served as a way to initiate topics and respond to previously initiated topics. For this specific group of roommates, the group text served more for the purpose of responding to topics than initiating them. And although some topics were discussed more than others, there was no one topic that dominated the group text discussion. Also, even though the texts were coded into eight categories the topics discussed within the group text were by no means limited to these topics. The examination of complaints made and questions asked revealed how this group of roommates understood that the main purpose of the group text message was not to complain or ask questions, although texts could be used (and were) for those activities. The results do not indicate a consistent pattern of how the roommates used the group text revealing multiple and changing purposes the group text message served.

**Difference In Roommates Texting Patterns**

The next four tables reveal that within the group text there were differences in texting patterns seen between the different roommates. There were certain roommates that sent more text than others (see Table 9).
Table 9: Roommate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most text messages were sent by roommate IR (23.3%) and the least were sent by roommates JC and ET (10.6%). Roommates also differed in their patterns of initiating a topic, responding to a topic, or both (see Table 10).

Table 10: Roommate and Kind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Can not tell</th>
<th>Text Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that IR had the most text messages in initiated, response, both, and can't tell categories. In many cases the content of the text message initiated a new topic as well as responded to a question or topic that had been previously discussed. In this case it was defined as "both." An example of this kind of text message is “I'm really confused what rent r we paying? September or August? If it August should it be cheaper since we are only paying for half a month.” Roommate AC and ET had the least amount of initiated text messages. Roommate TM had the
least amount of responding text messages, as well as the most text messages that contained a grammar or spelling correction, in relation to a previous sent text message. These two tables show how certain roommates participated in the group text message more than others. It also shows that roommates chose to contribute to the group text in different ways. The differences among roommates in the amount they texted and the kind of texts they sent show how each individual contributed uniquely to the group text.

Differences among roommates were also seen in the topics they discussed more frequently. There were similar patterns of topics discussed among the two roommates (IR and AC) that sent the most total text messages (see Table11).

Table 11: Roommates and Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Bills/Property</th>
<th>Location Check/Status Update</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Solicit Help</th>
<th>Borrow</th>
<th>Express Content</th>
<th>Mult</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Text Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although IR sent the most amount of texts in six topic categories, roommate AC followed a similar pattern sending the second most in the same six categories. The topic pattern of these two roommates overall are similar except for in the plans topic, where AC was more likely to text about plans compared to roommate IR with
AC sending 40 text messages relating to plans and IR sending only 29 text messages relating to plans.

In comparison roommates JC and ET were the two roommates who sent the fewest messages. Both roommates only sending 10.6% of the total text messages exchanged in the group text. These two roommates initiated texts least often, but the data shows that JC was more likely to respond to text messages more frequently than roommates SS, ET, and TM. JC sent the least amount of text on the following two topics: 1) bills/property, and 2) plans. Roommate ET sent the least amount of text messages on the following topics: 1) location check/status update 2) soliciting help 3) other. Roommate MT sent the thirst least amount of text messages and sent the least amount of text messages in the following topics: 1) plans 2) expressive content, and 3) multiple. Roommate SS was the roommate who texted least about borrowing with only 1 text message sent about borrowing.

The results showed that the roommates who texted the most seem to have similar pattern in the topics they text about while roommates who text the least tended to have different topics that they texted about. These similarities and differences show that some roommates were likely to text more based on the topic that was being discussed. One possible explanation is that roommates text less because they only want to text about certain topics.

Some roommates used the group text to ask questions more than others (see Table 12).
Table 12: Roommate and Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Number Of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR sent the most texts that contained one or more questions, while roommate SC sent the least. These results showed how the roommates utilized the group text message in different ways. The questions IR asked addressed various topics. This revealed how IR utilized the group text as a way of seeking answers to a variety of topics. One of the topics the questions frequently sought information about were IR’s roommates. This potentially shows IR’s increased interest in her roommates.

In contrast, the lack of questions SC posed in the group text shows how her use of the group text differed from IR’s. SC may have asked fewer questions for several reasons. Two likely explanations for the reasons SC’s asked less questions was because she did not find the group text as an appropriate site for asking questions or she did not see it as an efficient way of seeking an answer to a question. For example, SC may have asked questions face-to-face and may have also found this alternative method as a more efficient way of getting the answer to her questions.

Table 13 shows the pattern difference among roommates in their use of Emoji.
Emoji are picture characters that are specifically designed for electronic devices. Some examples of Emoji are picture characters of different facial expressions (such as a smiley face), different types of animals (dogs, cats, etc.), and different types of foods (pizza, ice cream, etc.). Roommate IR sent the most Emoji and MT sent the least. The difference in Emojis sent shows the roommates’ utilization of means other than words to communicate to the rest of the group. There are many different views of the purpose of Emojis which may have influenced the roommates’ choices to use Emojis or not.

Overall, the difference between the roommates’ patterns of texting show how each roommate contributes to the group text message differently. The difference in the roommates’ group text messaging patterns shows how the members of the group text determine the nature of the group text. This also shows that what distinguishes one group text from one another group text is the people that are included in the group text. Although group text messaging is a uniform concept, the nature of group texts is never exactly the same. This is because group texts are made up of different people that will contribute to that group text in their own way as well as based on how they view the functions of that specific group text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Emoji Use</th>
<th>Text Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements Other Than Words

Within the group text there were text messages that contained content other then words. This included Emoji, pictures, videos, and website links. Emoji were used 7% of the time (see Table 14).

Table 14: Emoji

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoji</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pictures were present 2% of the time (see Table 15).

Table 15: Pictures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pictures</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these other content types were not used often, they were still present. This shows how roommates had access to means other than written language to communicate to one another. Emoji is a feature that is exclusive to text messaging and not used in any other means of communication. The roommates’ use of these exclusive features showed that it is an acceptable way to communicate over text message. Pictures are not an exclusive feature of text messaging because pictures can also be shared face to face, but when a picture is shared over text message, it can be shared to multiple people at once and can be shared at any time. The data showed that the roommates utilized these conveniences that texting provided to share pictures with the group. Tables 16 and 17 display Emoji by Topic and Pictures by Topic.
Table 16: Topics and Emoji Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Emoji Use</th>
<th>Text Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill/Property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Check/Status Update</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting Help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Content</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that Emoji was used most under the “expressive content” and “other” topics and used least under the “bills/property,” “soliciting help,” and “borrowing” topics. The results showed how Emoji better serves to either replace or complement written language under certain topics more than others. Table 17 shows that pictures were used most under the “other” and least under the “multiple,” “soliciting help,” and “plans” categories. This reveals that pictures are used to address various topics. Pictures do not serve to just address one topic but rather roommates use them as an alternative to written language for multiple
topics. Table 17 also shows that 5 text messages contained something other than a picture. As mentioned earlier these were videos, or website links.

Although means other than written language was used in only 9% of the total messages, these additions still served a purpose within the group text. The roommates utilized these features of text messaging to enhance their communication within the group. These elements allowed there to be very few limitations on what the group could share with each other. One criticism of text messaging the group of roommates shared through the focus group interview was that it was very hard to express emotions through text messaging. This may be one reason for the link between Emoji Use and the topic of “expressive content.” The roommates rely on these elements of text messaging to find alternative and possibly more efficient and effective ways to communicate to one another. This is significant because if these features were not available to the group text, the roommates would be limited to how and what they communicated to the rest of the group.

**Group Text Messaging in Relation to Conflict and Sensitive Issues**

The findings show that the group text messages among this group of roommates was not used as a means to address conflict but was used to address sensitive issues. After coding the text messages, it became apparent that not only was conflict not a commonly addressed topic, it was not ever addressed within the group text. On the contrary sensitive issues such as “bill/property” (8.1%) and “borrowing” (2.8%) were addressed in the group text message (referring back to Table 2).

Table 2: Topics
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills/Property</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Check/Status Update</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting Help</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Content</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1161</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though these topics were addressed they were not discussed very often.

These results show the roommates’ construction of a mutual understanding of what is appropriate to discuss in the group text and what is not. Also, this demonstrates how the members of the group text made a distinction between conflict and sensitive issues. How the roommates came to a mutual understanding of the distinction between conflict and sensitive issues cannot be determined based on the quantitative data alone.

**Conclusion**

The quantitative analysis of the text messages allows for us to get a general sense of what a group text message among a set of roommates looks like. In general, the data revealed that all the roommates used the group text for purposes Wood (2006) defines as micro-coordination and hyper-coordination. The results unveiled four main themes that defined the nature of the group text. Then, the relation between the group text message and discussion of sensitive issues was looked at. It was concluded among this group of roommates, sensitive issues were
discussed within group text messages while conflict was not. The possible reasons for this finding will be discussed further in the final chapter.
Chapter Six

Discussion and Conclusions

In this chapter I discuss the connections between the quantitative and qualitative data and how this furthers our understanding of roommates and their use of text messaging. Next, I examine the study’s limitations and ideas for future research, and then I give a brief summary of my study's findings.

Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The idea to conduct both qualitative and quantitative methods of data arose from my interest to see how roommates talked about their use of text messaging compared to their actual use of text messaging. By gathering actual text messages from a group text between seven roommates and also conducting a focus group interview with the same group of roommates, I was able to compare their thoughts to their actions. Overall, it was seen that as a group the roommates’ use of the group text closely reflected their thoughts about how they were using the group text. For example, the roommates reported that the group text was a way for the group to stay connected, which was supported by the large amount of texting traffic seen throughout the three months. Another way the consistency between thoughts and actions was demonstrated was through the similarities between the topics the roommates reported discussing in the group text and the topics that were actually discussed in the group text. Being locked out, money, and planning are examples of three topics that were both reported topics of discussion by the roommates and topics of actual discussion within the group text. The alignment of thoughts and
actions could also be seen on an individual level. The roommates’ understanding, as well as their attitude towards the group text, was reflected through their individual texting patterns. For example, during the focus group interview certain roommates expressed a partly negative attitude towards texting, reporting that it is “overwhelming.” Roommates who reported negative feelings tended to text less within the group text. One individual expressed her understanding that she and another roommate would have a very low amount of responses. Looking at the quantitative data this was indeed true, and the two roommates were in the bottom half in amount of response texts sent. During the focus group interview the roommates discussed the use of individual texting as well. Because my study only analyzed text messages within the group text and not text messages between just two individuals, it is difficult to see if the roommates’ thoughts about how they used group texting aligned with how they actually used individual texting.

The similarity between how roommates think about their use of text messaging and their actual use of text messaging shows that individuals’ text patterns can be predicted based on their thoughts of how they use text messaging. As mentioned earlier, although my study did not analyze individually-sent texts it can be assumed that the connection between the roommates’ thoughts and actions in relation to the group text can be applied to individual texts as well. The connection between thoughts and actions helps us gain a broad explanation of people’s actions. Although there may not always be a connection between people’s thoughts and actions, in most cases a person’s thoughts of how they act can be used
to make predictions about how individuals are going to handle certain situations.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

One limitation of my study is that I analyzed only one group of roommates. The group my study focused on consisted of all females, between the ages of 21 and 22. It would be interesting to further my study by comparing several groups of roommates made up of a different ages, ethnicity, and gender. Holmstrom’s (2009) study revealed that men and women differ in which communication skills they place emphasis on. Because differences between males’ and females’ communication styles have been found, there should be an expected difference between how they use text messaging.

