Wayne State University Theses

1-1-2015

You Can't Hide Your Lyin' Eyes: The Uses Of Deception In Romantic Relationships

Jaclyn M. Gaule
Wayne State University,

Recommended Citation

YOU CAN'T HIDE YOUR LYIN' EYES: THE USES OF DECEPTION IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

by

JACLYN GAULE

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

2015

MAJOR: COMMUNICATION STUDIES

Approved By:

_____

Advisor   Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Creating and maintaining a romantic relationship through verbal and nonverbal messages requires collaboration from both partners involved. In particular, the quality of a couple's communication will reflect on the quality of their relationship (Dindia, 2003). For instance, the findings of Edenfield, Adams and Briihl (2012) showed that, "those who endorsed more open lines of communication and self-disclosure (openness)… greater expressions of love and providing comfort (assurances) were also associated with higher levels of reported commitment and love" (p. 159). When both partners agree upon and set parameters early on in relationships, they are more able to establish relational goals and set expectations for behaviors (Wood, 1982). When partners follow the set parameters, the relationship will continue. When those parameters are violated, however, it can create significant problems in the relationship. Research has shown that violations have been typically considered turning points or transitions in relationships (Afifi & Metts, 1998).

One general expectation in committed romantic relationships is that both partners will communicate in such a way as to maintain qualities that are desirable in relationships, such as intimacy, equality, and trust (Kelley & Burgoon, 1991). Conceptually, relationship maintenance is a set of behaviors, actions and processes used by both individuals that are in accordance with their relational expectations (Dainton & Aylor, 2002). As reported by Canary and Stafford (1992) there are five relationship maintenance strategies (positivity, openness, assurances, sharing tasks, and social networks), most of which have been linked to key relationship outcomes. For example, research by Stafford and Canary (1991) found that expression of assurances show that individuals believe they have a lasting relationship, while perceptions of assurances "lead one to believe that the partner is willing

to invest energies in the relationship for its success" (p. 236). In addition, sharing tasks by partners demonstrates the willingness to fulfill their obligations in order to achieve their independent goals. The perception of sharing tasks "promotes commitment, control mutuality, liking and relational satisfaction" (p. 237). In another example, a study by Edenfield et al. (2012) revealed that positivity was linked with liking and satisfaction, whereas openness and task sharing were linked to higher levels of commitment, liking, and love. Additionally, commitment and love were associated with assurances, while greater liking, commitment, and satisfaction were linked to social networks.

Another expectation in committed romantic relationships is that partners will avoid communicating in a way that causes distance or an imbalance in power (Kelley & Burgoon, 1991). Violations of relational expectations are known as transgressions, which have been shown to cause relational disruptions (Metts, 1994). One common form of a transgression in romantic relationships is the use of deception (Horan, 2012). Despite the fact that deception has been identified a violation of relational expectations (O'Hair & Cody; Metts, 1994), some research suggests that deception frequently occurs in close relationships (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013; Horan & Dillow, 2009). Furthermore, research has also shown that deception can actually be used as a form of relationship maintenance (Boon & McLeod, 2001; Dainton & Gross, 2008; Goodboy, Meyers, & et al., 2010; Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013; Peterson, 1996). Thus, the question investigated in this study is, how can deception function as both a maintenance strategy and a relational transgression?

This study seeks to determine the possible relationship maintenance benefits of deception in romantic relationships. Whereas relationship maintenance has been conceptualized in at least four different ways (Dindia, 2003), for the purposes of this study,

maintenance is conceptualized as the strategic and routine activities associated with keeping a relationship in existence.

Based on deceptive affection research (e.g., Cole, 2001; Gillen & Horan, 2013; Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013), then, it is proposed that deceiving one's partner through means of affection will enable couples to keep their relationship in existence. This information will add to the growing body of research that blurs the lines between "dark side" and "lightside" behaviors by attempting to provide a theoretical understanding of deception as a function of relationship maintenance. Such information can help to fill the void from previous deception research in examining the conjunction of expressions of deceptive affection with relational outcomes. This research is a continuation of previous deceptive affection research by identifying motivations to express deceptive affection or withhold affection in romantic relationships. Overall, this research furthers the understanding of the role of deception in relationships.

This thesis consists of five chapters. The first is the introduction and rationale, followed by Chapter 2 which contains the literature review of relevant research. The relevant research covers relationship maintenance, dialectics, affection, dark side communication, negative maintenance, and deceptive affection. The review of relevant research leads to the research questions driving the study. The third chapter is the method, within which participants, materials, procedures, and data analysis are discussed. The fourth chapter, results, provides the detailed findings of the study. Lastly, the fifth chapter, discussion, covers the implications of the study and identifies future research and the limitations of the study.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter provides an overview of the existing literature on relationship maintenance, dialectics, affection, dark side, negative maintenance and deception. Definitions as well as the guiding theories will be explained and explored. Lastly, gaps in the existing research will be identified leading in to the hypothesis and research questions.

Relationship Maintenance

Unlike the romantic relationships seen in romantic comedies where two star – crossed lover's eyes meet then "they live happily ever after", in the real world romantic relationships function in a much more intricate, complex, and at times messy way. Finding a suitable partner to enter in a romantic relationship is not as simple as Hollywood makes it appear. Also, the "happily ever after" is not guaranteed just because two people fall in love. To briefly summarize, it takes blood, sweat, and tears for romantic relationships to exist. According to Stafford (2003), "relationships stay together unless something tears them apart and relationships will deteriorate unless efforts are made to keep the relationship intact" (p. 53). Therefore, relationships are in constant motion; they are not static or unchanging (Dindia, 2003). Both partners must work towards their relational goals. The effort that is required of partners to meet relational goals is known as relationship maintenance.

Definitions

Not all couples have the same relational goals. As explained by Dindia (2003) there are four definitions of relationship maintenance; each has its own conceptualization of what relationship maintenance entails, in relation to the attitudes of the partners towards

the quality of their relationship. The first definition is based on a specified state or condition where partners are maintaining the fundamental nature of the relationship. The second definition is a satisfactory state where partners are keeping the relationship at a state which partners are content with. The third definition is about repair; this is when partners are using preventative and corrective measures to prevent the relationship from deescalating and terminating. The fourth definition, and the one this paper will focus on, is based around existence, which is where both partners are keeping the relationship in a place where the relationship is not being terminated. While Dindia (2003) have four conceptual definitions for maintenance, the definition for maintenance used is this paper is maintenance as the strategic and routine activities associated with keeping a relationship in existence.

Keeping a relationship in a specific state or condition. The first definition concerns itself with dimensions or qualities of the relationship. To keep a relationship in a specific state or condition "refers to sustaining the present level of certain dimensions or qualities through to be important in relationship development" (Dindia & Canary, 1993, p. 164). This includes maintaining intimacy, mutual control orientations, commitment, and liking (Dindia & Canary, 1993). Couples maintaining their relationship in a specific state or condition do so based on what they consider to be important to the relationship such as, characteristics or qualities, intimacy, attraction, interdependence, and understanding or knowledge of each other (Dindia & Canary, 1993).

Keeping a relationship in a satisfactory condition. The second definition describes those who keep their relationship in a place where it is mutually satisfying for both partners. Relational satisfaction is measured through participant self-reports using

relationship assessment scales (i.e. Hendrick, 1988).   However, as pointed out by Dindia

and Canary (1993) most of the research only examines the satisfaction of just one partner.

Therefore, to accurately measure keeping a relationship at a satisfactory level a romantic

dyad should be involved in the research to gain both perspectives.

Keeping a relationship in repair. As explained by Dindia and Canary (1993),

keeping a relationship in repair can refer to maintaining a relationship in a "good, sound or

working condition" (p. 166). It could also refer to, repairing a relationship that has

collapsed. Although the conceptualization of maintenance as repair brings the two ideas

together, Dindia and Canary (1993) prefer to keep the two concepts separate rather than

overlap them.   "Relational repair contrasts markedly from relational

maintenance…maintenance refers to *keeping* the relationship in its present state. Repair

means *changing* a relationship from its present condition and restoring it to a previous

(more advanced) state after decline or decay" (p. 166). Again, the unique relationship of

the couple will determine their form of repair.

Keeping a relationship in existence. For romantic partners who are keeping their

relationship in existence they are essentially keeping their relationship from terminating.

This definition differs from the other definitions in that it does not "imply anything about

the type or form of the relationship or any of the important dimensions or qualities of the

relationship…it does not specify whether relationship changes or remains stable during the

maintenance stage of relationships" (Dindia & Canary, 1993, p. 164). Couples who are

keeping their relationship in existence have varying maintenance behaviors that are unique

to their own relationship. One example noted by Dindia and Canary (1993), " in some

relationships, partners engage in daily, routine behaviors that reinforce the existence of the relationship" (p. 164).

As stated above, this paper looks at how partners maintain romantic relationship when keeping the relationship in a state of existence. Keeping a relationship in a place where both partners are working to prevent the relationship from ending is an interesting concept. Being in and maintaining a relationship completely depends on what each individual is gaining from the relationship. This study will address motivations and strategies for individuals who use deception in their relationships. Further, viewing maintenance through an existence lens briefly appears in previous maintenance research (Dindia & Canary, 1993); this study aims to further maintenance research to include deceptive behaviors and their influence on keeping romantic relationships in existence.

Relationship Maintenance Strategies

Although there are four different ways that researchers have conceptualized maintenance, the operationalization of maintenance has generally focused on the routine and/or strategic activities that are positive in nature and are frequently associated with key relational outcomes like satisfaction, liking, and commitment. Dainton and Gross (2008) discuss seven maintenance behaviors, five of which were first identified by Stafford and Canary in 1991. Ideally, if romantic partners engage in such behaviors then they will be able to maintain their relationship. Maintenance strategies are often routine and strategic actions that individuals in relationships rely on. These seven strategies are positivity, openness, assurances, social networks, sharing tasks, advice, and conflict management. While all strategies are essential to relationships, "assurances may hold the most importance for sustaining a relationship" (Stafford, 2003, p. 68). Edenfield, et al.

(2012) conceptualize positivity as a "cheerful outlook", openness as reciprocating self-disclosure, assurances as providing comfort and show love, task sharing is seen as both partners divvying responsibilities, and lastly social networks as involving "having common bonds with others" (p. 151). Dainton and Gross (2008) conceptualize advice as communicating one's feelings and thoughts about their partner, while conflict management is using "integrative behaviors" during relational conflicts.