Another limitation of my study was that it only analyzed group text messaging. The results showed that roommates did not initiate about conflict in the group text in order to save face. My study could be furthered by also analyzing roommates’ use of individual text messages to see how it is different from their use of group text messaging, and to investigate if the same face-saving behaviors apply to individual texting.

A third limitation is that my study only analyzed three months worth of a group text. Further data could be done analyzing the group text over a longer period of time. It would also be interesting to see how the use of the group text changes after the roommates do not live with each other anymore.

**Summary of Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of text messaging in conflict situations among roommates as well as within unique situations that only
roommates are faced with. For that reason, a review of the literature was done on conflict, sensitive issues, and text messaging. A final goal of the study was to focus on the role of group text messaging specifically.

The study investigated two questions: how do roommates understand the role of text messaging in managing their relationships, and how do they actually use text messaging to manage their relationships. Therefore, the study involved two parts: first, a group of roommates participated in a 60-minute focus group about their use of text messaging. Then, more than 1,000 text messages were collected over a three-month period from this same group of roommates. The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data revealed several findings. First, the study found that roommates do not resort to the use of group text in times of conflict. The main cause of roommates resorting to other means of communication resulted from the roommates’ desire to save face. The study’s second finding was that group text messaging is seen as more face-threatening than handling conflict through individual text messages. Third, the study found that the roommates do discuss sensitive issues via a group text. The distinction the roommates made between conflict and sensitive issues shows that there are indeed situations that are not considered conflict but yet still cause some level of discomfort. Finally, the study found that the roommates’ thoughts about how they used the group text message reflected their actual use of group text. The limitations of the study are addressed and suggestions are given for future research.

When reminiscing about college, past roommates seems to be a topic that always gets brought up. We hear stories about how people’s freshman year
roommate ended up being their best man at their wedding. While other stories sound more like nightmares and people cringe and the thought of how messy and obnoxious their old roommate was. Despite the stories outcome, my study can relate to roommates of all kinds. With the rise of technologies such as text messaging, roommates can chose (or not chose) to utilize this technology. Using the findings from my study, hopefully their choices lead to roommate stories with a happy ending.
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Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

Study Title:
Key Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katie Anselmo</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>303-907-2978</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Katie.anselmo@colorado.edu">Katie.anselmo@colorado.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Tracy</td>
<td>Faculty Advisor</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>303-492-8461</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Karen.tracy@colorado.edu">Karen.tracy@colorado.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. Please think about the information below carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

1. Purpose and Background
The purpose of this study is to examine how text messaging is used amongst roommates when resolving conflict and discussing sensitive issues. This research study includes a 90 minute focus group that will be audio recorded, transcribed and analyzed. This study will also include analysis of the group text messages among you and your six other roommates between the months of August and December 2012.
You are being asked to participate in this study because you have indicated an interest in helping me in my study, and because you are one of the roommates in the household of seven roommates.

2. Study Tasks and Procedures
Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to participate in a 90-minute focus group that will be audio recorded. The focus group will take place in your home. The participants will include you (if you agree to participant) and your six other roommates. I will conduct the focus group as well as be a participant in it. In the focus group you will be given hypothetical scenarios that could possibly occur between roommates and ask to discuss how you would
react, as well as your thoughts and feelings about the situation. I will also use two visual images in the form of pictures that will be accompanied by a scenario and ask you to discuss your reaction, thoughts, and feelings to the hypothetical scenario and pictures.

Participants in this focus group will be audio recorded using my iPhone cell phone device. The recording will immediately be transferred and stored to my computer, which requires a password to login. The only individual who will have access to the recording will be Katie Anselmo, the Principal Investigator and Karen Tracy, Faculty Advisor. The recording will be kept on Katie’s cell phone device (to ensure access to recordings in the case that they are deleted from the computer) and Katie’s personal computer. Both devices require a password to gain access to information on devices. The recordings will be used for analysis and will be retained for one year.

You may ask to have the audio recording equipment turned off at any point in time. Also, this study will analyze the text messages exchanged in the group text between you and your six other roommates from August 2012 - December 2012. If you wish for particular text messages or a particular situation within the group text to not be used as data in this research project please inform me, and I will ensure that these text messages will not be used as part of the data in my research.

3. Duration

Participating in the focus group for this study should take approximately 90-minutes of your time. The focus group will take place early in the 2013 school year semester.

Text messages from the group text will be examined starting from August 1st, 2012 through December 31st 2012.

4. Study Withdrawal

At any time, you have the right to withdrawal in participating further in this study.

5. Risks and Discomforts

There are no foreseeable risk or discomforts associated with this study. However, if at any point in time you feel uncomfortable, you may choose not to answer a question or even withdrawal from the focus group entirely. You may also request that specific text messages not be used as data within the group text message.

6. Benefits

There are no potential benefits to participants except that they may gain insight into roommate conflict and why texting is used to discuss sensitive issues.

7. Confidentiality

These are some reasons that we may need to share the information you give us with others:

- If it is required by law.
- If we think you or someone else could be harmed.

8. Compensation
Participants will not receive compensation for their participation.

9. Participant Rights

Taking part in this study is your choice. You may choose either to take part or not take part in the study. If you decide to take part in this study, you may leave the study at any time. No matter what decision you make, there will be no penalty to you in any way.

10. Contacts and Questions

For questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, call the Principle Investigator, Katie Anselmo, at (303)-907-2978.

If you have questions about your rights as a research study participant, you can call the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is independent from the research team. You can contact the IRB if you have concerns or complaints that you do not want to talk to the study team about. The IRB phone number is (303) 735-3702.

11. Signing the Consent Form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form. I am aware that I am being asked to be in a research study. I have had a chance to ask all the questions I have at this time. I have had my questions answered in a way that is clear. I voluntarily agree to be in this study. I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant (printed)

__________________________________________________________

Signature of Participant _____________________ ______________________ Date ____________

__________________________________________________________
Appendix B: Focus Group Interview Schedule

Introduction: Today we are going to be talking about how roommates use text messages to manage day-to-day life. Before we get started I will go over the consent form.

- Explain consent form and obtain a signed consent form from each participant

This group interview will take about 90 minutes and will be audio recorded using for later analysis. Everyone’s name will be changed in the research report I will be writing.

Start with an interesting question: How many text messages does an average American between the ages of 18 and 24 send and receive per day?

Answer: 109.5, that’s 3,200 texts per month. *(Time Tech Magazine, 2011)*

Nondirective Questions: (5 minutes/question)

- Example questions
  - Give an example of when you used text messaging to address a conflict with a roommate
  - Give and example of when you used text messaging to address a sensitive issue with a roommate
  - Give an example of when text messaging lead to the resolution of a conflict

- “Posing the ideal” (10 minutes/question)
  - Imagine your roommate asks you in person to borrow your brand new dress that you have never worn before. You splurged and spent your entire last paycheck in order to buy this dress because it was so cute you couldn’t resist. The last time your roommate borrowed your shirt she left a stain on it. You don’t want your roommate borrowing your dress. How do you tell her that she can’t borrow your dress?
  - Now imagine the same situation but instead of asking to borrow the dress in person she asks you over a text message.
  - Image that you are in your room studying for a final exam. All your other roommates are have just completed their finals and are downstairs celebrating by drinking and listening to music. They are being very loud and the noise is interfering with your ability to concentrate.
    - How do you ask them to lower the noise?
    - What do you do if they fail to listen to your request and continue to be loud?
    - Under what circumstance would you make this request by text?
  - Image that lately you have been very irritated with one of your roommates. You feel that all you need is some space from them.
    - What do you do to get space away from them?
    - What do you do if they don’t give you your space?
    - How would you tell them that you need space from them?
    - Under what circumstance would you make this request by text?
Now imagine that lately your roommate has been acting weird and seems to be avoiding you, but you don’t recall doing anything to make them upset.

- Would you confront your roommate about their actions?
  - If so how would you go about confronting them?
  - If not why would you not confront them?

- Under what circumstance would you make this request by text?
- Permanent
- Wording? – how interpreted
- How do you use bitchy tone
- Facebook IM?
- Length?
- Time

**Directive Questions (5 minutes/question)**

- “Compare-Contrast Questions”
  - How does addressing a conflict or sensitive issue over text messaging differ from addressing a conflict or sensitive issue in person?
  - How does being roommates different from being friends?
  - How does the time it takes to resolve a conflict over text messaging compare to the time it takes to resolve a conflict face to face?
  - How does the resolution of conflict over text messaging compare to when the conflict is solved face-to-face?
  - How do topics that are normally addressed over text messaging compare to topics that are normally addressed in person?

We are just about finished. What last thoughts do you have about how roommates use texting?
Appendix C: Focus Group Transcription

I transcribed the focus group interviewing using the standard symbols with subtle variations. One variation I used was placing the overlapped speech in the approximant position in which it overlapped. The following is a key of the transcription symbols I used:

Colon(s): Extended or stretched sound, syllable or word
(.) Micropause
(1.0) Times Pause
(() Double Parentheses: scenic details
() Single Parenthesis: transcriptionist doubt
[ ] Brackets: Speech overlap
= Equal Sign: Latching of contiguous utterance
! Exclamation Points: animated speech tone
hhh audible outbreaths
pt lip smack
hah laugh syllable

Focus Group Interview

1 IR: Alright:: (.) today? we are going to be talking about how roommates use text messages to manage day to day life (.) before we get started I’ll go over the consent form hhh oh yeah you guys all have to sign consent forms (2.0) um::
2
3 ]C:
4 SS: [about?]
5 IR: No(.) you have to sign (.) actually sign it you guys want to:: look over it real quick?
6 SS: [hah]
7 ]C: yeah: (.) I’ll sign it
8 IR: [ok] hah so basically:: it’s so: the purpose:: is to examine how text messages are used amongst roommates: when resolving conflict and discussing sensitive issues::? (.) and:: basically: you’re:: agreeing to:: the:: like focus group the recording here and (.) like the text messages:: that I have accessed? (.) and if you don’t want like anything included then you just: tell me and I just won’t include it:? in like the analysis and stuff? (1.0) and you can ask me to turn off the recorder at any time::?
9 SC: [hah]
10 IR: [[hah and if you’re uncomfortable or you can stop the interview hah hhh al::righty:: so: (.) to start with an interesting question::? how many text messages do an average: American between the ages of eighteen and twenty four send and receive per day:
11
12 AC: 50
13
14
JC: [50]
AC: [[yeah]]
JC: per day?
IR: per day
SS: [is this a quiz?]
JC: [like twenty?]
IR: <it's just like -
SC: [yeah I would say yeah more like(·) I'm gonna go with thirty (1.0)
AC: send and? receive
IR: [yeah] [yeah]
MT: oh(·) send and receive
IR: [yeah] [yeah]
ET: I'd say fifty
SS: [upper fifty::] like seventy five
JC: [what?]
IR: a hundred and nine point five::
SC: holy crap
ET: [wow::::]
JC: [every single day?]
IR: [yeah] so that's like
SS: we get like (1.0) seventy alone from our group text
AC: [that sounds right to me]
IR: [hah]
ET: [yeah definitely]
MT: [that's cray]
ET: wow::::
IR: al::right:: so the firs::t? question: ar:e example questions:(·) and: the first one is
give an example of when you used text messaging to address a conflict with
a roommate (2.0) does anyone have:(·) like an idea (1.0)
AC: [um::]
MT: like(·) rent?:?(·) like money?
IR: [yeah: like so that's kind of what I considered more of
like sensitive issues so that's kind of why I included it but was there I mean
we don't really have that many::(·) conflicts I guess(·) yeah::
AC: [I think that: it's most(·) for the
money: yeah that's the most easy thing:
IR: [that's what I thought too]
JC: [for the front house it's
who's gonna buy the next round of toilet paper
MT: yeah(·) that's true?
AC: [yeah]
JC: it's a sensitive issue hah
((laugher))
AC: (if you're) at the store(·) what really what really-
ET: [or like if you're locked out::]
SS: [yeah::]
MT: [yeah::]

ET: = cause you have a different text messages so every can just go look at it back
at the amount that they owe

IR: yeah

MT: but yeah if someone locks you out:

IR: yeah I don’t know I just was thinking like that one time that we went to the
mountains:: and there was like kind of like that awkward tension the whole
time:: and afterwards I don’t know() I feel like text messaging was easy
to() kinda

SC: [yeah]

MT: [yeah]

IR: solve that yeah

SC: [get across what you want]

MT: [well yeah like a plann:ing situation]

IR: yeah:: pt() alright:: so(): the next one is give an example of when you used text
messaging to address a sensitive issue so that was like the toilet paper:

((coughing))

SC: [yeah::]

MT: [yeah::]

IR: pt um::(.) do you guys think like borrowing clothes and stuff or food?

SC: [yeah]

ET: um:: yeah I text sometimes() about food

JC: [yeah before you go for it

IR: = [yeah]

SS: [it’s usually maybe after the fact-

SC: [right::]

((laugher))

ET: YEAH hah I borrowed your shoes

AC: [usually]

AC: yeah but usually if I’m() if it’s like sensitive in a bad way like I don’t do text
messaging

IR: [yeah()] like what do you mean in a bad way

AC: [like I either not text back like if I’m actually

upset about something:: () I’ll usually not text back or just talk to the

person

JC: call them on the phone cause it’s more direct

AC: but if like usually cause text messaging is pretty informal like usually if I say
something? it would probably be taken as a joke: hah more then anything

you know?

SC: [yea you can’t read the context

MT: [and it’s definitely not gonna be like in the group text

if there is a-

IR: like a one on one

MT: yeah like a one on one


IR: [ok: so given an example of when text messaging led to the resolution of a conflict or I guess sensitive issue:]
AC: is this just among roommates?
IR: yeah::
AC: okay:
IR: and is it just the group message
AC: but strictly to roommates
IR: = also you can you can also do:: (. ) outside the group message I guess
JC: but strictly to roommates
IR: [yeah::]
JC: umm
AC: cause I feel like sometimes:: (. ) like if I feel like I want to tell somebody
jc: like they did something that made me upset but I’m not trying to make it a huge deal out of it? (. ) like I’m not tryin ta like sit them down and talk about it I might send them a text message (. )
JC: [mmm hm::]
AC: =and it just depends
JC: yeah
SS: I think we use it mostly like (1.0) for tasking things like who’s going to store::
or like the liquor store (2.0) hah
SC: or to drop off rent checks
ET: [or if you (need to) do something
SS: yeah or if you need a ride::
ET: [yeah]
SS: =who’s available to come pick you up and
JC: [yeah that’s a big one hhh for me hah
SS: it’s a really easy way to –
IR: k anything else?
(2.0)
AC: um:
(2.0)
SS: I know in(,) the group text I have with you and Nika like we kind of just like
(2.0) Nika will say:: like I don’t know we like emotionally like support each
other I guess like in the group text like if we’re going through something we just like ?oh it’s okay:: like (2.0) I don’t’ know
AC: yeah it’s like a constant (. ) thing you have there: during the day like if you need
to get something out
JC: like MT was having a conflict today in class:
((laughter))
JC: and it was like a way to like distract herself cause you were feeling so hungover:

MT: [oh yeah::: hah]

JC: in Chem (1.0) and sometimes I text just to like give myself something to do(:)

MT: [yeah:]

JC:= and the group text is like my out let

MT: [entertaining]

SC: [entertain my mind]

AC: yeah like yester when I was in class and I was just like well:: this has been the most miserable

((laughter))

AC: = day ever(,) so I texted that then like five really cute boys walked in to my class so I texted that too::

((laughter))

ET: but like SC today texted me!:God darn it our major sucks I have three boys in like all my international

((laughter))

ET: = affairs classes

SC: yeah and I knew that you’d be able to (complain) back

((laughter))

SC: =because of our major yeah that’s(,) that’s true

IR: that’s funny

SS: [we like to use it for like just like witty remarks that you kind of think about]

SC: [yeah]

SS:=throughout the day:

IR: [yeah::]

SS: that you think are funny

AC: [like things you think to yourself and

((laughter))

AC:= think thank God I have roommates to tell this to they all get it

((laughter))

ET: it’s so funny

SS: [even if they don’t get it:::

SC: [yeah:::]

IR: [that’s true::]

SS: =it’s funny

IR: =what do you guys think of like the use of umm emoji?

((laughter))

((coughing))

ET: love it

SS: I’m big on emoji because I’m too lazy to really

JC: [yeah:::]

SS: convey(,) what I’m trying to say

ET: you can’t really express that kind of face or (,) those symbols in words

IR: like face to face yeah or words:
ET: yeah so: (.) it's perfect?

JC: I'm a crying cat that's exactly how I feel

((laughter))

AC: and there's no way: to convey: like conveying:: mood and emotion over text
messages is LITERALLY impossible

ET: [impossible]

AC: =and even though those emoji are so:: random it does kind of lend itself to

MT: [helps out]

AC: =creating some kind of-

SS: like personality:

MT: because that's the problem in text messaging

IR: yeah::

MT: you can like not know someone's tone if they're like being sarcastic

AC: [right]

MT: =or being mean or like they're mad at you but like an okay period can be
like(.) anything

AC: [okay]

IR: [like they're mad at you::]

MT: =angry or like(.) alright

IR: yeah:: well that's like one of the problems that I found like analyzing and coding
it because like (. ) I don't know I was I don't know I'm trying to look at like
(.) the use of like questions? and stuff too but it's just like SO:: hard to like
categorize or like tell the difference

JC: [mmhm: yeah::]

IR: so that's why it's kind of hard with the conflict or the sensitive cause you can't
really tell if (they're) like being defensive:: or like nagging or like

JC: [right]

IR: =you know what I mean?

((yeah: mmhm:)

IR: =I don't know so: I don't know it's interesting pt okay:: now these are called
posing the ideal questions? (. ) and: it says imagine you're roommate asks
you in person to borrow your brand new dress that you've never worn
before pt you splurged and spent your entire last pay check in order to buy
this dress because it was just so cute? you couldn't resist hhh last time your
roommate borrowed your shirt she left it a stain on it hhh you don't want
your roommate borrowing your dress how do you tell her that she can't
borrow your dress

(3.0)

SC: I would say it's brand new and maybe you can wait until after I've worn it a few
times

JC: [yeah until I've worn it or something

SS: Say that I was planning on wearing it this weekend:: maybe: you can borrow a
different dress

SC: yeah

AC: I would say last time you spilt on it so maybe next time after I've worn it a once
((laughter))

ET: wear a bib

((laughter continues))

AC: wear a rain coat over it

((laughter))

ET: you’re allowed to wear it but you have to wear a bib and rain coat

IR: do you like bring up the price of the it at all: or like how you-

SS: hmm: no::

JC: [no]

SS: I don’t buy expensive clothes so::

(laughter)

AC: if I did I could buy a really cheap thing but it could mean just as much to me

SS: [yeah::]

JC: to be honest I’d probably let them wear it but I would be like very firm before I
gave it to them and be like

MT: [don’t fu-

JC: =don’t fuck this up or I’ll actually be really mad at you and then usually :) oh

sorry

IR: that’s ok hah

JC: =then usually:: that would be enough and they’d be like no I just won’t wear it::

hah

((laughter))

MT: yeah

ET: [yeah::]

MT: (you’d just be) like remember? last time::?

AC: [usually you’d just be like you really really really really

have to be careful though and then: :) then I’d probably let them borrow it

JC: You’d be like here (flip it) so::

AC: [I’m planning on getting wasted so::

((laughter))

IR: k: now imagine: the same situation but instead of asking to borrow the dress in

person then your friend asked you over text messages

(1.0)

SS: I think that would bother me:: more

IR: why

SS: I don’t know? I feel like it’s kind of-

AC: It’s harder to respond to:

SS: yeah:

JC: [especially if they did in the group text]

SS: [it catches you off guard: a little big more I think like so you’re

just like oh:: they’re in my closet like :) it’s like kind of a little bit violated

AC: and it’s just so much harder to word like actually think about how to word that

then

JC: [right]

AC: =then letting it just come naturally as a verbal response
MT: yeah cause you convey it so much better with words like I can just like picture
Caroline being like well remember what happened last time?
JC: yeah hah
((laughers))
AC: or like when we use our tones to make it like not a big deal that over
SC: [right:]
AC: =text messaging: if I said those words verbatim they’d be like maybe even
offended by like
IR: [like interpreted::]
AC: =if I said them
JC: yeah I definitely think that’d be true(.) cause you couldn’t like laugh it off or:
   convey comic relief at all it would just be like
IR: mmhm:
JC: =no hah
(laughter)
AC: or be like yeah exactly
IR: what:: why did you: () can you like expand on:: () if it would be hard in the
   group text message
JC: yeah: I think it would be way worse in the group text if they did that because(.)
   then you would() have to be shiesty in front of everyone and you’d just
   seem like selfish or if they didn’t know the context cause like maybe your
   roommate knew like if you came home and told them about the whole
   scenario: () and then now everybody in the whole house would know: and
   they’d be like !God what a jerk(.) just let her borrow it
((laughter))
SS: yeah
AC: I don’t know
SC: [I could never see this happening]
IR: hah I know
((laughter))
SC: sorry
IR: okay:: imagine that you’re in your room studying for a final exam () all your
   other roommates have just completed their finals and are down stairs
   celebrating by drinking and listening to music
ET: [is this a real life example::]
((laughter))
IR: they are being very loud and the noise is interfering with your ability to
   concentrate how do you ask them to lower the noise::
JC: who did this happen to
SS: [shut the phhh
AC: [when ever I’m:: in this position: I usually(.) send a text
message
JC: [mmhm:]
ET: [In the group I was upstairs sick once when you guys
SC: [yeah if you’re in bed and
   you like really don’t you’re like tryin to fall asleep or something like that it’s
almost easier to be like hey can you guys just turn down the music(.) and I
certainly just do that