Further research has turned up even more strategies for relationship maintenance. As reported by Dindia (2003), there is a set of 49 relational maintenance and repair strategies placed within eleven superordinate types including communication, metacommunication, avoid metacommunication, pro-social strategies, togetherness, and antisocial strategies, among others. For example, communication is sharing information with each other. Dindia (2003) reports that talking about the relationship serves to escalate the relationship in its early stages, and then later serves as conflict management. Metacommunication occurs when couples talk about the communication that occurs in their relationship. To avoid metacommunication would be to keep quiet and not talk about their communication. Pro-social strategies include being nice, cheerful, and refraining from criticism (Dindia, 2003). Togetherness strategies include spending time with one another and performing or partaking in activities as a couple. Whereas the previous strategies are often in line with the "pro-social" view of maintenance, there is another set of strategies that are less pro-social in nature. Within the antisocial strategies category there are such tactics as, coercive attempts to change the partner, threats, negative behaviors, and acting cold.

Following suit with the above antisocial strategies, Stafford (2003) reported that avoidance, which includes lack of self-disclosure and increased physical or verbal distance, could also be used to maintain a relationship. Likewise, Hess (2000) found that spatial or verbal distance between individuals in a relationship could actually, at times, improve relational quality. The study acknowledges that closeness is often associated with "goodness" while distance is associated with "badness". However, the tandem use of closeness and distance are "essential components in the dialectical tensions that govern relationships" (p. 480), meaning that couples use both closeness and distance for the betterment of their relationship. Hess (2000) also reported that deception is used as a distancing behavior when maintaining relationships. This finding provides a framework for how deception can be employed as a maintenance behavior for couples that are keeping their relationship in existence. Therefore, partners trying to keep the relationship alive may be using deception as a distancing behavior as part of their routine maintenance strategies. In taking the "distance" idea a step further, Le, Korn, Crockett and Loving (2011) studied the effect of temporary geographic separation among romantic couples who were separated geographically for vacations, school breaks and the like. They looked at the separation though a maintenance lens and found that such distance between partners could lead to missing one's partner causing them to employ maintenance behaviors to stay connected with each other.

> The experience of missing a partner is theorized to be functional in relationships by motivating pro-relational behavior for individuals who are committed to their relationships and provides a potential explanation for why some geographically separated relationships are maintained, while others are threatened (p.664).

Therefore, in relationships seemingly "asocial" strategies such as avoidance and distance have the potential to help maintain relationships.

In summary, although the research typically highlights pro-social strategies used for maintaining relationships at a desired level, some research suggests that more a-social or anti-social messages could also serve a maintenance function when maintenance is conceptualized as keeping the relationship in existence (Hess, 2000). Indeed, there are several contradictions that appear in the literature. Openness and closedness, togetherness and physical distance, metacommunication and avoiding metacommunication, and positivity and negative behaviors are all examples of contradictory maintenance strategies. Such contradictions should not be disregarded; instead they need to be critiqued, because examination of these contradictions may shed some light onto the unique nature of romantic relationships. "To fully understand relationships we need to know about both their positive and negative aspects" (Pearlman & Carcedo, 2011, p. 10). Thus, the next section examines a theory dedicated to understanding such contradictions: relational dialectics.

Dialectics

Relational Dialectics Theory deals with meanings that are created between relationship partners through their use of competing discourses. Discourses are the systems of meaning that individuals use to communicate (Baxter & Braithwaite, 2008; 2010). Relational Dialectics Theory also looks at the discursive tensions or competing discourses, which are not a bad thing. According to Baxter and Braithwaite (2008), "such discursive tensions are both inevitable and necessary" in relationships (p. 350).

Negotiation occurs in all relationships and allows individuals to define relational meanings, expectations, and behavioral patterns in the early stages of their relationship (Metts, 1994). Negotiation also allows those in a relationship to navigate through their tensions. Relational dialectics covers many of the dialectical tensions that are commonly found in relationships including openness-closedness, autonomy-connection, predictability-novelty (Baxter, 1990), inclusion-seclusion, conventionality-uniqueness, and revelation-concealment (Baxter & Erbert, 1999). This paper focuses on the two primary contradictions that have been identified by prior research, openness-closedness and autonomy-connection (Hoppe-Nagao & Ting-Toomeny, 2009), as a way to focus on deception as a possible means to handle relationship tension and keep the relationship in existence (i.e., relational maintenance).

The openness-closedness contradiction refers to the tensions of wanting to disclose information and wanting to withhold information. Intimate partners want to share aspects of their lives with each other but yet would like to still maintain some degree of privacy (Hoppe-Nagao & Ting-Toomey, 2009). Romantic relationships do not have to be built on complete honesty; instead maintaining some degree of privacy is natural. Cole (2001) would agree stating, "without a doubt, complete disclosure fails to depict the nature of communication between romantic partners" (p. 107). Hence, withholding, a form of deception (McCornack, 1992), can serve as an important function in relationships and thus can help to maintain relationships.

The autonomy-connection is the second dialectical tension that could be used to understand the role of deception in relationship maintenance. "Autonomy is the desire and ability to be self-sufficient, self-contained, self-defined and accountable only to one's self.

Connection is the desire and ability to be reliant on others, to be relied on, to be connected with others, and to be defined in relation to others" (Goldsmith, 1990, p. 538). Partners in romantic relationships want to maintain a level of independence and being a unique individual, all the while trying to balance being dependent, connected, and one half of a couple. Through interviews Hoppe-Nagao and Ting-Toomey (2009) compiled four key perceptions of the autonomy- connection dialectic: degree of perceived contradiction, degree of perceived comfort, degree of perceived togetherness, and degree of perceived independence (p. 145).

The degree of perceived contradiction showed that "couples perceived autonomy and connection to be in competition" (p. 146). Participants expressed that during their relationship they felt they were only able to achieve one or the other rather than both. When one is only able to achieve autonomy or connection in their relationship they might be left with their relational needs unfulfilled. Second, the degree of perceived comfort shows that "feeling comfortable seeking out independence, or trying to establish connection with their spouse, because they believed that their spouse would understand their motivations" (p. 147). Third, the degree of perceived togetherness theme showed that participants often spoke of the relationship rather than the individual. In other words, there was a "repeated reference to a desire for togetherness" (p. 146) where togetherness is being concerned with the relationship and the partner rather than just oneself. Fourth, the degree of perceived independence theme showed that partners thought of independence as "being your own person" (p. 147). Being able to provide one's partner independence allows for maximizing satisfaction and maintaining harmony in the relationship (Hoppe-Nagao & Ting-Toomey, 2009). Limiting independence or discouraging

autonomy can be detrimental to the relationship. Doing so, according to Hoppe-Nagao and Ting-Toomey (2009), "might lead people to become resentful of their partner for limiting their autonomy" (p. 148). As these themes illustrate, autonomy and connection are both needed in a relationships. Couples are able to navigate the autonomy-connection contradiction by making sacrifices for the betterment of the relationship. Sacrificing one's needs for the "good of the relationship" can resolve dialectical tensions. They may also use a-social or anti-social strategies like deception to create these moments of autonomy (Hoppe-Nagao & Ting-Toomey, 2009) and thus maintain the relationship.

Relational Dialectics Theory focuses on specific, situational communication, such as meanings that are constructed social and maintained though everyday communication (Baxter & Braithwaite, 2008). Therefore, it does not deal in generalizations, but rather studies the specifics behind each meaning-making event. Romantic partners create meanings by combining their personal identities and their relational identities (Baxter & Braithwaite, 2010). As a result, partners may find relational importance in both positive relationship maintenance behaviors, as well as negative ones, given the contradictions that permeate relational life. Before discussing negative maintenance in-depth, it is important to explore one of the key ways that partners build connection: through affection. Indeed, as will be argued in this paper, one form of negative maintenance may be deceptive affection or the withholding of affection; therefore the concept of affection needs to be explored first.

Affection.

Creating and managing the connection aspect of the autonomy-connection contradiction comes from the partner's investment in maintenance behaviors.

One way for couples to bond and become connected to each other is through displays of affection. Partners will use discourse to create the meaning behind their affectionate behaviors. The meanings created by couples are unique and specific to their relationship and cannot be applied or measured by to other relationships. Affection Exchange Theory posits that affection exchange contributes to survival because it promotes pair bonding and the increased access to resources pair bonds provide" (Floyd, 2001, p. 40-41). Going further, Floyd and Pauley (2011) explain that highly affectionate individuals are more comfortable with intimacy and closeness, have higher levels of satisfaction, and are more often in long-term relationships. Given affection's importance as a positive maintenance strategy, it is possible that partners may "fake it" when they do not feel it to keep the relationship going.

Affection can be defined as, "an internal state of fondness and intense positive for a living target" (Floyd, Judd, & Hesse, 2008, p. 286). Showing and receiving affection begins at birth and carries on through the duration of one's life. It does not need to be taught; the want for affection and the ability to display affection is innate. As adults, affection plays an integral role in the creation of romantic relationships and is a crucial aspect of maintaining such relationships (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2010; Stafford, 2003).

Certain displays of affection (i.e., kissing, saying "I love you") serve to advance the development of romantic relationships. Affection can also communicate relationship status to those outside of the relationship. Affection can be communicated verbally and non-verbally, which provides multiple facets for affection to occur. Kissing, cuddling, hand holding, and whispering sweet nothings are just a few of the ways in which one can show his/her partner affection. When couples publically display affection they are indicating to

others that they are romantically involved while simultaneously reaffirming their commitment to each other (Floyd, 2006). Whether in public or private, romantic partners who share greater amounts of affection are fostering strong connections in the relationship (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2010). The results of Horan and Booth-Butterfield's (2010) research on the effects of giving and receiving affection in a relationship showed that, "both giving and receiving affection are associated with greater commitment and satisfaction" (p. 407). Their results supported prior Affection Exchange Theory research, which states that affection is positively related to relational quality (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2010).

Affection as a buffer against harmful effects of a transgression also deserves attention. Horan's (2012) study revealed that those who receive high amounts of affection from their romantic partner are satisfied with their relationship and perceive transgressions to be less severe or hurtful. Any transgressions from the partner are better received when it was made from a highly affectionate partner. Therefore, the wronged partner possibly will not fully understand the severity of the transgression. Horan (2012) also stated that steady amounts of affection from within the relationship could create the perception of a "safe environment where transgressions would not occur" (p. 114). Partners who receive steady amounts of affection might be naïve to the idea that their significant other would ever commit a transgression. As such, if a transgression were to unfold in the relationship it may not be seen as a huge ordeal.

Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2001, 2006) explains the role of affectionate communication in romantic relationships. Affection Exchange Theory views affection as currency, "when individuals give affection to others, they expect to receive some type of benefit" (Floyd & Pauley, 2011, p. 151). The theory states that affection is both a resource

and an investment, in any relationship. To classify affection as an investment, an understanding of affection as being a valuable and a significant resource to relationships is a must. Higher levels of affection lead to higher levels of commitment and satisfaction. Horan and Booth-Butterfield's (2010) research shows that both partners in romantic relationships experience satisfaction and commitment when they receive affectionate messages. When there is a higher level of satisfaction and a higher level of commitment in a relationship then there will tend to be a greater investment from both partners. Greater investment in a relationship lessens the likelihood that the relationship will be terminated. Therefore, affection helps to maintain romantic relationships and a sense of connectedness among partners.

Affection Exchange Theory research has shown that both the sender and receiver of affectionate messages show biological benefits. Affection in romantic relationships lends itself to personal and relational benefits. Floyd and Pauley (2011) discuss the benefits of affection in relationships, such as improved mental health, stress alleviation, stress regulation, stress buffering, and recovery from stress. Floyd, Judd, and Hesse (2008) found that not only does the receiver of affection reap the above benefits but also when people express affection they too become less susceptible to stress.

Affection is a key way to build connection. While affection is great there are alternatives to genuine feelings of affection and associated messages, which may still lead to connection, but autonomy as well. Felt affectionate actions are displays of affection that one internally feels for their partner (Floyd, 2006). Felt affection is in contrast to routine affection and deceptive affection. For example, there are instances where affectionate acts are performed out of routine. They are performed not out of feelings of affection but out of

habit and are performed without conscious effort (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). Such instances could be done deceptively when affection is displayed because partners have always done it rather than because they want to do it. A kiss when leaving for work might become routine in a relationship and is likely to occur even if an individual is upset with their partner. Dindia (2003) describes this as a routine maintenance behavior. Such behaviors are "not consciously and intentionally employed as relational maintenance strategies but, nonetheless function to maintain the relationship" (p. 10). Routine maintenance is also important in sustaining connections.

Affection may be communicated for other reasons that may still maintain connection, but are associated with deception and other dark side behaviors. Affection Exchange Theory postulates that people are capable of expressing affection without actually feeling it. This could happen out not only out of routine, but also out of politeness, as an ulterior motive, or obligation (Floyd, Judd, & Hesse, 2008, Floyd & Pauley, 2011). An individual with ulterior motives might tell their new partner that they love them, when in fact they may not actually be in love, but rather they would just like to "get in their pants". In this instance the individual would be masking or hiding their true feelings; this is known as a deceptive affectionate message or DAM (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). The thought of deceptive affection in a romantic relationship may leave some with a sour taste in their mouth. However, deceptive affectionate messages (DAMs) have been found to be common in romantic relationships and are considered to be a useful maintenance tool (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013), possibly to sustain connection in the relationship even when the emotion is not felt, but also possibly as a way to assert autonomy. In addition, Horan and Booth-Butterfield (2013) note that an individual might also withhold from

expressing affection that they are genuinely feeling for their partner. Withholding affection could be another form of maintaining connection, but with physical and psychological distance attached to it. These concepts will be further discussed in the deception, affection, and maintenance section.

In summary, relational partners experience competing discourses of openness-closedness and autonomy-connection in their romantic relationships. Maintenance strategies are often used by partners to navigate these competing discourses. In particular, individuals will sometimes suppress their instinct to display affection, or show it when they do not feel it. All of this suggests that even with affection, there may be a dark side component, another competing discourse in relationships, which is the focus of the next section. As Hess (2000) found, distancing behaviors can help partners keep their relationship in existence. Likewise, dark side behaviors can function to maintain relationships, but in a different way. They could be used maintain autonomy, by keeping the relationship in existence but from growing too close. Additionally, dark side behaviors may also be used to maintain connectedness even when partners do not want to feel connected.

Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication

The dark side of interpersonal communication is a collection of what Spitzberg and Chupach (1998) call the "seven deadly sins". Of the seven "sins", there are two that relate directly to the study of negative relationship maintenance. First, the authors explain, " the dark side is concerned with deviance, betrayal, transgression, and violation" (xvi). The way that Spitzberg and Chupach (2008) conceptualize this form of "darkness" is to say that when people behave in ways that fail to respect norms and preferences, it is considered to

be the source of darkness. Yet, the question is, whose norms and preferences are considered? Duck (1994) ruminated about the future research of the dark side of communication, stating that it is within "the personal meaning systems of the two relational partners that acts are given their negative or positive spin" (p. 19). When studying negative acts in romantic relationships, the act has to be understood in the context of a relational culture at a particular point in time.

The second view of darkness states that, "the dark side is concerned with the paradoxical, dialectical, dualistic, and mystifying aspects of life" (p. xv). People will reason complex situations or scenarios in order to gain some level of understanding; this process results in the creation of their own complexities. Spitzberg and Cupach (2008) go on to explain that, "things are seldom entirely what they seem-and when they are, we often refuse to accept them as such, often creating another level of paradox" (p. xv). The dark side does not need to be intimidating, nor should it be avoided; instead it should be embraced and understood. "Confronting and exploring the darkness helps us cope with it and adapt to it accordingly" (Spitzberg & Chupach, 1994, p. 316). And, as previously discussed, behaviors that may be labeled "dark" could have maintenance-type characteristics.

Negative Maintenance. Maintaining a romantic relationship does not solely consist of positive forms of maintenance. There are behaviors and strategies that are often thought of with a negative connotation-not unlike the dark side of communication; however, such negative behaviors are not used with the intent to disrupt the relationship, but rather to maintain the relationship, tend to an individual's personal needs, or to make oneself feel better about the relationship (Goodboy, Meyers, & et al., 2010). Goodboy,

Meyers, and et al. (2010) note that "aversive relational behaviors" and "antisocial maintenance behaviors" are different labels given to the phrase "negative maintenance behaviors: (p. 67-68). This paper will use the phrase "negative maintenance behaviors" that more current research (i.e. Dainton & Gross, 2008; Goodboy, Meyers, et al., 2010; Goodboy & Bolkan, 2011) uses as an umbrella term for the older phrases- "aversive relational behaviors" and "antisocial maintenance behaviors". Negative maintenance behaviors, according to Goodboy, Meyers, et al. (2010) are "maintenance behaviors in the sense that the desire to continue the existing relationship is supplemented by performing these aversive behaviors" (p. 67). Thinking about maintenance as keeping a relationship in existence, where the relationship could see changes or remain stable; it is clear to see how negative maintenance could facilitate the stability or fluctuation of one's relationship.

It was not until recently that negative maintenance behaviors have been studied as behaviors that would help to maintain a relationship (Dainton & Gross, 2008; Goodboy & Bolkan, 2011; Guthrie & Kunkel, 2013), although earlier research did recognize that antisocial strategies can be used (Dindia, 2003). Negative maintenance behaviors include jealousy inductions, avoidance, destructive conflict, allowing control, spying, infidelity, deception, transgressions, and abuse (Goodboy & Bolkan, 2011; Goodboy, Meyers, & et al., 2010). According to Goodboy and colleagues,

> The use of negative relational maintenance behaviors may be one way in which relational partners are able to keep a relationship in existence because by engaging in these behaviors, partners are able to reconcile their individual needs with their desire to remain involved in the relationship, albeit through questionable interpersonal behavior (p. 67).

Goodboy et al. (2010) found that the quality of a romantic relationship plays a role in the benefits of negative maintenance behaviors. Their research showed that high-quality relationships did not benefit highly from negative behaviors, while low-quality relationships are more likely to benefit from such behaviors. In low-quality relationships negative maintenance behaviors are speculated to be a way for partners to manifest distance within the relationship. As mentioned, the use of distance in a relationship can serve as a maintenance behavior (Hess, 2000). Spitzberg and Chupach (1994) describe the need for distance by explaining the problems associated with closeness. "Closeness often breeds undue influence, loss of identity, loss of privacy, frustrations of individual goals and personal project, and the possibilities of great psychological and even physical harm" (p. 317). Thus, negative maintenance behaviors may make room for autonomy while also keeping the relationship in existence. Furthering this idea of negative maintenance is the concept of deception and its potential role as a negative maintenance behavior.

Deception. While honesty is often thought of as "the best policy", it can actually be the wrong choice based on situational circumstances. Honesty between persons can create unwanted outcomes, "at times, honesty can inflict significant personal hurt or relational damage" (Zhang & Stafford, 2009, p. 481). Whereas the use of deception is associated with negative outcomes, it could actually lead to a positive outcome, in the right context. Boon and McLeod (2001) found that just 27% of their participants believe romantic relationships are dependent on complete honesty. "Although romantic partners may value trust and honesty, deception may serve positive functions in romantic relationships" (Guthrie & Kunkel, 2013, p. 143). This view of honesty and deception is classified as part of

the dark side of communication. The dark side of communication takes what is known about right and wrong and blurs the lines.

> The dark side is about the ironies involved in discovering that what is presumed to be evil often has moral and functional justification; likewise, what is presumed to be satisfying, legitimate, and righteous is often reprehensible and prone to abuse and destructiveness (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1998, p. xv).

Deception is often used as a strategy for a specific purpose (O'Hair & Cody, 1994). Deceptive messages are made up of false impressions and assumptions. A deceptive message is delivered with the intention and full knowledge of misleading another (Burgoon & Buller, 2008). Deceivers have to be thorough in their attempts; poorly executed deceptive messages are less likely to be successful. Successful undetected deception is dependent on one's communication skills. "Successful deceivers, then, are those who have a knack for emitting behaviors that convey believability while masking behaviors that betray their true feelings or communicate discomfort and dishonesty" (Burgoon, Buller, & Guerrero, 2008, p. 290). Those who are successful deceivers will simultaneously create the message, deliver the message, control nonverbal cues, manage emotions, listen to the receiver, keep the conversation moving, and be discrete about the deception (Burgoon, Buller, and Guerrero, 1995).

There are many forms deceptive acts that individuals employ as needed. When people think of deception they often think of blatant or outright lies; however there are also concealments (masking), omissions (withholding), evasion (diversionary tactic), overstatement (embellishment), and equivocations (ambiguity) (Burgoon & Levine, 2010; O'Hair & Cody, 1994). This paper focuses on all forms of deception that are found in

romantic relationships, and particularly how partners may utilize deception to maintain such relationships.

McCornack (2008) used Paul Grice's research from 1989 to conceptualize Information Manipulation Theory. Grice coined Grice's Cooperative Principle that described four maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner) that would later become the backbone of Information Manipulation Theory. According to Information Manipulation Theory (McCornack, 2008) there are five ways that people deliver information to on another. Cooperative messages are those that disclose all of the information that is relevant to the receiver. This information is deemed to be truthful and informative. Quantity violations are those that deliver information that is not as informative as receiver would want. Quality violations are messages that hold no truth; they are considered "bald-faced lies". Relational violations are messages that have no relevance to the topic being discussed. Lastly, manner violations are messages that are ambiguous and vague giving the listener little to no information. According to this theory, "messages are commonly thought of as deceptive derive from covert violations of the conversational maxims" (McCornack, 1992, p. 5). In other words, when one of the above maxims is violated by an individual then deception has occurred.