ET: [mhm]
SC: =for them
AC: [yeah::
SC: [you know]
AC: =cause everybody just understands like
JC: [definitely]
SC: [yeah::]
AC: =if I'm in that position and people are being loud I just send them a text
message hhh then go in the room and I usually just say sorry even though
it's not really like(.) the nicest text message I know that they understand

SC: yeah: yeah:
AC: so it's not a big deal
SS: we all take that like really seriously I think like that like if you come out of your
room especially: and like say: please be quiet
AC: [yeah::]  
JC: yeah everyone gets really awkward

((laughter))
SS: yeah no more noise
AC: I feel more I feel more
MT: [I feel like no matter what-]
AC: =mean doing that then just sending a text message
SS: yeah
MT: well:: and whenever it's not like anyone's ever trying: to be loud it's just
catches you
SS: [yeah]
MT: off guard then you just feel really bad
SS: [yeah]
MT: =either way so you're just like oh:
JC: yeah it's usually like what always happens is Sunday nights Nick closes: and
Chelsae opens: hhh so Nick get to my house at (. )twelve thirty: and I wait
up for him in the living room hhh and then we like talk really loudly hah and
have the TV on and AC just has to be like go to our room? hah

((laughter))
JC: like okay:: sorry::: hah
AC: that's exactly what happens
JC: [it's happen every weekend]

((laughter))
MT: yeah that did happen
IR: [that's funny::]
ET: [that happened-]
AC: [I usually always send a text message]
MT: cause then you'll be like oh yeah-
AC: [they go away]
MT: (you’d stay awake until N got there)
C: mhm: I’d –
MT: [we’d be like in the living room::]
IR: ok so: (1.0) lets just say that you did send a text message? and: () everyone
like () no one listened and they kept being loud then what would you do
ET: get out of my room
SC: [yeah]
IR: [yeah]
ET: I wouldn’t be happy about it:
SS: mmmmm
JC: I don’t know what I would do that has happened to me that happened to me a
lot sophomore year
ET: [actually I think that -]
JC: =and nobody listen to me like and I just like: () pouted and like just tried to fall
asleep
MT: yeah either-
AC: [call or just do that]
SS: I feel like either you just like when it gets to that point like you almost start
thinking: that like they’re like doing it on purpose
JC: [yeah? cause you just get so pent up in
your room]
SS: = uhhhh how can they not know that I have to wake up early
SC: yeah exactly why aren’t they thinking about me
JC: [yeah or they’re just so drunk and
they can’t even () they’re not even checking their phones:
((yeah))
ET: Yeah I tend to text when I was like sick upstairs hhh ! hey can you guys be quiet
and no one answered and I was like () gosh darn it
JC: they’re (always) hah
ET: = I can’t get out of bed: like
((laughing))
ET: =D’s here screaming (and I was like) this is unacceptable
((laughter))
ET: I called SC and she was like !oh my go I’m so sorry
MT: [we all look at our phones
at the same time
((yeah))
ET: it was so easy though but-
SC: !to the front house
JC: this is unacceptable hah
((laughter))
IR: um:: so we kind of hit on this () but: if you could just like be more concrete like
what wha- under what circumstances would you make this request by text
hhh so like we said kind of like the first:: that would be like your first mode
of action or whatever
IR: = if you were sick an- or just didn’t want to get out of bed::
(1.0)
ET: yeah
JC: yeah if you didn’t it’s it’s depends
[ it usually depends on the time
JC: = if there were guests I would be less inclined to go out
SC: me too
JC: but if it was just you guys I wouldn’t really have a problem being like ! yo (or
like) just yelling to you guys or something like that
SC: yeah
MT: (or just) pound on the doors::
SC: break down the doors
((laughter))
IR: okay:: () image: that lately you have been very irritated with one of your
roommates you feel that: all you need is some spa- space from them what
do you do to get space away from them (1.0)
((hmm:))
SC: through text?
IR: or just like in general
ET: through text? hah
SC: hah
((laughing))
IR: space space space space hah
((laughing))
IR: = you push the space button
AC: [I don’t know go hang out with other friends or go to my
roo:m
MT: I feel like yeah remove yourself from the situation:
(1.0)
JC: I go to Denver sometimes when I’m just like not sick of necessary my
roommates but of Boulder and I just go down and hang out with my sisters
or go and hang out with Nick
(2.0)
SS: yeah(.) just hang out with a different group of frien:ds
JC: right
MT: [because if you’re around and like(.) you’re being grump that’s just cause
for like more trouble
JC: yeah
MT: they’re going to be like (.) !oh what’s wrong:
ET: and you’re just like NOTHING::
((laughter))
ET: = NOTHINGS THE MATTER
IR: ok so what do you do if they don’t give you your space and you kinda don’t have
like cause a lot like out of town people don’t really have that option
ET: [yeah::]
IR: = to go home: yeah::
ET: we're stuck with you bitches
((laughing))
AC: um:: tell them I need space
SC: [go to the library]
((laughing))
IR: go to the library::
JC: hah SC
AC: [tell them I just need to be alone]
ET: [yeah]
SC: [yeah]
IR: would you tell them like face to face:
ET: [yeah]
SC: [yeah]
IR: would you tell them like face to face:
ET: yes
AC: yes:
SC: yeah (not over) text
MT: [that's a face to face thing:]
SC: yeah
AC: cause usually if it's somebody I need space from it's somebody I'm close
enough to to just be like
SC: [yeah]
AC: = yo::
SS: I feel like if I need space –
ET: [yeah because that's why you need space because you're al- always together
you're always really close
SS: yeah I feel like if I need space I don't even like actually like explicitly say:: that I
need space ever it's just like you go to your room almost you know like just
make it like body language I think:
JC: I was just about to say that
SS: [yeah]
JC: =that's a big one:
SS: you know like if you're just in your room on your computer or your laptop like
that's kind of a signal like a red flag like oh:: they're kind of preoccupied
maybe I'll just give them space:
SC: yeah::
IR: so like I know that-
JC: (like an invitation)
SS: yeah you guys said that if there's ever was a door closed in your house you'd
know automatically like something was wrong
MT: yeah I was saying that
JC: [yeah my doors usually open]
AC: I don't think I've ever had both my doors closed (.) if it wasn't because I was
naked
MT: or like need to be (to be alone)
AC: [changing and sometimes that doesn't even happen
SS: yeah hah
((laughing))
MT: that's what I was saying we only close our doors when absolutely necessary so
we like know when something's wrong

ET: when (K's) over

MT: [laughing]

JC: [nudity]

ET: yeah word

((laughing))

AC: hey man it's the truth:

IR: so I know that like we were all friend before but what happens if you lived with
some that you didn't know like: would you handle: (.) the situation hah
differently

ET: well we didn't really know you that well before

IR: that's true:

MT: [you get to know them]

IR: = but say that you moved in with a random person hhh I guess maybe think
about freshman year too:: yeah

ET: yeah:: well even living with someone you know: (.) is like a completely
different experience

IR: yeah::

ET: like J (. ) is my friend but I would never ever live with her ever again in a million
years because it was like-

MT: the worst thing ever

((laughing))

ET: so:: I don't know? she's just so different when you're with her twenty four
seven

SC: yeah

MT: [yuck]

AC: it's so:: depending on each individual person: (.)

IR: like your relationship with them?

AC: [just like if living with a new person it would to: tally
depend on what that person is like hhh but I feel like most of the time I
would communicate things with them totally: in person (.) just because text
messaging isn't always (1.0) like submitted you know it's not always
absorbed the same way

MT: it's not like it's not like a real conversation

AC: [I don't think they'd take it seriously]

SC: it's kind of (. ) passive aggressive

JC: [I also::]

ET: yeah

JC: like when-

ET: no one gets my sarcasm over text so people just like hate me

SS: [no (.) no one gets your sarcasm

((laughing))

ET: I fuckin
MT: [I feel like we treat that the same:]
JC: [so sarcastic]
MT: like when you need space you do the same thing no matter who it is kind of
unless like your lashing out on the person cause you’re like really close with
them but (.)
IR: yeah:
MT: = in terms of like getting space if you don’t know the person you’re still going
to like leave or get in your room or like you know
IR: like (eventually::) physical:
JC: [like with E I hard- I barley knew her: when I moved in with
her sophomore year and like (.) we: like (.) we would never text so it would
have been really bizarre for me to out of the blue hhh text her something
especially if it wasn’t particularly nice or like friendly
IR: intersteing
JC: = so just didn’t like that just wasn’t a way we communicated ever:: like if we
were going to talk it was only because we were like together in the house
hhh I was never like seeking her out necessary like (1.0) outside of that (.)
arena I guess?
IR: interesting
MT: [but it can be like (2.0) really (1.0) get out of hand if it doesn’t get said
al- member because I just think of C:
ET: [yeah::]
MT: = who like would just lock herself in her room and never say anything to
anyone
ET: [oh yeah::]
SC: but you knew she was so upset with everyone
MT: [you knew she was upset? but it just never we just like
never talked about it never communicated
JC: and you wish she had just sent you a text so you knew
MT: mhm: yeah just say something
SC: [smoke signal]
MT: what the heck
IR: [hah smoke signal]
((laughing))
MT: like are you even alive:: I thought she was like peeing in a jar and just keeping
in her room
((laughing))
MT: =because she like wasn’t coming out
JC: like (aviator) style:
IR: oh my god so:: would there like under any circumstances would you make that
uh request by text like for space
SS: from an ou- like someone you don’t know?
IR: either (.) both like with people you do know or people you don’t know
MT: like if it went on-
AC: [directly or indirectly?]
IR: wh- what do you-
AC: like indirectly I might like I’m gonna go:: just do this like I just
IR: [oh:] AC: = have to have two to five me time as Caroline says so: if it was like (1.0)
usually
IR:
AC: = I’d say: if I’m saying it directly like I need some space I would never say that
over text
SS: me neither it just makes it so:: -
MT: ughh
SS: feel::
AC: [it’s such a like uh like uh blahh
SS: [a formal
AC: it’s like sending a letter to some body that says I need some space period
MT: or like an e-mail
((laughing))
MT: like a facebook message
AC: yeah like I wish you just told me that
JC: [yeah I remember freshman I really didn’t like it when her
boyfriend slept over because I didn’t know him and I really didn’t know her
that well and it weirded me out
IR: [yeah]
((laughing))
JC: = and I like talked to my mom about it and she was like you need to just tell her
that and so: I would have never done that over text I definitely had to
handle that ~
IR: face to face
JC: [one on one with her otherwise I think she would have thought I was a
huge jerk
(1.0)
IR: yeah: (. ) do you think that like living (. ) I don’t know just like living in a house
obviously is so much different (. ) then the dorms like does that obviously
effect the way you handle things
SC: [not shearing a bedroom is different]
JC: so:: nice
IR: yeah not a two by two box
SS: [yeah]
SC: yeah::
SS: you really (. ) don’t have any space to yourself at all:: when you live in the
dorms like no where can you escape
JC: mmmh: (1.0) like I would have been totally fine with G having her boyfriend
over every night if we didn’t share the same room (. ) that’s the part that
made it weird
IR: hah yeah
JC: I was like I can see you guys hah
((laughing))
JC: ehhh what are you doing::
IR: hah ok now imagine that lately your roommate had been acting weird and
seems to be avoiding you but you don’t recall doing anything to make them
upset hhh would you confront your roommate about their actions
ET: yes but not through text
JC: I would do it through text probably
(2.0)
MT: yeah (.) eh- depending on the person
AC: [it’s kind of the way the (situation) takes it so I guess if there so
much that I have to text them
JC: [yeah that’s what I
was just thinking]
MT: [sometimes if they’re- ]
AC: otherwse usually it will probably just (1.0) become a a topic when we’re
together sometime
JC: sometimes I have anxiety about those things like if I think I’m noticing a friend
like being angry with me it it only I only start thinking about it what I want
to text them when I’m in class or like when I’m alone and I’ve had time to
think about it but not like when I’m engaged in a group
MT: mnhmm
JC: when I would actually confront them or like when I’m with them (.) like I don’t
see it as a problem but when I’m alone I do
SS: [I think yeah:-]
JC: texting I think does make it actually easier though to confront them in that type
of situation just like is everything ok? you wouldn’t obviously be like (1.0)
why are you mad at me or: what did I do wrong you know: just kind of
check in (.) like are you alright
JC: [yeah hah]
MT: [you just set it up]
AC: I think it’s easier I think for the other person to maybe say what’s going on
then through text messages cause usually like you put up a wall when it’s
just you two and you are just like now:: (.) it’s whatever cause you just don’t
want to talk about it but if you: do it through text messages then it gives you
kind of like hhh this distance and softness to being like yeah:: like I’ve been
kind of annoyed lately but (.) you know
MT: No I think it’s like a nice way to open that (.) conversation up I guess
SS: [mnhmh:]
MT: = like get it started but I think like (.) conversations like that: and like even if
you need space or whatever are like have deeper rooted thing that need to
be discussed
SS: [yeah:]
JC: I also think that if they’re like a problem like people are really prone to like (.)
making up speeches in their head that they want to deliver to someone
when they finally get the change hhh and like letters and text messages and
stuff like that are like hhh a really good way to do that because you can like
be super articulate: and like get all your points across and like line them up
if like you do have something
SS: [yeah]
JC: = you are upset about and like you can go back and edit it
AC: [exactly yeah:]
SS: if you have something you need to get off your chest it's a good way-
JC: [mhm:]
SS: cause yeah like you said it's a good way to put your edit in there where as if
you're talking it doesn't come out that way you want it to yeah::
JC: [yeah like blah: hah]
IR: do you guys ever use letters to like: (1.0) I don't know confront people or: do
counter
JC: [I haven't used letters since like middle school]
AC: I actually have:
IR: what?
AC: yeah I totally have () that depends though that's usually it's () it's when
MT: [after somebody
like-] [cause it's longer?]
AC: = cause it's taken to an extreme:
IR: yeah
JC: (letter are like a) yearbook hah
MT: [letters () letters and words are like in text like really good way to like
get everything out that you're thinking so you can look at it but I think that's
the danger with text messages cause letter
((yeah::))
MT: = a lot of times you write the letter and you don't send it
AC: [you just need to get it out]
MT: = but text messages like some of the most mad I've been if I'm ever in a
JC: [yeah it's so easy]
MT: = confrontation is because it's like a text message fight and it's so stupid and
things are being said that are just like right there in the moment cause you
can just press send and like () a harmful thing has been sent
JC: [yeah (I've been there)
MT: but when you write it down or like when you're saying words you're not
gonna just like unless you're really pissed off? if you're having a
conversation you're either going to like say these words then like retract
them or you're going to think things a little bit more through
SS: yeah you can be really aggressive -
MT: REALLY aggressive over a text message and you can send like a million at a
time
SC: and you just don't have time to respond
SS: [yeah]
MT: yeah it's like too much
SC: [yeah I don't know I do that]
IR: so:: what do you think about like the permanent aspect of like a text messages
like versus words cause like once you send a text message like it's pretty
permanent

SC: yeah
IR: and you can like always go back and look at it yeah:
JC: [re-read]
IR: : I don’t know what do you guys think about that in conflict?
SS: I think like I've had a couple like text fights like with Cody
((coughing))
and:: it's just hhh it's bad I think I don’t know cause I do look back on it it also kind
of gives you clarity like when you look back on it like the next couple days
like in the moment you look back on it and it kind of feeds the fire and it like
JC: [mmhmm:]
SS: = makes you more angry and you’re like !yeah I’m so right like this is just
getting me more fired up and you just keep like go- feeding off it but
JC: And it's always sitting there in your inbox hah
SS: yeah
IR: do you think like part of that is like how it's like interpreted cause you can’t
really like use a certain tone over text messages
MT: [you keep thinking about how it was said:
SC: yeah maybe it was said this way:: should I have responded that way:: maybe
they didn’t mean it in that sense
IR: yeah::
JC: like hah like last year our house was so dirty all the time and it was like kind of
(.) really stressful for me? like it's like I’m not the cleanest person but I can’t
like live in like (.) such a mess like we were doing hhh and I like would
always take it out on M because like she was the messiest one so hhh I
would I remember sending her this like really snarky text about like
cleaning up something hah and she like text me back and was like that’s E’s
or something like that like she didn’t make the mess and I felt like so:: guilty
hhh right after I sent it I was like um:: (.) I’m sorry I assumed but I like
couldn’t take it back or couldn’t like-
SC: yeah
JC: I just sounded like an idiot when I was like oh sorry hah: like right afterward
IR: yeah
AC: yeah it’s weird that we have like with iPhones it’s really weird that the
message stream? that you have::
JC: [mmhm:]
AC: =because like with alright like with !my old flip phone like you didn’t look at
text messages like that they’re more like passing notes and nobody really
keeps notes and nobody really keeps them but like with this I can look back
and like me -
ET: [yeah you forgot]
IR: till like last year
AC: [=me and people’s conversations that I don’t even really talk to any
more for like a year: are just like
IR: [yeah::]
AC: =are ongoing: or even our group text message like I can see hhh what we were
talking about hhh I can just with ease
JC: (I cleared by board) both times hah
AC: = just by moving my thumb I I can see everything we’ve talked about in that
text message since (. July
MT: and now you can do like screen shots where it will be like-
IR: hah be posted
MT: yeah conversations will be posted
((laughing))
AC: oh yeah screen shots
MT: it’s just like remember when you could lock your text messages in like high
school
IR: hah like the good old days
MT: [and you don’t (need) anything else and you lock certain ones
JC: like the ones that like meant the most to you
MT: yeah?
IR: [yeah yeah seriously]
JC: [the boys]
IR: [cute boys]
ET: [they’re like the ones you remember so you lock it
IR: [oh yeah]
ET: = and you’re like well you said this to me
((laughing))
SC: yeah it’s scary to think that all that history of what you’ve said to them
ET: [mhm::]
SC: =like the other way like on their phone
IR: oh my gosh:: well that’s like also on Facebook
ET: we all better be friends forever you guys
IR: [when you’re board]
SC: yeah all social media it’s crazy
IR: do you guys ever use like Facebook (. instant messaging:
(1.0)
JC: yeah I do
ET: [mhm: everyday of my life]
IR: really?
((laughing))
IR: oh yeah for Javiar
ET: yeah that too
IR: do you guys fight over it hah
ET: we don’t really fight (. when we when he annoys me I just don’t talk to him
or I stop speaking) Spanish
IR: [would you guys ever: hah]
((laughing))
IR: would you ever use it to like solve a problem or like address and issue I guess?

SS: Facebook IM?

IR: yeah

MT: I know people who have like Facebook message

IR: [Facebook message]

MT: I know people who have done that

SC: [oh the message]

JC: well yeah

MT: [like a big old long Facebook Message]

SS: [Facebook Message is kind of the new letter I feel like]

MT: [yeah:: or like e-mail or something]

SS: [yeah::]

SC: [in high school it was a big conflict zone-

MT: [like she Facebook messaged me]

SC: [yeah::]

AC: I know Facebook message sometimes can be real (weighty)

SS: yeah because it's private

MT: it's private

JC: [it's like the only thing on Facebook that is private]

AC: [it's like the next]

MT: [gives you time to think]

AC: =it’s the it’s the it’s the uh: (.) the text message to the e-mail versus the: the text message to the letter does that make sense? (.) like it’s like uh it’s like uh:: -

SC: text message letter

SS: (equivalent) to a letter

AC: it’s like an e-mail but like you have everybody on your Facebook so:

SS: [yeah]

JC: I resolve conflicts over (.) I use Facebook message kind of a lot (.) I really like it:

cause I think it’s so fast and easy: and I hate texting so (.) it’s like much easier for me and like just last night I like talked to Tracy about something as kind of like making her upset and like (.) I don’t know it worked just like a charm?