Deceptive messages are constructed so that the receiver hears what the sender wants them to hear. It is presumed that when individuals communicate with each other they are being honest, relevant, clear, and informative, or in other words cooperative; with such presumptions individuals become more vulnerable to deception (McCornack, 2008). Researchers have discovered there is a 'truth bias' in romantic relationships (McCornack & Parks, 1990; Horan & Dillow, 2009; Burgoon & Buller, 2008). Individuals involved in a

romantic relationship become closer and more intimate as their relationship progresses. While intimacy increases, the ability to detect deception decreases.

Interpersonal Deception Theory (Burgoon & Buller, 2008) was formed in an attempt to understand how a couple navigates the process of deceiving and detecting deception. Scholars of Interpersonal Deception Theory believe that deception is done intentionally in romantic relationships (Horan & Dillow, 2009). Deceivers are goal-orientated and will control their communication so that they can be successful in their deceptive attempts.

Scholars of Interpersonal Deception Theory found that people who are familiar (i.e. knowing communication styles, habits, and personal values) with each other are better able to deceive each other. This is because, in deception, both the sender and receiver play a role in the delivery of a deceptive message. "The more receivers expect truthfulness and the more they are familiar with the deceivers of deceptive behavior, the less deceivers fear detection" (Burgoon & Buller, 2008, p. 230). Thus, the longer two partners know each other and spend time together the easier it becomes for them to deceive one another (McCornack & Parks, 1990).

In addition, the variety of deceptive tactics available to an individual increases the likelihood successful deception. Consequently, having familiar relations with another helps deceivers to select the necessary deceptive strategy. Deceivers will select a deceptive strategy that is best suited for the situation and the deception receiver (Horan & Dillow, 2009). Knowing how one's partner reacts to certain truths helps the deceiver shape their deceptive message and tailors it to their needs. Cole (2001) found that partners would engage in deception if they believe that their partner will react aggressively to the truth. In such instances, deception may be used in order to avoid punishment from one's partner.

The combination of various deceptive strategies and familiarity allows individuals to better deceive and not get caught. While detection of deception is possible, McCornack and Parks (1990) found that "even if highly involved individuals are lucky enough to accurately detect a lie, they probably will not be able to determine what information the lie was designed to hide" (p. 116).

Studying the motivation behind a lie is just as important as studying the lie itself. "If a deceiver has good intentions and is motivated to serve the interests of others, deception is an acceptable form of communication" (O'Hair & Cody, 1994, p. 193). Lying is not always done with malice as the motivator. Boon and McLeod (2001) uncovered individuals' attitudes on deception through their study. Their research revealed that people find that deceiving their partner is, at times, the proper and moral thing to do (p. 472). A lie could easily be used to spare the feelings of another or to spare another from pain (Boon &McLeod, 2001). Guthrie and Kunkel (2013) found that deception was used to be both polite and to protect each other's face; "it is clear that protecting the partner's face and being polite with romantic partners continue to motivate behavior in romantic relationships, and deception may be the means to serve these purposes" (p. 153). Being polite and protecting each other helps couples create and maintain positive images of each other. Kaplar and Gordon (2004) say that such lies are said to be "altruistically motivated" (p. 491). They add that lies that are altruistically motivated are more justifiable and the lie tellers think of themselves as being loving and not deceptive. Lie tellers have also reported that lies that are intended to protect a loved one are actually easier to tell (McCornack, 2008).

Deception, Affection, and Maintenance. Completely honest communication between intimate partners can be detrimental for their relationship (Peterson, 1996; Zhang & Stafford, 2009). As noted in the deception section, deception does not have to be detrimental to a relationship. Deception in romantic relationships has actually been found to be a maintenance tool (Boon & McLeod, 2001; Dainton & Gross, 2008; Goodboy, Meyers, & et al., 2010; Peterson, 1996; Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). Horan and Dillow (2009) found that the use of deception might help relational partners work through dialectical tensions. Likewise, Guthrie and Kunkel's (2013) research concluded that couples would indeed use deception to negotiate dialectical tensions. In the instance of the autonomy-connection tension partners may deceive their partner "as not to compromise the connectedness she or he simultaneously desires with the relational partner" (p. 160). Cole's (2001) research found that relational satisfaction is positively linked to being successfully deceived by one's partner. Partners who use deception rather than the truth are attempting to avoid unfavorable outcomes. Therefore, when unfavorable or negative outcomes are avoided both partners will still be content within their relationship; no harm no foul. According to O'Hair and Cody (1994) "deception is a message strategy…that is purposeful, often goal directed, and frequently functions as a relational control device" (p. 181).

Being involved in a romantic relationship can cause conflict, strain, and disappointment for either or both partners involved. When partners in relationships experience such trouble it can be detrimental to their health and well-being (Rook, 1998). Rather than put themselves though this trouble, partners will turn to deception as an alternative option. In this instance, both the well-being of the relationship and both

individuals may be maintained due to the usage of a successful deceptive act. In particular, given that expressing affection to one's partner has been linked with stress-reduction and increased satisfaction (Floyd, 2006), it is possible that deceptive affection could be an example of a deceptive act that has positive implications for the maintenance of relationships.

Horan and colleagues (Booth-Butterfield, 2013; Carton & Horan, 2013) have recently studied affection and deceptive affection in romantic relationships. Deceptive affectionate messages (DAMs) are used when one partner does not feel the affection they are expressing. DAMs can be verbal or nonverbal in their delivery. Forms of verbal DAMs include saying, "I miss you" or "I love you" when those sentiments are not genuinely felt in the moment. Nonverbal forms of DAMs include holding hands, kissing, or hugging one's partner when they would rather not. At times, one may genuinely feel affection for their partner but refrain from expressing it; Carton and Horan (2013) refer to this as withholding affection (WAs). Withholding affection occurs when one wants to sit close to their partner or wants to say "I love you" but will actually hold off on doing so.

In their study, Carton and Horan reported the frequency of deception along with expressed or received affection. The aim of the study was to investigate withholding affection from ones' partner. They found patterns among their participants; overall the act of withholding affection occurs frequently in romantic relationships. In another study by Horan and Melanie Booth-Butterfield (2013) they acknowledge that deceptive affection occurs within romantic relationships; what they set out to find was the process of using deception through affection and the functions that go along with such forms of affection. The study resulted in the statement that, "expressing deceptive affection is a common

experience in romantic relationship" (p. 209). Further results showed that, "DAMs may be indicative of temporary dissatisfaction with a partner or relationships" (p. 210). This is not to say that partners are not in love with each other, but rather at the moment that the DAMs were used as a masking behavior for current negative feelings about the relationship or partner.

The combined studies presented here verify that romantic partners do use deception in their romantic relationships. It has also been revealed that deception is used as a way to maintain such relationships. Previous research has indicated the frequency that deceptive affection is being used in romantic relationships. However, previous research has not identified the purpose for using deceptive affection. This study aims to understand the relational outcomes associated with deceptive affection in romantic relationships.

Hypothesis and Research Questions

Previous research has shown that partners will use deceptive affectionate messages as a way to keep a relationship in existence or to prevent the relationship from deescalating (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). Along with communicating DAMs, partners will also without their affection from their partners. Withholding affection that is genuinely felt has also been identified as a way for partners to maintain their relationship (Carton & Horan, 2013). Dindia (2003) found that some partners are maintaining a relationship in an existence state. Relationships that are classified as being "in existence" are significant enough to appear in relationship research and therefore should also be studied through a deceptive affectionate lens. Therefore the follow hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis: There will be a positive association between DAMs and WAs and keeping the relationship in existence.

It is known that DAMs are used in romantic relationships. However, the literature is still limited and there is still a need for further investigation of such deceptive messages. Previous research has reported forms of DAMs such as, sitting close, laying close, kissing, saying 'I love you', complements on appearance, and expressing joy to one's partner- all of which were communicated without the feelings being genuine (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). What is not known is if there are other DAMs that can be identified as a maintenance strategy. One of the main focuses of this study is to identify the types of DAMs that partners utilize as a form of maintenance. Furthermore, identifying DAMs in the context of maintenance will lead to the point of being able empirically measure the types of DAMS and their association with different relational outcomes. Accordingly, the second set of research questions are:

RQ1a: What is the association between DAMs and pro-social forms of relationship maintenance?

RQ1b: What other forms of DAMs may exist that are directly related to the maintenance of romantic relationships?

Intertwined with DAMs is the ability for one to withhold expressing their felt affection to their partner. Concern for perception has been cited as a motivation to withhold ones' affection (Carton & Horan, 2013). Reported reasons for withholding affection are as follows: it was an inappropriate time, fear of the reaction to expressing affection, relationship norms, and to maintain interaction (Carton & Horan, 2013). At this time, this is the only research that has been done to identify when withholding affection

occurs and the motivation for doing so. To add to the literature on withholding affection the following questions were asked:

RQ2a: What is the association between WAs and pro-social forms of relationship maintenance?

RQ2b: What other forms of WAs may exist that are directly related to keeping a romantic relationship in existence?

To extend the existing literature on deceptive affection beyond manintenance, both DAMs and WAs will be analyzed for their effect on how interconnected partners feel with one another, their level of commitment, and their level of relational satisfaction. Currently reseach has not examined the association between DAMs and WAs and other relational outcomes. Therefore, the following research question was asked to address both deceptive affection and withholding affection in order to identifiy if they are seen in other realational outcomes such as closeness, commitment, and relational satisfaction.

RQ3: How are DAMS and WAs associated with other relational outcomes?

CHAPTER 3 METHOD

To get a better look at how DAMs and WAs are used as ways to maintain romantic relationships, a survey has been created to gather information. The survey is reflective of prior DAMs and WAs research (Carton & Horan, 2014; Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013) with the addition of relationship maintenance, satisfaction, agenda and closeness measures (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992; Hendrick, 1988; Stafford & Canary, 1991; Stanley & Markman, 1992). The survey consists of both close-ended questions and open-ended questions about participant's current or previous romantic relationship and the role of deception as a maintenance tool.

Participants

Particpants had be 18 years or older to participate; they also must have been in a current romantic relationship for at least 3 months, which "...has been imposed in prior AET-based romantic affection research, and is argued to be sufficient for partners to develop relatively normative routines of affectionate interactions" (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013, p. 200).

The sample consisted of 125 participants (n = 91 females and n= 28 males; 6 did not report their gender). This modest sample size may have played a role in limiting the significance of some of the statistical analyses. A post hoc power analysis revealed that an n of approximately 242 would be needed to obtain the statistical power at the recommended .80 level (Cohen, 1988).

Age ranged from 18-51 years, the mean age was μ=20.98, SD= 2.12. The majority of participants were Caucasian (75.79%), followed by Black (13.68%), Hispanic (3.16%), Asian (1.05%) and Other (6.32%). Participants' relationship length ranged from four

months to thirty-five years (μ=4.22, *SD*= 6.45).   70.4% of participants were dating (54.4% were in a serious relationship) and 29.6% were married.

Procedures and Instrumentation

Participants were recruited from a midsize urban university through an announcement posted on the communication department's subject pool and through an email blast to communication majors. As an incentive, participants could earn research credit for their course and/or they could enter into a drawing to win a $100 gift certificate. Once the institutional review board approved the study an email was sent out to students containing information about the survey and a link to the survey. A link was also posted on the communication department's subject pool. If participants were eligible and interested in the survey, the provided link took them to the Qualtrics website where they could read the information sheet describing the survey.

The first section that participants completed was a series of screening questions participants answered if they were currently in a romantic relationship, if they were in a long-distance relationship, and if they were in their relationship for more than three months. Next, participants reported their current relationship status. After the first part of the survey was completed, then participants answered questions about their use of deception in their relationships, followed by questions that ascertained their maintenance of relationships using pro-social communication. The final section assessed outcome variables including closeness, commitment, and satisfaction with the relationship. Additional information on the variables is provided below.

Demographic information.

Demographic information was collected. Participants reported their sex along with their partner's sex. In addition, participants were asked to report their age and the race they identified themselves as.

Independent Variables.

DAMs scale. The hypothesis sought to find a positive association between DAMs and withholding affection and keeping the relationship in existence. To address the hypothesis, measures of DAMs and withholding affection were constructed to assess instances where partners communicate affection when the feeling is not present or is being withheld. The items for the DAMs measure were derived from the diary study of Horan and Booth-Butterfield (2013) who depicted examples of verbal and non-verbal deceptive affectionate messages. The instances of expressing deceptive affection were used to create a 14-item measure consisting of seven verbal and seven non-verbal items using a 7-point Likert scale where '1' represents *strongly disagree* and '7' represents *strongly agree*. Items such as "I smiled at my partner when I did not feel happy", "I have told my partner I love him/her when I didn't really feel it" and "I have told my partner I enjoyed spending time together when I really did not" were created and used to measure the expression of deceptive affection.

WAs scale. Likewise, a measure of withholding affection was constructed from Carton and Horan's (2014) diary examination of withholding affection study. The measure was constructed to assess instances where partners did not communicate affection when he/ she felt that way. There were eight items such as, "I have withheld from expressing my feelings to my partner when I would rather share my feelings" and "I have refrained from

kissing my partner when I wanted to" in the measure using a 7-point Likert scale. These

two measures were followed by open-ended questions to capture any other types of DAMs

and WAs not already represented in the scale (RQ1b and RQ3, respectively).

Scale validity. To assess construct validity of the DAMs and WAs scales, Cole's

(2001) 9-item scale measuring deception was used. Originally Cole had nine items,

however for the purposes of this study only eight of the nine items were used. Since this

study is not looking at the frequency of deception, the sixth item ("Please estimate the

number of times you lie to your partner during the course of a week") on Cole's scale was

removed from the survey. The remaining eight items contained questions such as, "I

sometimes found myself lying to my partner about things I have done", and "I have tried to

hide certain things that I have done from my partner". A 7-point Likert scale was used to

measure the items, 1 represented *strongly disagree* and '7' represented *strongly agree*.

Previous reliability was .84 (Cole, 2001), in the current study reliability was $\alpha=.82$.

Dependent Variables.

Relationship maintenance. In line with previous maintenance research (e.g.,

Canary & Stafford, 1992; Stafford & Canary, 1991; Stafford & Canary, 2001) a measure of

relationship maintenance was chosen to specifically represent maintenance factors that

keep a relationship at a desired level. The measure is from Stafford and Canary's (1991, p.

228) study, which reported five factors that operationally defined maintenance behaviors:

positivity, openness, assurances, sharing tasks, and network. The measure consists of 24

items using a 7- point Likert scale with '1' representing *strongly disagree* and '7'

representing *strongly agree*. Sample items include "I have implied that our relationship has

a future", "I have told my partner how I feel about our relationship", and "I have periodic

talks about our relationship with my partner" were used. The previous alpha reliability were as follows: positivity α = .89, openness α = .84, assurances α = .84, tasks α = .71, network α = .76 (Stafford & Canary, 1991). The present study had the following alpha reliability: positivity α =. 87, openness α =. 89, assurances α =. 88, tasks α =. 76 network α =. 58.

Relationship satisfaction. To further understand how DAMs and WAs are related to maintenance, the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) (Hendrick, 1988) was implemented. As used by Cole (2001) to assess relationship satisfaction, Hendrick's (1988) RAS consists of 7 items using a 5-point Likert scale. Questions varied from 'how well does your partner meet your needs?' to 'how often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?'. Following suit with Hendrick's (1988) scale, '1' represents *low* and '5' represents *high*. Previous reliability was .86 (Hendrick, 1988); current alpha reliability α =.89.

Commitment. Commitment to a romantic partner was used to measure "keeping a relationship in existence" and was assessed through the use of a modified version of the Commitment Inventory (CI) created by Stanley and Markman (1992, p. 606). The complete CI included two categories, constraint commitment items and dedication commitment items; each category had multiple sub categories. Modifications of the original CI removed subcategories that were unrelated to this research. For the purposes of this research only the subcategory "relationship agenda", under the dedication commitment section, was used to assess one's commitment to the future of the romantic relationship. The category consists of six items using a 7-point Likert scale with '1' representing *strongly disagree* and '7' representing *strongly agree*. Items such as, 'I do not have life-long plans for this

relationship', and 'I want to grow old with my partner' were used. Prior alpha reliability for the relationship agenda subscale was .94 (Stanley & Markman, 1992). In this study reliability was α=.93.

Inclusion of self in other. Finally, given the recent work by Ledbetter (Ledbetter, Stassen, Muhammad, & Kotey, 2010; Ledbetter, 2010) who advocated IOS as an alternative outcome to relationship maintenance, the IOS scale (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992) was used as an additional item to measure how interconnected one is with their partner. The measure is presented as a series of seven overlapping circles, where '1' represents *minimal overlap* and '7' represents *almost total overlap*. Previous romantic relationship alpha .95 (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). Current alpha could not be obtained due to the difficulty of assessing reliability with a single item scale. However, convergent validity was assessed through a series of correlations of the IOS scale, relationship quality, and commitment. The results of the correlation revealed high-quality relationships were moderately associated with interconnectedness (r=.507, $p \leq .001$). Low-quality relationship were negatively associated with interconnectedness (r=-.535, $p \leq .001$). Relationship quality was obtained from the satisfaction scale, scores that fell below the mean were coded as low-quality and scores above the mean were coded as high-quality. Lastly, the analysis showed that commitment and interconnectedness were positively associated (r=.648, $p \leq .001$). These results indicate that the IOS scale is correctly measuring the participant's level of closeness or interconnectedness with their partner.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis.

DAMs Scale. Prior to testing the hypothesis and research questions, it was necessary to evaluate the DAMs and WAs scales to make sure they were both correctly measuring the constructs. First, a Principal Components Analysis (PCA) using a Verimax rotation was run for the DAMs measure. If any item did not have a factor loading greater than .399 it was eliminated from the measure. When necessary, the 40/20 rule was employed. If an item was found to load on any given component it would have a factor loading that was greater than .40 and exhibit a difference of .20 from any other factor.

The initial results showed that the item "I have told my partner I was busy when I was not" cross-loaded on two components. This item was removed and a re-estimate was performed, leaving thirteen items. Once the PCA showed simple structure and none of the items were cross loading, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was done to verify the results of the PCA. The EFA did not show simple structure; the item "I have told my partner I miss him or her when I don't really miss them" loaded onto two factors with a difference less than .20 between them. This item was removed and the EFA was run again on the remaining 12 items. This time the EFA did show simple structure. The results indicated a two-factor solution, both factors had eigenvalues greater than 1 and accounted for 58.25% of the total variance. The results indicated a two-factor solution with 12 items. The first factor has 8 items (5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) and is the 'verbal displays of deceptive affection' subscale while the second factor has 4 items (2, 3, 4, 7) and is the 'nonverbal displays of deceptive affection' subscale. (Factor Loadings are available in Table 2). The factor correlation matrix showed these two factors were correlated at .691, but the factor analysis

showed these are two distinct measures that are related. Results of Cronbach's Alpha for the DAMs measure indicated an overall alpha reliability of .90. The two factors also proved reliable; *verbal displays of deceptive affection* α=.88 and *nonverbal displays of deceptive affection* α=.84. Two correlations were done to test the construct validity of the DAMs subscales; verbal DAMs were moderately correlated ($r=.488$, $p \leq .001$) and nonverbal DAMs were also moderately correlated ($r=.429$, $p \leq .001$) with the existing deception measure (Cole, 2001).

WAs Scale. A PCA with a Verimax rotation was also run for the withholding deception measure. The results showed one factor with an eigenvalue above 1. All eight of the variables loaded on the factor with values all above .5. The one factor structure fits the data well. The EFA results aligned with the PCA, the results indicated a one-factor solution with 8 items. The total variance explained by the factor was 52.67%. The withholding affection measure proved to be reliable, $\alpha=.89$. To measure construct validity, a correlation of WAs and the previously used deceptive measure (Cole, 2001) was run. The results of the correlation indicate a positive correlation ($r=.451$, $p \leq .001$) of the WAs measure and Cole's measure.