IR: interesting do yo- so do you think length kind of has something to do with it

JC: mhm: (typing) makes it so much faster yeah::

ET: [so much faster]

IR: yeah::: but like our i- iPhones I don’t know they have like the little key board but I guess if it’s still

JC: [yeah]

ET: [Facebook is (bad with it)

MT: Facebook's nice for people across the country like Australia and stuff

IR: [yeah:::][yeah that's true]

MT: it’s really easy

ET: it’s really easy

MT: and you can send a message whenever and you know they'll get it like it's
MT: they're gonna get it whenever like their time of the world they wake up or whatever
IR: that's true () so like looking through the text messages that I printed out do you think () that you: text more like during like I'm like looking at the times: and like also like the months so like I don't know during the month do you guys () I don't know notice
SC: [like certain times you text more then others?]
IR: [yeah:: just in general]
MT: definitely during class
SC: [yeah::]
IR: ok
AC: when I'm (waiting)
JC: [usually after eight PM I'm usually inaccessible via text message]
IR: (laughing)
MT: during the day when I'm board
ET: during the day: but not so much in the weekend unless we're like () planning
SC: [we're usually all together?]
MT: =something
IR: (yeah)
AC: when I'm (waiting)
JC: [usually after eight PM I'm usually inaccessible via text message]
IR: (laughing)
MT: definitely not: -
JC: [unless you call me I'm not going to be able to respond to you]
MT: yeah nights are bad
(JC.0)
MT: yeah if I'm at work or something:
SC: having a busy week sometimes I just don't even:-
SS: [no I get so behind on my text message I'll have to spend like ten minutes kind of catching up yeah:
JC: through that day
SS: mhm:
AC: when I'm board and alone though: I text like everyone one of you individually
((coughing))
AC: what' happening where are you when are you going to be home what are you (laughing)
((coughing))
AC: = doing tonight::
IR: hah what are you doin hhh ok so going back to like () when you were talking about M and like using a snarky tone like I don't know how do you? () cause obviously like you we can like interpret some kind of () tone or like attitude even though it might not be correct so like: hhh I don't know you:
(1.0) think you convey that
ET: punctuation is a big one (.) like if I put a period at the end of my sentence like
(1.0)
IR: you're mad
ET: [it's serious]
((laughing))
AC: yeah usually just like the the -
JC: [I should just look at that text it's so ridiculous
AC: = how many words I use or how I spell them it's so funny: that this even
matters
SS: [yeah]
ET: [yeah]
AC: = n.a.h
ET: same (.) same
SS: [uh huh]
JC: [or like uh or like three O's]
((yeah))
SS: OK versus k (1.0)
((yeah))
MT: like kk
SS: [I always use if I'm mad at someone hhh and they like type me a long thing I'll
just type ok and that's like a really snarky way to just like (be okay)
AC: [ok versus k yeah:]
MT: [if they text
you like a really long-
SS: [yeah:: ! like I'm so sorry (it's) like ok
AC: or if I don't somebody to text me to keep texting me I usually use like little
words
JC: [or sure]
SS: [sure]
JC: [sure's a passive aggressive
one hah]
AC: = as possible hah
IR: uh huh::
ET: make it seem like you're really busy
AC: or no response (.) like I'm not trying to keep this conversation going
ET: [or wait a long time before your respond yeah:: hah]
MT: the time between responses
ET: [mhm:]
IR: al:righty ok
ET: [!!I'm so busy having a life that I just couldn't respond to you]
AC: or want to keep talking to you
SS: [yeah it’d suck if you could see if um: (.) the text message has been read or not]
IR: [you can now]
(1.0)
ET: what?
IR: yeah you can
SC: [(you’ve) seen if they read it]
MT: that’s how BBM was I hated that
SC: [yeah::]
ET: [really?] [I didn’t know that on the new iPhone five?]
IR: you have to make sure you turn it off on like your phone
SC: oh ok
IR: you know what I mean:
SS: maybe I should do that to mine
SC: [mhm:] 
IR: now you can tell if they’re typing too
ET: oh I knew that
SS: [yeah I can see that yeah:]
SC: I ignore all my text but not on a person con- like I’m not like upset with anyone
I just am like I read it and I’m like oh
SS: I text back in my head yeah I think I would say then I just put my phone down
SC: [yeah] [yeah yeah]
JC: me too
SS: [it gets me in trouble]
SC: yeah
JC: (laughing))
SC: [mhn::] hah
IR: hah ok sorry so: going back to: the avoiding question um: if you didn’t confront them like why wouldn’t you (. ) confront them about their acting weird (2.0)
or avoiding you
(3.0)
AC: probably cause I’m frustrated with them too:
MT: yeah
JC: (you don’t want to indulge) them
AC: [which is why how I guess: friendships can be distanced 
sometimes because hhh a lot of the times I’m just like hhh wha- do you 
want me to ask you why your upset like I don’t know? I didn’t do anything 
like if you’re upset]
ET: [yeah]
AC: =you can tell me: so like that’s why I might not:
MT: sometimes you just need it to pass
JC: If I did it if I knew they had a good reason to be upset with me:: (. ) if I didn’t 
confront them it might be because I know that I (. ) was wrong and I’m too 
embarrassed or I don’t wanna get a in a fight (1.0) or it would be what AC 
said if I didn’t think I did something wrong
SS: yeah sometimes you make it to be like a bigger deal then it is too then you kind
SC: [ye:ah]

SS: = of just like hhh let it like it’s like a vicious cycle yeah:: and like I don’t know

JC: [get big hah]

SS: = that happened with N and I last year like we hhh like it was some petty fight that we go into? and we like hadn’t talked and then like there was like this awkwardness that just grew and grew and grew and finally like we had to just be like let’s just talk about it: and it went away right away just because we talked

JC: [yeah]

MT: C and M

SC: [ye:ah]

IR: do you think sometimes things get like exacerbated over text like unnecessarily

JC: yeah

MT: =about and then you’re like oh shit when it’s so much harder either to like (. ) really fastley sent it and not think

AC: [this totally happened with me a few weeks ago with K because

MT: =I got mad at her for saying something at a party hhh and I just like was gonna let it go but then it was really bugging me and I really wanted to tell her but

AC: I didn’t want it to be a big deal so I just texted her about it hhh and then she
just (.) I could tell she didn’t understand what I was saying hah when she responded so I like

MT: [yeah]

AC: reiterated what I meant and she still didn’t understand it and it just turned into this huge deal and I don’t know it was just like (.) nevermind it’s just not –

JC: [right]

AC: it wouldn’t have happened if we talked face to face

SS: when you texted or when we were texting like when I needed someone to cover me at work hhh and you texted back like hhh (.) you would like something: like

AC: [yeah]

SS: = that you thought I might definitely take the wrong way? like you def- you

AC: [mhm::]

SS: = immediately followed it with like a I’m sorry I didn’t mean it to come off like that but I just don’t like and then you explained how you felt

JC: yeah

AC: [yeah I said sorry about that first sentence hah

SS: yeah

AC: [that was definitely and impulse text

JC: hah

IR: so do you think like I know like a lot of times you like hhh I don’t know what the correct word is like (.) not like pretense but be like I don’t want you to take this the wrong way but: like do you think you do that more often or like sent it and then be

SS: [preface]

IR: = like but like I didn’t mean it like that

MT: I think it’s more of an impulse thing first

((mhm:))

AC: it depends it depends if it’s an impulse text or if it’s a text I’ve been thinking about for a while

ET: [yeah because it take so much longer to think about text and type it out then t- like (.) I feel like (.) if you’re fighting with someone face to face then you can just say things that you don’t mean right off the bat without thinking about them but when you’re texting like hhh just the process of texting means that you’re thinking about what you’re saying

JC: that’s true

SC: [that is (.) interesting]

SS: [but not necessarily also thinking about how they might interpret that

ET: yeah no I -

MT: [the (thing is)]

JC: [since you got in front of them you feel like you have more power to like say something mean because –

MT: you’re protected

SS: [yeah]
ET: [yeah that's true:: you're like all brave behind your cell phone
((yeah))
MT: when it's face to face like (.) p- not everyone's good with words or like can
convey their emotions through words really well? so that can be really
tricky but like when everyone has emotions and it's really hard to like hide
them if you're really upset so like that's something that you can't get over
text message
ET: yeah ex- like tone of voice (.) says everything like what's what most fight are
MT: [tone of voice] [like language]
ET: started over
MT: [yeah exactly]
SC: [yeah]
IR: do you also think like the other people's reaction (.) like has to do with it like
you know if you're sitting there and someone like starts crying you know:
over like text message you wouldn't see that yeah::
[((yeahh))]
MT: [cause you don't know]
SC: [you're never going to be effected]
MT: [someone's crying on the other end at all]
IR: [yeah]
MT: and they can be playing it off like their just like really cool about it but they
could be really upset
SS: and like the timing too cause like you can hhh be sitting there waiting for their
response you know like checking your phone over and over again and like
see them like maybe typing a little bit then like erasing it or something you
know like where as in face to face like you you can't just sit there and wait
for a response (.) you just respond automatically
JC: mhmm:
IR: pt ok alright ho:::w: (.) ok these are compare and contrast questions how does
addressing a conflict or sensitive issue over text messaging hhh different
from addressing a conflict or sensitive issue in person hhh we kind of hit on
this but (1.0) elaborate
AC: [yeah there’s just so many different hhh like micro inequities and dynamics
that you have to like (oblige) to like you know there’s so many that you
have to obey and obliged like when you’re in a a a conversation with
somebody that’s just like social etiquette (.) or social kind of rules that is t-
totally different
IR: interesting
AC: [face to face versus text messaging]
JC: I think what's really key: in the differences is that you have the choice not to
respond on a text message
SC: [yeah]
JC: = which in conversation: that can be it’s way less dramatic then like turning hah
around on your heel and like walking away from someone when they're
talking to you you can just like f- whoops just be like screw you! and just put
your phone down
AC: [and then walking back]
JC: = and be like I’m not even going to respond to that I’m so mad
ET: or like if if I get a text I don’t like I’m like I don’t even have time for this but if I
JC: [which I do a lot hah]
ET: = said that to someone in real life it would be like (.) cause an even bigger fight
IR: yeah
ET: that I wouldn’t want wanna work out
IR: = said that to someone in real life it would be like (.) cause an even bigger fight
IR: yeah
ET: or like if if I get a text I don’t like I’m like I don’t even have time for this but if I
IR: = said that to someone in real life it would be like (.) cause an even bigger fight
SC: = a little more
ET: or even think about what they meant by it like ask what was that a joke? was
that sarcastic or: like swee:t
IR: how does being roommates different from being friends?
(SC.0)
ET: mmm:
MT: oh well I did?
ET: it’s way different living with someone but (.) it’s like (1.0) I don’t know
SS: can you repeat the question
IR: how does-
AC: [like whether you live well with somebody or whether you get along
with somebody sometimes can be-
ET: [yeah totally different]
(1.0)
IR: how does roommate differ from being friends (1.0) cause like obviously I don’t
know I just think about like us like we’ve been friends forever but like once
we started living: like together obviously our relationship changed
AC: [we were luck? that we lived well together:]
IR: yeah exactly and it just like changes your relationship like you: living with
someone like you learn so much about them like you share experiences that
you wouldn’t normally and like you have to deal with different issues like
that are kind of hard sometimes like money or respect or like borrowing
and stuff like that
SS: yeah I think yeah that’s what does make a roommate relationship is when
you’re like when you’re similar in those types of ways and you’re cohesive
about it at least
JC: [yeah]
SS: = but like when we lived with N like last year hhh like we’re the best of friends
but we were not meant to be good roommates just because we lived
differently together like (.) she jus- I don’t know we have different living
styles
IR: and she didn’t live with hah
ET: [you just have to like be able to talk about it because if you
don’t mention it then it just gets worst]
IR: yeah
SS: someone told me recently that you have to treat like hhh roommate stuff
sometimes like business situations and you have to like not put any
emotions into like hhh the rent situation or like the cleaning stuff like if
someone’s bothering you like if they have if they’re too noisy you have to
treat it like business so that like it doesn’t effect your relationship your
friendship