Table 1 Withholding Affection Scale Correlations

	Share Feelings	Touching	Contacting	Time Together	Intercourse	Expressing Joy	Kissing	Full Attention
Share Feelings								
Touching	0.637**							
Contacting	0.656***	0.692***						
Time Together	0.523***	0.665***	0.671***					
Intercourse	0.423***	0.538***	0.403***	0.455***				
Expressing Joy	0.3**	0.564***	0.464***	0.535***	0.38***			
Kissing	0.443***	0.655***	0.569***	0.477***	0.572***	0.688***		
Full Attention	0.432***	0.493***	0.43***	0.483***	0.381***	0.465***	0.392***	

Note *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics For Independent Variables

Variable	Total	SD
Maintenance	109.53	14.92
Positivity	57.96	8.55
Openness	34.4	6.76
Assurances	24.28	4.2
Networks	11.07	2.19
Tasks	11.66	2.29
IOS	5.13	1.63
Commitment	33.21	8.9
Satisfaction	28.09	5.81
Married (1=Yes)	0.24	
Casually Dating (1=Yes)	0.16	
Female (1=Yes)	0.77	
Black (1=Yes)	0.13	
White (1=Yes)	0.69	
Hispanic (1=Yes)	0.05	
Asian (1=Yes)	0.02	
Other Race (1=Yes)	0.04	
Years Together	4.22	6.45

Main Analyses

    Hypothesis. To address the hypothesis, 'There will be a positive association between DAMs and withholding affection and keeping the relationship in existence, a series of correlations were run. The results indicate the data was not conistent with the hypothesis. Further investigation showed both verbal displays of deceptive affection (r=-.377, $p \leq$ .001) and nonverbal displays of deceptive affection (r=-.403, $p \leq$ .001) had a moderatly negative significant correlation with keeping the relationship in existance. Witholding affection was not significantly associated with keeping the relationship in existance (-.185, p=.054). These results indicate that a negative association exists between deceptive affection and keeping the relationship in existance.

    RQ1a. Research question 1a asked about the association of DAMs and and pro-social forms of maintenance. The results of a correlation analysis show that verbal DAMs are negatively associated with positivity (r=-.376, $p \leq$.001), openess (r=-.308, p=.002), and tasks (r=-.301, p=.002). While assurances (r=-.146, p=.142) and networks (r=-.098, p=.323) did not show an association. Similarily, nonverbal DAMs were negatively assocaited with positivity (r=-.414, $p \leq$.001), openess (r=-.363, $p \leq$.001), assurances (r=-.280, p=.004), and tasks (r=-.238, p=.015) but not networks (r=-.101, p=.312). These results reveal that deceptive affectionate messages are negatively associated with aspects of relationship maintenance.

    RQ1b. The answer to RQ1b 'What other forms of DAMs may exist that are directly related to keeping a romantic relationship in existence?" Participants answered the question, "What other forms of deceptive affection have you enacted with your partner?"

The answers were examined to identify themes representing additional DAMs. Each seperate strategy was identified as a unit. A total of 58 participants (46% responded) provided answers to the question, offering fourty-three strategies. Using the constant comparision method where each item is comapred to others, a total of eight themes were found. Four of the themes that showed up were previously identified in Horan and Booth-Butterfield's (2013) DAMs research. The four repeat themes were to protect a partner's feelings, avoid conflict, to please one's partner, and to protect one's self. However, four new themes were identified that deviated from previous research.

First, several participants indicated they used deceptive affection when talk about their own or their partner's family. Participants reported such things as, "I told him that I was eager for him to meet my family. I did it to make him feel important and to show him that my family would be accepting of him. In reality my family would give me a hard time in accepting him" and "I would tell my girlfriend that I enjoyed spending time with her family even though I didn't always enjoy it". Second, participants indicated they use deceptive affection to build their partner's self-esteem. Sample statements include, "I have told my partner that he is very intelligent when I felt otherwise" and "he is shorter than me and that makes me not wear high heels, but I lie to him and tell him it doesn't bother me". A third theme, protecting one's self from the truth, also emerged. A participant reported, "I have a firm belief that my partner is engaged in an extra-marital affair...however, as time has passed, I have proceeded as though I believed my partner is and has always been faithful". Lastly, several participants reported they never deceive their partner. Participants wrote things such as, " I don't deceive my partner" and "I am not deceptive about my feelings with my partner".

RQ2a. The second research question asked for the association between withholding affection and pro-social forms of relationship maintenance. The results of a correlation analysis indicate that withholding affection has a negative association with positivity (r=-.160, p=.100), openess (r=-237, p=.014), assurances (r=-.083, p=.393). and tasks (r=-.109, p=.265). However, there was no assocaition for WAs and networks (r=.079, p=.416). Therefore, based on such results, withholding affection does not act as a pro-social maintenance strategy.

RQ2b. The second question also asked what other forms of withholding affection are associated with keeping maintaing a romantic relationship. Participants answered the question, "What other forms of withholding affection have you enacted with your partner?" A total of 79 participants (63% responded) provided answers to the question, offering fifty-four strategies. Using the constant comparision method where each item is comapred to others, eight themes were found. The intitial analysis identified eight themes, five of which have been previously addressed in WAs research; punishment, during conflict, to avoid seeming clingy or overly interested, being tired or busy, and to protect one's feelings.

Additionally, three new themes emerged that can add to the WAs literature. First, several participants reported withholding affection because they or their partner do not want to express public displays of affection (PDA). Participants wrote, "I don't believe in PDA anywhere" and "I have to withold from kissing him goodbye cause he refuses to kiss infront of people". Second, particiants reported withholding affection out of relational uncertainity. Sample statements include, "saying I love you or saying 'sexy' things or flirty things because I am not sure if I want to be in a relationship and I am afraid he will think bad of me if I initiate sex" and "talking about our future together...I am unsure of how our

future is going to play out. I am 22 years old, I never expected having to factor in a significant other into my plans". Lastly, many participants reported that they never withhold affection from their partner. Particiapnts wrote, "I do not withhold affection with my partner. If I want her I let it be known", "I don't hold back from any way that I feel towards my partner" and "I don't withhold affection from my partner if I want to show it".

    RQ3. The third research questions asked how DAMs and withholding affection are associated with other relational outcomes. A corellation analysis was perfromed to look at the association of DAMS and withholding affection on closeness and satisfaction (Table 2). Verbal DAMs had a weak to moderate negative and significant association with closeness (r=-.363, p≤.001) and satisfaction (r=-.408 p≤.001). Nonverbal DAMs also showed a weak to moderate negative and significant association with closeness (r=-.401,p≤.001) and satisfaction (r=-.309,p≤.001). Withholding affection had a similar association. Closeness is negatively associatied with withholding affection with a weak correlation of -.203 (p=.014). In addition, there is a moderate significant negative association between withholding affection and satisfaction (r=-.313, p≤.001).

Table 3 Deceptive Measures Correlated with
Independent Variables

Variable	Verbal		Nonverbal		Withholding	
Maintenance	-0.377	***	-0.403	***	-0.185	
Positivity	-0.376	***	-0.414	***	-0.16	
Openness	-0.308	*	-0.363	***	-0.237	*
Assurances	-0.146		-0.28	*	-0.083	
Networks	-0.098		-0.101		0.079	
Tasks	-0.301	*	-0.238	*	-0.109	
IOS	-0.363	***	-0.401	***	-0.23	*
Commitment	-0.303	**	-0.355	***	-0.236	*
Satisfaction	-0.408	***	-0.309	**	-0.313	**
Married	0.165		0.218	*	0.081	
Dating	-0.131		-0.198	*	-0.077	
Seriously Dating	-0.168		-0.26	**	-0.216	*
Casually Dating	0.064		0.104		0.196	*
Female	-0.206	*	-0.155		-0.042	
Male	0.183	*	0.133		0.035	
Black	-0.111		0.062		0.084	
White	-0.041		-0.085		-0.2	*
Hispanic	-0.074		0.002		-0.032	
Asian	-0.007		-0.172		0.54	
Other Race	-0.057		-0.021		0.002	
Years Together	0.142		0.215	*	-0.021	

Note *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Post Hoc

Correlations of relationship type and length of the relationship were analyzed. The results indicated that being married had a weak positive association with DAMs ($r= .209$, $p= .021$). Length of the relationship also had a weak positive association with DAMs ($r= .184$, $p= .044$). There were no significant associations with WAs for married couples ($r=.062$, $p=.500$) or with length of the relationship ($r=.-042$, $p=.647$). However, a weak negative association appeared for WAs and couples who were seriously dating ($r=.-.206$,

p=.023). There was also a weak positive association between WAs and casually dating (*r*=.

203, *p*=.026).

In a replication of Goodboy, et al.'s (2010) study, it was found that deception

functions differently in high-quality versus low-quality romantic relationships. In high-

quality relationships, relationship quality is negatively correlated with the use of verbal

DAMs -.286 *(p≤*.001), nonverbal DAMs -.215 (*p*=.017), and WAs -.244 (*p*=.007). For low-

quality relationships, relationship quality was positively correlated with the use of verbal

DAMs .369 (*p≤*.001), nonverbal DAMs .280 (*p*=.002), and WAs .257 (*p*=.006).

Table 4 Correlation Matrix of Variables

Variable	V DAMs	NV DAMs	WAs	Sat.	Commit	IOS	Open	Assur.	Pos.	Net	Tasks	Male	Female	Married	Serious	Cas	Asian	Black	White	Hisp	Other
NVDAMs	0.636[c]																				
WAs	0.533[c]	0.413[c]																			
Satisfaction	-0.408[c]	-0.309[c]	-0.313c																		
Commitment	-0.303[c]	-0.355[c]	-0.236a	0.77[c]																	
IOS	-0.363[c]	-0.401[c]	-0.23a	0.714[c]	0.648[c]																
Openness	-0.072[c]	-0.35[c]	-0.268b	0.534[c]	0.567[c]	0.511[c]															
Assurances	-0.196[c]	-0.225[b]	-0.23	0.465[c]	0.66[c]	0.395[c]	0.644[c]														
Positivity	-0.437[c]	-0.384[c]	-0.268	0.488[c]	0.493[c]	0.382[c]	0.656[c]	0.559[c]													
Networks	-0.151	-0.133	-0.094	0.289[b]	0.275[b]	0.257[b]	0.346[c]	0.347[c]	0.502[c]												
Tasks	-0.383c	-0.275[b]	-0.169	0.365[c]	0.46[c]	0.384[c]	0.58[c]	0.47[c]	0.667[c]	0.361[c]											
Male	0.183[a]	0.133	0.035	-0.217[a]	-0.225[a]	-0.095	-0.2	-0.312	-0.325	-0.134	-0.12										
Female	-0.206[a]	-0.155	-0.042	0.24[b]	0.227[a]	0.105	0.190[a]	0.319[a]	0.35[c]	0.142	0.138	-1									
Married	0.128	0.195[a]	0.062	-0.06	0.152	-0.071	0.106[a]	0.196[a]	-0.058[d]	-0.02	0.323	0.054[d]	-0.064								
Serious Date	-0.145	-0.247[b]	-0.206[a]	0.253[b]	0.209[a]	0.214[a]	0.146	0.196[a]	0.13	0.122	-0.058[d]	-0.201	0.219	-0.627[c]							
Casual Date	0.078	0.114	0.203	-0.331[c]	-0.506[c]	-0.323[c]	-0.363[c]	-0.517[d]	-0.155	-0.147	-0.347[c]	0.175[a]	-0.184	-0.251[b]	-0.477[c]						
Asian	-0.003	-0.172	0.056	-0.049	-0.048	0.054	-0.065	-0.024[c]	-0.051	-0.03	0.071	-0.089	0.088	-0.09	0.144	-0.068					
Black	-0.104	0.071	0.089	-0.066	-0.066	-0.078	-0.02	-0.045	-0.019	0.041	-0.087	-0.057	0.051	-0.12	0.082	0.081	-0.062				
White	-0.001	-0.186[a]	-0.188[a]	0.168	0.183	0.193[a]	0.12	0.074	0.105	0.046	0.168	0.024	-0.015	0.138	-0.116	-0.091[b]	-0.237[c]	-0.6			
Hispanic	-0.074	0.002	-0.032	0.09	0.084	0.029	0.044	0.152	0.036	-0.008	-0.046	-0.139	0.137	-0.059	0.017	0.017	-0.04	0	-0.171		
Other	-0.052	-0.017	0.005	0.11	0.083	0.197[a]	0.083	0.03	0.071	0.01	0.084	0.053	-0.058	-0.129	-0.215[b]	-0.098	-0.035	-0.089	0.148	0.106	
Rel. Length	0.102	0.192[a]	-0.042	-0.036	0.148	-0.058	0.064	0.177	0.059	0.059	0.347[c]	-0.028	0.019	0.648[c]	-0.395[c]	-0.242	-0.072	-0.064	0.198[a]	-0.11	0.023

Note: a $p<.05$, b $p<.01$, c $p<.001$

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

Whether it be sharing affection that is not felt in the moment or refraining from sharing affection that is being felt, both deceptive affectionate messages and withholding affection are ways to masks one's true feelings for their partner. This paper sought to further the understanding of ways DAMs and WAs are communicated and potentially used as maintenance strategies. To do so, one hypothesis and three research questions were developed. The findings indicate that deceptive affection and withholding affection are not positively associated with keeping romantic relationships in existence, nor are they positively associated with any of the other relevant outcomes. Instead, the use of DAMs and WAs is negatively associated with pro-social maintenance, closeness, commitment, and relational satisfaction. In addition to the items in the scales, participants also described using other forms of DAMs and WAs, such as, expressing positive feelings about a partner's family and not saying "sexy" things. In the sections that follow, these results will be furthered explored.

Interpretation of Findings

DAMs as Maintenance. As mentioned, previous research has found that DAMs are used in romantic relationships (Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). Separately, deception has been used for relationship maintenance purposes (Boon & McLeod, 2001; Dainton & Gross, 2008; Goodboy, Meyers, & et al., 2010; Peterson, 1996; Horan & Booth-Butterfield, 2013). However as seen in the results, the use of deceptive affectionate messages are not associated with positive relational outcomes. The analyses indicated that both verbal and nonverbal DAMs do not serve as a way to maintain a relationship in an existing state.

While not consistent with the hypothesis, this study highlights the importance of affection in romantic relationships. These results are in contrast to Horan and Booth-Butterfield's (2013) previous DAMs research. A possible explanation for opposing results could be due to the survey design; instructions and definitions displayed on the survey may have had a priming effect for the participants. Participants may have thought negatively about deceiving their partner and in turn their results may have been skewed. Additionally, operationalizing existence by measuring commitment may have caused the current results to conflict with previous DAMs research. Future research should consider another measurement for keeping a relationship in existence.

Interestingly, when relationship status and DAMs were correlated, the results showed that those in casual dating and married relationships reported using more DAMs than those in serious dating relationships. While further analysis is needed to fully understand this relationship, a potential reason for the use of DAMs being higher in married participants can be explained by IDT. McCornack and Parks (1990) found that the longer partners know each other the easier it becomes for them to deceive each other. That being said, simply having been together longer, when married, could create more opportunities to be deceptive. However, Interpersonal Deception Theory (Burgoon & Buller, 2008) cannot be used to explain why serious daters use less DAMs. Such results could indicate that partners who want to maintain their relationship value their relationship and in turn the true expression of affection.

Participant's responses to the open-ended question were aligned with the journal study of Horan and Booth-Butterfield (2013). Overlapping themes from previous research of DAMs use were found in a thematic analysis; however the analysis also revealed new

DAMs themes. Interestingly, the themes identified participant's motivations for using DAMs in addition to strategies. Participants reported they use DAMs when talking about their own family's feelings for their partner and their feelings for their partner's family. In a broader view, this type of deception could be a way to protect a partner from unfavorable conversations. A second theme was using DAMs to build their partner's self-esteem. Partners are deceiving each other as a way to not only save face but also to build up the self-confidence of each other. The next theme to appear was that of using deception with their partner but as a way to prevent dealing with the reality of their relationship. These responses add to the deceptive affection literature in that they introduce new deceptive themes in romantic relationships. In addition, these themes can expand the DAMs measure used in this study. The last theme indicated that partners never deceive each other. This again is contradictory to Horan and Cole's respective deception research. Further studies could investigate the relational circumstances that create a deceptive free relationship.

WAs as Maintenance. In line with the DAMs results, withholding affection is negatively associated with relationship maintenance. Withholding affection in a romantic relationship is associated with fewer maintenance behaviors, feeling less interconnected, lower levels of commitment, and lower levels of relationship satisfaction. While it is known that deception can be used to maintain relationship, this study revealed that deceptively withholding affection has an adverse effect. These associations are reflective of the partner's intent to maintain their relationship. Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2001, 2006) could also give insight into the results of withholding affection; AET considers affection to be a currency or resource in romantic relationships. Withholding affection as a form of punishment to one's partner, a theme that was observed in the present study,

highlights the role of affection as a currency/resource. They are withholding from initiating or reciprocating affection in order to punish their partner. If one is punishing their partner by refraining from expressing affection it could lead to or be caused by feeling less interconnected, committed, and experiencing lower levels of satisfaction in the relationship. AET helps to understand the current results of WAs and the effect on maintenance, closeness, commitment, and satisfaction.

Responses to the open-ended question, as previously discussed, showed repetitive themes to existing WAs research. This study found the following themes that were also reported in Carton and Horan's (2014) study: as punishment, during conflict, avoid seeming clingy, tire/busy, and to protect one's self. Similar to the DAMs themes, three new themes developed: does not like to express PDA, relational uncertainty, and never withhold affection. These responses offer more insight into the motives and forms of withholding affection in romantic relationships. Such items can help to expand the WAs scale used in this study.

Participants also identified their motivations to withhold affection as well as the strategies used. The emergent themes are similar in that they are more closely tied to one's personality or personal traits rather than those of their partner. Those with avoidant attachment styles may be more likely to withhold affection due to their personal nature in that they do not like to become too attached to their partner. They may also be uncomfortable displaying affection in general. Further analysis could reveal if individual differences can account for the variation in displayed and withheld affection.

Deception and Relationship Variables

Not expected, but noteworthy, the results showed that being married and the length of the relationships were positively correlated with the use of DAMs Future research should address these findings that being together for a longer period of time has a positive association with the use of DAMs. As mentioned above, IDT (Burgoon & Buller, 2008) could be used to understand these results. The longer partners have been together the easier it is for them to deceive each other. Therefore, in married couples and couples that have been together for a significant amount of time may find it easier and more efficient to deceive their partner rather than express their true feelings.

Implications

Conceptual Implications. Contrary to the hypothesis, the use of DAMs and WAs in romantic relationships are not considered to be forms of relational maintenance. The results highlight the integral role of genuine affection on maintaining romantic relationships. As the literature explains, expressing felt affection has benefits for both the sender and receiver (Floyd, Judd, & Hesse, 2008). Therefore it is understandable that withholding affection or expressing fake affection has the opposite effect in that it can be detrimental to both partners and their relationship. This study furthers the importance of honesty and affection in stable or high-quality relationships and hints at the idea of needing to use DAMs or WAs can be indicative of a problematic relationship. Likewise, openness was negatively correlated with DAMs and WAs, this result is not surprising in that partner's are not being open and genuine about their feelings when they are having to hold back or communicate fake affection.

The results of the post hoc replication of Goodboy, et al.'s (2010) study indicated that despite good intentions, having to fake affection or refrain from expressing affection will cause partners to be less happy or less likely to work towards continuing the relationship. It is one thing to lie about dinner…it is a whole other to lie about affection.

Theoretical Implications. As briefly mentioned in above sections, the results are partially aligned with Interpersonal Deception Theory (Burgoon & Buller, 2008). The familiarity of individuals with each other enables them to better know how and when to deceive their partners. IDT can be applied to both DAMs and WAs. When thinking about DAMs a connection can be made to length of romantic relationships and a higher use of DAMS. As people get to know one another they realize what topics require deceptive messages and also the most effective behaviors to use when being deceptive. Likewise, being more familiar with each other makes it easier to withhold affection, especially as a way of punishment.

Methodological Implications. While this study's results were not consistent with previous research, it did make advancements to understand how deception can be used to maintain relationships. Additionally, this study developed two deceptive affection measures. DAMs and WAs were both operationalized as scale measures. Previous research in this area relied on data from journals to study both DAMs and WAs. These scales are able to measure participant's use of deceptive affection behaviors and are proven to be reliable (DAMs α= .90, WAs α= .89). Currently the DAMs scale is divided into verbal and nonverbal DAMs, however a better way to conceptualize this division of DAMs would be to think about these behaviors as routine and strategic. Saying "I love you" can be thought of

as a routine affectionate behavior, whereas being sexually intimate is a more strategic deceptive affection behavior.

Limitations

There are three limitations to this study; hopefully future research can address these. The first is the small sample size. Ideally this study should have a larger sample size than N=125. The power analysis revealed an N=242 would provide more significant results. A larger sample may be more accurate in reflecting associations between deceptive affection and relational outcome. Another limitation of this study is the majority of participants were U.S. college students; these results may not generalize to other populations. College aged students may not have the relationship experience or length to adequately identify the use of deceptive affection when maintaining long-term relationships. Lastly, existence was measured through the use of the commitment scale; this scale may have had a negative influence on the results of this study. The college aged population may not be thinking long term in their current relationships, therefore the commitment scale may not have accurately measured their concept of keeping a romantic relationship in existence.