(1.0)
IR: interesting
ET: I feel like that like the fact that you were friends before you could just say:
listen
IR:
[that makes it easier]
ET: = you’re so loud and I can’t sleep
MT: it definitely makes it easier
SC: [yeah that makes sense]
SC: but then
MT: [if there’s conflict I guess]
SC:
[ye:ah but even if you don’t live like you talk it out it’s
there’s just some people you will not live well with like C or J just like
people I didn’t know that I would never –
MT: [but like living with them like-]
ET: well because that’s like we didn’t really know them before and we just dove in
SC: [yeah]
ET: = and lived with them and we’re we like GOD what did we do:::
SC: [yeah] [yeah]
MT: I lived with J before
SC: it affect our friendships
ET:
[yeah::]
AC: [yeah]
MT: I didn’t have a choice though
AC: it is weird though like with (1.0) yeah like with us living together? like I wasn’t
like MT I wasn’t that close with you when we moved in but because
MT: [mhm:] AC: = we (.) lived well together we became closer
MT: [yeah but I coulda gone the other way
AC: mhm: yeah:
SC: it’s interesting
ET:
[that’s why me and SC we found each other in the basement
SC: [hah yeah]
ET: = when with th- the craziness?
SC: [the craziness? (all) the two hibernating caves (we were the
ones who were out hah yeah]
ET: [let’s just stay in SC’s room forever and talk and be best friends]
((laughing))
SC: it’s true though it’s interesting
ET: it’s like your relationships depend around or at least in the sophomore house
  was like hhh who:: you () didn’t live well with forced people ta () be
  friends basically you were friend with the people you lived well with hhh
  you were also friends with the people that () also didn’t live well with
  other people hah if that makes sense
IR: yeah::
MT: [I think it can be a true test though because () you: can think you know
  someone really well: until you live with them and you can see a whole
  different
ET: [yeah]
MT: = side of them and like hhh sometimes it doesn’t matter but sometimes it like
  makes you look at the person differently
MT: yeah
AC: [yeah]
JC: [it’s like you probably had the same experience with like J like I’ve known
  Tsince I was really little and then hhh like () it really just didn’t work and
  I thought I knew her so well and like well with you and J it worked but hhh
  like () I thought I knew her really well hah and it was like so inconsistent it
  was like she liked to clean and cook and do fun things and then like when
  she wanted to like party it was like lets tear our whole door down and
  break it into a million pieces hah and like be so: crazy and I was like I can’t:
  do this I need consistency like at least like a little bit
SS: mhm:
JC: but with like with Tessa like I like she and I were just becoming pretty good
  friends this summer hhh I would have never been comfortable like teasing
  her so like much as like I do about her like indecisiveness like I just like
  make fun of her hah so much now and it’s only because we live together
  now like it feels: so much more right I would have just felt like I would have
  never done that () in a different context
IR: interesting
MT: that’s I was thinking about this the other day Chelsea (and you) were like yeah
  before I really knew you I like thought you were so: fashionable
((laughing))
MT: like oh she just always so well put together and I was so surprised
((laughing))
IR: yeah actually I’m a hot mess
((laughing))
MT: just like wo::w
((laughing))
SC: and you can have those blunt conversations as roommates whereas-
IR: yeah
SC: [you know?]
JC: yeah you can’t you have to otherwise you’re gonna like kill each other
SC: [yeah]
IR: Um: do you think like you’re upbringing or like background like role does that
  play in it
ET: a lot
SC: yeah
AC: well yeah you’re home life how you’re use to living is like so much
SC: how clean you are
AC: [like expecting:]
ET: [like I left he dishes in the sink for like weeks and I couldn’t handle it
and it probably like her mom cleaned it all at home
JC: mmm:
SC: our roommate K definitely had a maid growing up cause she didn’t even know
how to put laundry or soap any type of detergent
ET: [remember the dishwasher twice?]
SC: yeah: she put the liquid yeah::
ET: [with the liquid hand soap]
JC: [no she did not]
SC: yeah::
ET: [yeah: twice]
SC: and she cooked chicken in the microwave (.) frozen
((laughing))
SC: anyways::
JC: who was that
ET: [(she brought) her own thermostat
SC: [our old roommate]
MT: the unknown
SC: so she obviously like her mom just she had a different upbringing then I did
you know and that definitely affected the way we lived together
SS: and like the way you see them: kind of
SC: yeah: defintly
ET: [yeah:]
SS: I think we build this persona about them if they don’t know how to do certain
thing you know and you’re like how could you not know that or how could
you not
SC: [yeah]
SS = be as clean you know
SC: right
ET: but also I think being out of state (.) was a huge thing that like
SC: [mhm:]
JC: oh my gosh I bet
ET: we were like well cause everyone know everyone here from Colorado
SC: [yeah]
SS: and we can just like go home
ET: yeah exactly
AC: that me all the time
MT: [but this is like their home]
ET: mmm:
SC: [yeah]
(1.0)
IR: hhh ok pt how does the time it take to resolve a conflict over text messaging
compare to the time it takes to resolve a conflict (2.0) over text messaing

hah

((laughing))

IR: over hah versus face to face
JC: it takes so much longer I hate it
IR: over text messaging?
JC: over texting
IR: you think?
MT: I rather just have a conversation and get it over with
JC: I am so: keen on phone calls like I love talking on the phone
hah even if it's not like resolving conflict even if it's just like figuring
anything out hah like I can't just text you like I'm just going to call you and
I'll hang up in thirty seconds and know everything I need to know
SS: yeah I'll start texting and then I'll just be like-
JC: what's the point of this
SS: ((no))
JC: yeah
MT: everyone has something to say
JC: [yeah you'd just like what what what hah like every body]
MT: when I'm like behind too much in a group text I just don't even respond I just
don't
SS: [yeah oh yeah]
MT: when I like get off work and I have like twenty I'm just like (
IR: sorry guys
SS: [or when like]
AC: I'm like the opposite I read through all of them and respond to everyone
((laughing))
JC: one IR this is for you
((laughing))
AC: I will or I'll go to the separate ones I don't know that's just how I am
IR: that's like part of the of my quantitative part of it? and like coding is I'm gonna like uh record every time someone initiates a topic and every time someone responds to it so: (. ) what do you guys think of

SC: [interesting]

SS: SS and JC would score zero in responses

JC: yeah:: like so bad

IR: but like I don't know I'm kind of having a hard time like defining like what would you guys think like initiating a topic like would be defined by you know what I mean?

SC: yeah:: like starting a new conversation topic

IR: [yeah cause I know like a lot of the times someone will say then someone will just say something completely different but then someone will respond to the first person's so::]

MT: [well it's kind of like (. ) (starting) a tone (. ) like not even like the same topic cause we have random brains and we like to just report what's happening in our days? like random things like where are my shoes?] I can think of so many examples hah]

MT: = you know like or like something

AC: [yeah like rambling versus: like when we actually are trying to get things done]

MT: like to find like a real conversation (. ) is impossible

JC: [this is funny]

JC: just like AC being like well tried to get wine and beer then like ET's response then Tessa goes hah does someone have a bread pan loaf

AC: [I can think of so many examples hah]

((laughing))

JC: hhh and then SS goes (. ) hhh anyone out and about and want to pick me up at SC: [ I don't even know what that is]

JC: =the UMC and no:: one responds

MT: [no: one resp-]

ET: [I called her after I read that]

JC: [oh::: ok that's good to know]

AC: no one is responding to anybody

((laughing))

SC: we're all on different topics yeah:

AC: but it's funny because we got so sick of the group text messages we were so everything now we're a- people just hah if you don't have the answer you don't you don't answer

JC: [we'll ignore you]