Future Directions

Future research should expand upon the two measures created for this study. Participants were asked to list any other forms of DAMs or WAs they have used in their relationships; their responses can be added as scale items to the DAMs and WAs measures. The new themes should be included in the scale for future use. Expansion of the measures can benefit the reliability and validity of the scale. This study did not examine the purpose of DAMs or WAs outside of a maintenance context. The current study indicated DAMs and

WAs are not used for maintenance purposes; however it is known that they are used in romantic relationships. That being said, the role DAMs and WAs play in relationships is still unclear. In what context are these forms of deceptive affection being used? Future research may examine the function of deceptive affectionate messages and withholding affection in romantic relationships. Additionally, future research should look into the inverse pattern of relationship status to uncover why deception is more common in casual and married relationships and is less common in serious dating couples.

APPENDIX A

1. I have told my partner I miss him/her when I don't really miss them.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

2. I have engaged in sexual intercourse with my partner when I would rather not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

3. I have expressed affection out of routine rather than desiring to do so.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

4. I have been physically intimate (ex: hugging, touching) with my partner when I would rather not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

5. I have complemented my partner on his/her appearance when I really did not mean it.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

6. I told my partner I enjoyed spending time together when I really did not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

7. I kissed my partner when I would rather have not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

8. I smiled at my partner when I did not feel happy.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

9. I told my partner we would spend the rest of our lives together when I really had doubts about doing so.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

10. I sat close to my partner when I preferred to be farther away.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

11. I have told my partner I enjoyed their cooking when I really did not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

12. I have told my partner I enjoyed what he/she was doing to me, when I didn't really enjoy it at all.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

13. I have told my partner I love him/her when I didn't really feel it.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

14. I have told my partner I was busy when I really was not.
    Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

APPENDIX B

1. I have withheld from expressing my feelings to my partner when I would rather share my feelings.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

2. I have refrained from touching (ex: hugging, hand holding) my partner when I wanted to.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

3. I have withheld from contacting (ex: calling, texting) my partner when I wanted to.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

4. I have withheld from spending time with my partner when I would rather see him/her.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

5. I have refrained from engaging in sexual intercourse with my partner when I wanted to.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

6. I have withheld from expressing joy at seeing my partner when I wanted to.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

7. I have refrained from kissing my partner when I wanted to.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

8. I have avoided giving my full attention to my partner when I could have.
   Strongly Disagree 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Strongly Agree

REFERENCES

Afifi, W. A., & Metts, S. (1998). Consequences of expectation violations in close

relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 365-392.

Baxter, L. A. (2004). A tale of two voices: Relational dialectics theory. *The Journal of

Family Communication, 4*(3&4), 181-192.

Baxter, L. A. & Braithwaite, D.O. (2008) Relational Dialectics Theory. In L.A. Baxter &

D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.) *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (pp. 349-

361). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baxter, L. A., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2010). Relational dialectics theory, applied. In S. W.

Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.) *New directions in interpersonal communication research*

(pp. 48-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baxter, L. A., & Erbert, L. A. (1999). Perceptions of dialectical contradictions in turning

points of development in heterosexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and

Personal Relationships, 16*, 547-569.

Boon, S. D., & McLeod, B. A. (2001). Deception in romantic relationships: Subjective

estimates of success at deceiving and attitudes toward deception. *Journal of Social

and Personal Relationships,* 18, 463-476.

Burgoon, J. K., & Buller, D. B. (2008). Interpersonal deception theory. In L.A. Baxter &

D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.) *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (pp. 227-

239). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Guerrero, L. K. (1995). Interpersonal deception IX.

Effects of social skill and nonverbal communication on deception success and

detection accuracy. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 14*, 289-311.

Burgoon, J. K., Levine, T. R. Advances in deception detection. In S. W. Smith

 & S. R. Wilson (Eds.) *New directions in interpersonal communication research* (pp.

 201-221). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Canary, D. J. & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage.

 Communication Monographs, 59, 243-267.

Carton, S. T., & Horan, S. M. (2013). A diary examination of romantic and sexual partners

 withholding affectionate messages. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31*,

 221-246.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ:

 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cole, T. (2001). Lying to the one you love: The use of deception in romantic

 relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*, 107-129.

Dainton, M. (2003). Framing the maintenance of relationships through

 communication: An epilogue. In D.J. Canary & M. Dainton (Eds.). *Maintaining*

 relationships through communication (pp. 299-321). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

 Associates.

Dainton, M., & Aylor, B. (2002). Routine and strategic maintenance efforts: Behavioral

 patterns, variations associated with relational length, and the prediction of

 relational characteristics. *Communication Monographs, 69*, 52-66.

Dainton, M., & Gross, J. (2008). The use of negative behaviors to maintain

 relationships. *Communication Research Reports, 25*(3), 179-191.

Dindia, K. (2003). Definitions and perspectives on relational maintenance

communication. In D.J. Canary & M. Dainton (Eds.). *Maintaining relationships*

through communication (pp. 1-28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dindia, K., & Canary, D. J. (1993). Definitions and theoretical perspectives on maintain

relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10*, 163-173.

Edenfield, J. L., Adams, K. S., & Briihl, D. S. (2012). Relationship maintenance strategy

use by romantic attachment style. *North American Journal of Psychology, 14*(1), 149-

162.

Floyd, K. (2001). Human affection exchange: I. reproductive probability as a predictor of

men's affection with their sons. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 10*, 39-50.

Floyd, K. (2006). *Communicating affection: Interpersonal behavior and social context.*
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Floyd, K., & Judd, J., Hesse, C. (2008) Affection exchange theory. In L.A. Baxter &

D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.) *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (pp. 285-

294). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Floyd, K., & Pauley, P. M. (2011). Affectionate communication is good, except when

it isn't: On the dark side of expressing affection. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H.

Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships II* (pp. 145-173). New

York, NY: Routledge.

Gillen, H. G., & Horan, S. M. (2013). Toward an understanding of the relationships among

deceptive affection, deceptive beliefs, and relational qualities. *Communication*

Research Reports, 30, 352-358.

Goodboy, A.K., & Bolkan, S. (2011). Attachment and the use of negative relational

maintenance behaviors in romantic relationships. *Communication Research Reports, 28*, 327-336.

Goodboy, A. K., Myers, S. A., & et. al. (2010). Relational quality indicators and love styles as predictors of negative relational maintenance behaviors in romantic relationships. *Communication Reports, 23*(2), 65-78.

Guthrie, J., & Kunkel, A. (2013). Tell me sweet (and not-so-sweet) little lies: Deception in romantic relationships. *Communication Studies, 64*(2), 141-157.

Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 93-98.

Hess, J. A. (2000). Maintaining nonvoluntary relationships with disliked partners: An investigation into the use of distancing behaviors. *Human Communication Research, 26*(3), 458-488.

Hoppe-Nagao, A., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2009). Relational dialectics and management strategies in marital couples. *Southern Communication Journal, 67*, 142-159.

Horan, S.M. (2012). Affection exchange theory and perceptions of relational transgressions. *Western Journal of Communication, 76,* 109-126.

Horan, S.M., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2010). Investing in affection: An investigation of affection exchange theory and relational qualities. *Communication Quarterly, 58*, 394-413.

Horan, S.M., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2013). Understanding the routine expression of deceptive affection in romantic relationships. *Communication Quarterly, 61*, 195-216.

Horan, S. M., & Dillow, M. R. (2009). Deceivers and emotion: The relationships

among deceptive message type, relational qualities, and guilt and shame. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 17*, 149-165.

Kaplar, M. E., & Gordon, A. K. (2004). The enigma of altruistic lying: Perspective differences in what motivates and justifies lie telling within romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 489-507.

Kelley, D. L. & Burgoon, J. K. (1991). Understanding marital satisfaction and couple type as functions of relational expectations. *Human Communication Research, 18*, 40-69.

Le, B., Korn, M. S., Crockett, E.E., Loving, T. J. (2011). Missing you maintains us: Missing a romantic partner, commitment, relationship maintenances, and physical infidelity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28*, 653-667.

Ledbetter, A. M. (2013). Relational maintenance and inclusion of the other in the self: Measure development and dyadic test of a self-expansion theory approach. *Southern Communication Journal, 78*, 289-310.

Ledbetter, A. M., Stassen, H., Muhammad, A., & Kotey, E. N. (2010). Relational maintenance as including the other in the self. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 11*, 21-28.

Metts, S. (1994). Relational transgressions. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp.217-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCornack, S. A. (1992). Information manipulation theory. *Communication Monographs, 59*, 1-16.

McCornack, S. (2008). Information manipulation theory. In L.A. Baxter &

D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.) *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (pp. 215-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCornack, S.A., & Parks, M. P. (1990). What women know that men don't: Sex differences in determining the truth behind deceptive messages. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*, 107-118.

O'Hair, H. D., & Cody, M. J. (1994). Deception. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 181-216). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Perlman, D., & Carcedo, R. J. (2001). Overview of the dark side of relationships research. In W.R. Cupach & B.H. Spitzberg (Eds.) *The dark side of close relationships II* (pp. 1-38). New York, NY: Routledge.

Peterson, C. (1996). Deception in intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology, 31*, 279-288.

Rook, K.S. (1998). Investigating the positive and negative sides of personal relationships: Through a lens darkly? In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.) *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 369- 394). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Chupach, W. R. (1994). Dark side denouement. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 315-320). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stafford, L. (2003). Maintaining romantic relationships: A summary and analysis of one research program. In D.J. Canary & M. Dainton (Eds.). *Maintaining relationships through communication* (pp. 51-77). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type,

gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8*, 217-242.

Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 54*, 595-608.

Wood, J. T. (1982). Communication and relational culture: Bases for the study of human relationships. *Communication Quarterly, 30*(2), 75-84.

Zhang, S., & Stafford, L. (2009). Relational ramifications of honest but hurtful evaluative messages in close relationships. *Western Journal of Communication, 73*(4), 481-501.

ABSTRACT

YOU CAN'T HIDE YOUR LYIN' EYES: THE USES OF DECEPTION IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

By

JACLYN GAULE

August 2015

Advisor: Dr. Katheryn Maguire

Major: Communication Studies

Degree: Master of Arts

A purpose of this study was to further the literature regarding the use of deceptive affection in romantic relationships. This study picks up where previous research left off in that it aimed to identify relational outcomes that may be associated with the use of deceptive affection. This study sought to identify deceptive affectionate behaviors and their role in romantic relationships. Two measures were created; a scale to measure DAMs and a scale to measure WAs, both proved to be reliable. Results from the study provided additional items to be included in the measures going forward. The study did add to the existing literature for use of DAMs and WAs, though the results were not consistent with previous research and the hypothesis. However, the results indicated that deceptive affection is negatively associated with relational outcomes. These results provide an opportunity to further explore the purpose of deceptive affection in romantic relationships.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

I am a graduate student at Wayne State University; my main focus is on interpersonal communication with an emphasis on romantic relationships and deception.