SC: you figure someone else will
SS: [yeah]
SC: you know I was home and I was just like ah someone will respond to SS
JC: [and it's like]
funny things (1.0) funny things we all respond to but then
ET: Sarah like walks like thirty minutes
SC: [I was like hah then she walks in the front door like oh guess no one responded]
hah
JC: [cause like (something happens) you're like no:
ET: [yeah::]
SC: I was like sorry hah
ET: I had your car anyways that would have been a good excuse
JC: the bread loaf thing hah
IR: hah do you have a bread loaf
ET: what is that by the way
SC: yeah I didn't know what that was
MT: I don't know AC asked me to text that
SS: [we have one]
JC: [hah AC]
ET: yeah to cook bread
SS: [Chelsea we have one]
AC: I think it's min::e:
(1.0)
SS: well fine:
IR: we'll give you that when you give us our plate bowls
(laughing))
AC: you can get your plate bowls when:ever: you want
IR: [just kidding hah]
IR: ok ready: (.) how does the resolution of conflict over text messaging compare to
when the conflict is solved face to face
(1.0)
ET: we just answered that
JC: no it's like how do you feel at the end of it
ET: [oh: hah]
JC: right?
IR: yeah
JC: I feel dissatisfied when I solve a conflict over text
IR: really?
JC: yeah I would rather see them
SC: [yeah me too I'd rather have a conversation]
AC: [oh yeah cause when I see them
and it's like this is weird something happen between us? since I've seen you
last but like
JC: [in the
cyber world]
AC: it was cyber:
JC: yeah hah
MT: or it can be like (1.0) easily (.) forgotten I don’t know maybe that just me and
like [but hhh me and J bicker like sisters and (.) when it’s like over text
message the next time I see her we’ll just like never bring it up again cause
we’ll either have been like drinking or it will be like a really underhanded
comment that like we’ll just never talk about hah it can be forgotten
SS: [I don’t know if it’s dissatisfying like solving
something over text messaging but it’s definitely satisfying when you solve
something face to face]
((mhmm:
ET: yeah I agree
SS: yeah
JC: yeah
MT: and you can like hug it out
SS: yeah
MT: and see each other’s reaction like is this honestly like over
((yeah))
ET: yeah I don’t feel good like solving something over text I don’t feel good about it
ever I’m just like ok it’s solved
IR: it’s just kind of done
ET: [but in person you’re like oh this is great!
MT: it like makes you stronger that makes it better
MT: yeah
AC: if (anybody) wanted to know
JC: [I would like to cons- construe that something’s like over with a funny and
light hearted I would like use a haha and emoji probably just be like oh
everything
SS: [yeah]
JC: = back to normal now so that I wouldn’t feel weird with them when I saw them
later
MT: [yeah:]
AC: It’s gotta follow up with a smiley face
JC: yeah a smiley
AC: [smiley’s]
JC: smiling purple devil
SS: smiling pile of poop
JC: yeah hah
((laughing))
AC: that’s your go to
SS: I like the ghost
JC: a bunch of thumbs up in a row
IR: hah a bunch of thumbs up
ET: I do do the thumbs up I think (everyday)
SS: [I do this one]
(JC.0)
((laughing))
JC: I think that
AC: yeah the applause
JC: [this is going to be recorded so maybe I should say it hah]
ET: do it
AC: what you like the little boy and the girl holding hands
JC: [no the best one was when Katie was like
when you guys very: first included me in the group text hhh and they were
like who used the shower hah upstairs last night hhh everyone’s like Sarah!
and like all everyone hah hhh the whole group text text clapping hands hah
and like balloons
IR: [was like]
JC: = and a thumbs up
(!!laughing!!)
JC: I thought it was so:: funny
IR: hah hhh that was really funny hhh ok how do topic that are normally addressed
over text messaging compare to topics that are normally addressed in
person ([JC.0]) so I guess we kind of talked about that but like (.) just I don’t
know make it more concrete like
AC: convenience
ET: [they’re less:: (1.0) less serious stuff over text (1.0) I feel]
SC: [yeah like rent] [yeah]
SC: just trying to get something across like a bunch of people that’s what the group
text is good for
MT: or like making a plan
AC: [I would say it’s about (.) formality and convenience are like two huge
ET: [yeah planning]
SS: like you ca- when we see each other in person we check in with each other
every time like hey how’s your day like you get a lot more information like
more emotion
MT: but it’s like
AC: [I don’t know like usually I don’t text you guys hey how is your day]
((no::))
ET: right everyone responding to that on the group text would
IR: [that’d be so: annoying
hah]
SC: I’d just respond with (emoji)
JC: [yeah hah]
MT: it’s use to like (1.0) for laughs or like a purpose
SC: yeah
ET: yeah
SC: like planning or jokes
JC: then planning you have to like edit around like people like if the- like what we
had to do with Taylor so didn’t just like piss her off when we went to Vegas
AC: [oh my god yeah now I have like
ten group texts]
JC: we were like (kind of) have to take Taylor out so we weren’t just like VEGAS
  yeah:
IR: [oh yeah:]
ET: thanks:
JC: [It’d be super annoying]
SC: [I don’t know though because my friends from home and I have
  a text message group and my friends would be like how’s everyone’s first
day of school hhh and I don’t respond to those but like
(laughing))
MT: well you don’t to
AC: [like how was your day:::]
SC: yeah
MT: but you don’t like see each other
SC: yeah I guess that’s cause we live in different we’re not roommates
ET: [that’s true you don’t live with each other:] MT: you can’t see them and ask them in person
SC: [all over the country]
SC: yeah
JC: with my group text from sai- with the saint mary’s girls they (.) I couldn’t meet
  them cause we were going to Las Vegas the next day and I couldn’t I just
  was tired and I was sick and didn’t wanna go back and they were all pretty
  mad at me because hhh it was like the last time like the five of us were
together was like years ago or something hhh but I just was like I don’t care
  and they kept me in the group text because I didn’t have control of it and
  I’m pretty sure just to be jerks a little bit because they were like they would
  say like snarky comments and they knew: that I was reading them cause I
  was obviously receiving all them
IR: yeah:
JC: but they didn’t take me out of it just to be bitches so
IR: mmmm:
JC: I don’t know
SC: [or like go we’re meeting up here or whatever and yeah
JC: yeah
AC: I also think it’s funny when I either like how cause we have so many friends
  that
SC: [it’s hard]
AC: = when try to do group text messages like hhh (.) it’ll it can only fit ten p-
  people in a group text message and people will try to text more then that so
  they’ll be like
IR: [oh I didn’t know that]
AC: = four people like I’ve had this happen on multiple occasions where they’ll be
  like two people hhh that have no: idea (.) they’ll just be like because
  everyone assumed they’re in group text message and ther-
ET: [that that’s happened to me!]
AC: yeah because you can’t fit that many people
ET: [I don't know whose it was like Max or something and everyone's like so mountain this weekend! and I was like mmmm]

JC: [yeah hah]

ET: I totally got that text

SC: hah yeah

AC: or when people don't have an iPhone

MT: oh yeah

JC: [yes iPhone seven]

MT: [so bad]

AC: so they don't get the text messages or like they can't group text message like I [you're Kenny Hunt] [or like emoji?]

AC: =always can tell when I get

MT: and I'm just like so judgemental

AC: I I get so confused now when I get a text from somebody that's like worded like a group text message and I'm like are yo- talking to me?

IR: [yeah]

SC: yeah like C the other day

IR: [like Chris yeah:]

ET: [like Chris::]

SC: the other day I just didn't respond he's like you didn't respond to my text and I was like wasn't it a group text? he was like yeah and I was like uh: but it says like just C on my phone

AC: [I felt so bad for him I don't think anybody responded]

IR: I did!

ET: [I did]

AC: ok good cause like

MT: [I did I did]

IR: I flipped out I was like whoo

AC: = we all just ignored him cause hah we thought someone else had responded

SC: [(no one's) texting me]

((making crying sounds))

ET: but it's just like mass text

SC: [not even trying to be mean]

AC: but I could tell cause it has the fraction like one out of two

IR: hah yeah

ET: oh:

JC: that's the thing when Max texted us like a paragraph long text about going to the mountains and he had like ten people

MT: [not one person wrote back]

AC: no body wrote back then once somebody started writing back everbody was like no: can't dude

JC: yeah like no no no

AC: [and then just like no no no hittin it hard]
IR: oh: ok um: what types of conflicts (1.0) like s- uh I don’t know like type of
conflict style do you think text is so like I don’t know there’s like
collaborative avoidant () stuff like that () do you think
JC: what was the question?
IR: like what kind of conflict () like management or conflict solving style do you
think
ET: passive aggressive is that a style hah
IR: mhm:
ET: fo sho
MT: [yeah for sure]
JC: (I think) it can be
IR: (1.0)
SC: yeah
MT: no but avoidance cause () it’s so easy to avoid
JC: [you don’t have to respond]
ET: yeah
SC: but then sometimes like if you th- they aren’t you’re roommate they live in a
different state it’s like you don’t really have any other option cause you’re
not going to e-mail them
MT: you can call them
SC: you can call them I guess () hhh if you’re like we were saying you’re trying to
get a lot across like I’ll text my friends from home in text message form
sometimes just because it’s easier ya know
AC: cause you can talk throughout the day: instead of setting aside like
SC: yeah
AC: time
MT: well like with work like trying to get your shift covered or like hhh trying to
get a bunch of people if yo- people will send like group text messages? and
it’s so: easy
AC: [this is true] [yeah]
MT: = not to respond when it’s just a text but if someone calls you and leaves a
message hhh you feel like you need to call them back or else it’s going to be
like awkward next time you see them
AC: [yeah getting your shift covered is like the: best like way
to look at text messages cause if I do a group text message () hhh like point
five people will respond
MT: yeah it’s like the worst
AC: [if I do if I send every person one individually half the people
MT: [with they’re name
in it]
AC: =will respond to it other if you wanna get your shift covered you better just call
SC: [yeah::]
AC: =them or find them at work and ask them
MT: cause it’s easy to avoid it’s just easy to not respond
JC: we
AC: it’s easy to say on
JC: at my work we have a Facebook group for Trep and all members are a part of it
MT: [yeah it’s easy to say no]
JC: = and (.) it’s very interesting since that new development on Facebook where
it’s like seen by: these people so if you make the mistake of venturing onto
the Trep
((oh::))
JC: = Facebook it’s like who can cover my shift four thirty and our boss will go
through and tag you in it if like you a uh if cause she knows your schedule
cause we send it to her hhh and if she knows that you’re available she’ll like
tag everybody in that post and be like please respond to this person but it’s
very efficient? and it
MT: [blah]
JC: = really does get the right people to cover shift for you and it’s kind of nice
AC: [seen by
fourteen people [and no one responds]
JC: [and no one responds]
ET: that happens
JC: [and it’s like uhh awkward]
IR: awkward hhh alright last question what last thought do you have about how
roommates use texting
(2.0)
((hmm))
ET: I mean it’s weird to think that (2.0) that like even compared to sophomore year
when we lived with seven girls we all had like Blackberry’s and no one had
group text or like we all had different types of hhh phones and now we all
have iPhones and we’re all able to be in this group text and like have emoji’s
and stuff together and it makes it so much easier but
JC: yeah
ET: like it’s like in the last year: like two years that was made possible
SC: [yeah:]  
MT: I would have never thought about that two year ago using group text
ET: [yeah me either]
SC: [yeah sophomore
year I had a Blackberry
MT: yeah me too
JC: yeah it’s like you can summarize it by just like convenient and like our text
message is also like laid back and like funny and like friendshipy also logical
MT: [I would never want
to be in a group text with Julianne]
JC: = and functional I guess cause we talk about rent and stuff
SS: I also think it’s some what overwhelming I’m like a late adapter though and I
take a while to like get use to change like if like Facebook was new I might
take a while to get use to that and I feel like that’s how group text is for me
I’m still like hhh like I don’t know whip lash I feel like it’s like a lot to handle
(2.0)
SS: = that’s how text messaging is for me in general
MT: I feel like (.) but like now if it’s taken away
SS: yeah
MT: I’d be like well what the fuck
SS: yeah I wouldn’t really know
MT: sorry hah
SC: I think with roommates it’s like you see each other at home every night so
during the day I feel like is when we text most because we’re all doing
different things and we’re not together
IR: separation anxiety
SC: how’s it goin! I mean we don’t say it it’s just a way to check in if we’re not home
ET: It keeps me in the loop even if I’m not trying well I know everyone’s at work
heh
JC: [back house what are you doing]
MT: [I know]
ET: =I’m not going to go home and sit by myself I’ll do something else
SC: [right]
SS: mhmm:
ET: or like
(2.0)
SS: we’re always connected
((yeah))
IR: and I think al-
JC: which can we overwhelming
SS: mhm:
IR: yeah I think we use it a lot to do for like toilet pa- I don’t know just like
roommate stuff
JC: toilet paper?
((laughing))
AC: no it’s remarkable how much of a text message is about toilet paper though
((laughing))
IR: about rent
AC: [telling my roommates to buy toilet paper we’re out of toilet paper I bought
toilet paper or we need to borrow toilet paper from the back house so
texting the back house to get toilet paper
MT: we go through a lot of toilet paper
Appendix D: Coding Book

A – Message #
B – Roommate
1 = JC
2 = AC
3 = SC
4 = IR
5 = SS
6 = ET
7 = MT
C - Kind
1 = Initiation
2 = Response
3 = Both
4 = Correction
5 = Can not tell
D – Topics (central)
1 = Bills/property
2 = Location check/status update
3 = Plans (day, weekend, upcoming/future)
4 = Soliciting help (keys, being picked up)
5 = Borrowing (car, clothing, food)
6 = Expressive content
7 = Multiple
8 = Other
E - Emoji
0 = Absent
1 = Present
F – Pictures
0 = Absent
1 = Present
G – Times
1 = August
2 = September
3 = October
H – Complaints
0 = None
1 = Person
2 = School
3 = Other
I – Question
0 = None
1 = One or more