

Amber Chen

Emma Lichtenstein

Danielle Boris

Olivia Wherry

We Love The Way You Lie

Introduction

Technology has changed the way we communicate with each other in interpersonal relationships. The original form of communication was face-to-face, whereby people could judge availability or lack thereof quite effortlessly based on physical presence. The introduction of mail and the telephone reduced both the amount of contextual cues one receives from such communication as well as transparency regarding one's whereabouts. While these innovations opened up communication channels to people who were not geographically proximate, they also led to ambiguity in communication; people could blame shoddy service for unresponsiveness or miscommunication. With the advent of mobile smartphones, social networking sites, and messaging applications, we are always on and always connected to our co-workers, friends, family, and significant others. Constant access and availability are taken for granted and in some respects, we have become too available. The problem of the past was finding the means to communicate with someone, but now managing our unavailability can be as difficult as managing our availability when it comes to social interactions. Today we have the opposite issue, in that we are overwhelmed by opportunities for communication and seek to avoid unwanted interactions. Consequently, we have become increasingly more strategic in our availability management.

However, engaging in strategic availability management often leads to deception. The lies people tell to avoid certain situations can be butler lies about location or non-butler lies about feelings or facts. We were particularly interested in seeing the effects of deception in emotional or sexual relationships. These types of relationships are a special case because they have different norms from friendships or family ties. In relationships there are certain mutual expectations such as constant communication and full disclosure, which may not be as heavily emphasized in friendships or family ties. When a significant other does not respond quickly, their partner may think that something is wrong; when a significant other obscures the truth, the implications on the relationship can be very severe. We speculate that the way in which people in emotional/sexual relationships use deception in communication may reflect these social norms. In our study, we are curious to see whether relationship status and emotional intimacy influences the amount and content of lies told.

Literature Review

The Evolution of the Lie

In understanding how people are deceptive in their availability management through text messaging, we must first comprehend how people lie.

Deceptive messages can be categorized by Turner et al.'s seminal study on the five categories of deception (1975): a secret withholds the truth completely; a lie deliberately falsifies the truth; an exaggeration stretches the extent of the truth; a half-truth withholds pieces of information to conceal the whole truth; a diversionary response is an avoidance tactic used to move attention away from available information. There are varying degrees to which the truth

can be obscured, and various reasons for using each type of deceptive message. In order of most to least frequent, people tend to lie about feelings and opinions; actions, plans, and whereabouts; knowledge and achievements; explanations for actions; facts and personal possessions (DePaulo, 2004). This finding is especially relevant in the study of romantic relationships, as they revolve around emotional intimacy and spending time together.

More recent research has given rise to the butler lie, a linguistic strategy used in availability management. Though a butler lie is a type of lie, it encompasses many aspects of Turner et al.'s framework. Hancock et al. (2009) coined the term in reference to the domestic workers who were the liaison between their masters and guests – if the head of the house did not want to meet, the butler would claim the master to be otherwise occupied, or craft some other clever excuse on the master's behalf. While butler lies were originally defined as a tactic to politely enter or exit an instant messaging conversation, the definition has expanded to include “ambiguity inherent both in communication media (e.g., about one's location or current activity) and in the social conventions for their use (e.g., appropriate response times, locations for conversation)” across all text-based communication mediums (Reynolds et. al, 2013). The research shows that message senders tend to lie more often about their whereabouts than other information; receivers tend to drastically under-estimate the rate of lying and are inefficient at detecting deception for messages concerning availability.

Lies in Romantic Relationships and Hookups

Lying in committed romantic relationships has been a topic of much concern amongst communication scholars. In a relationship authentic self-disclosure enables us to trust one

another, but also leaves us vulnerable for betrayal and deceit. As such, many significant others strive to find the perfect balance between what and what not to share.

While most lies are often divided into either self-serving/egoistic or other-serving/altruistic, this separation is a bit more complex in romantic relationships -- since your interests are so inextricably linked, sometimes a self-serving lie may also benefit your partner. Cole (2006) argues that due to the tension between inquisitiveness and constrictiveness in romantic relationships, lying may be necessary. As previously mentioned, romantic relationships require great amounts of time spent together and emotional support; these demands for availability may become overwhelming and in order to retain a sense of individual identity, people have to strategically manage their resources.

The most common reasons for lying in committed romantic relationships include to avoid upsetting or hurting the receiver (Kaplar & Gordon, 2004), to avoid relational trauma and conflict, and to keep up positive face with their significant other (Guthrie & Kunkel, 2013). In a romantic relationship, you must consider the thoughts and feelings of your significant other as well as yourself, and at times it may be easier to falsify the truth so as to not damage those thoughts and feelings. Furthermore, relationships depend a lot on mutual trust and agreement, so at times it may be easier to falsify the truth to suppress a latent disagreement or avoid a particularly nasty argument. Boon & MacLeod (2001) found that the majority of participants believe that the degree of honesty in a romantic relationship depends on the situation, further supporting the idea that people are motivated to lie when telling the truth could jeopardize the relationship. People also may be inclined to lie because they think their partners will not find out: the research also found that people were over-confident in their ability to deceive their

partners, and partners only detected lies 50% of the time. This is similar to the disconnect found between senders and receivers of butler lies.

However, not much research has been done in regards to deception in casual hookup or friends-with-benefits type situations, most likely because these are murky and difficult to define. A recent study defines a hookup as “a sexual encounter (may or may not include sexual intercourse) between two people who are strangers or brief acquaintances, usually lasting only one night without the expectation of developing a relationship,” (Paul & Hayes, 2013). However, this does not consider the nuances of such relationships. Hookups can run the gamut from one-night stands, to non-exclusive hookups, to friends-with-benefits. In regards to communication, the Paul and Hayes study found that hookup partners who had positive experiences were more likely to instigate a future meeting or engage in small talk after the fact than partners who had negative experiences. However, this continuing of communication may present its own unique problems. A study by Quirk et. al (2014) found that deception was less likely to occur when partners had similar expectations and a mutual understanding of ground rules prior to entering the relationship, but more likely to occur if the commitment was ambiguous and if one of the partners was high in anxious attachment. In general, females seemed to be more concerned with deception in such relationships than males, particularly in regards to feelings and intentions.

Though much research has been conducted on butler lies in friendships or general deception in romantic relationships, no singular study has examined how people in casual versus committed romantic relationships manage their availability through text messaging. We are particularly interested in this correspondence due to the varying degrees of closeness and associated social norms. While it may be acceptable to have sporadic communication with a

friend, such behavior may not be acceptable in a committed romantic relationship without a reason. Similarly, while it may be easy to communicate constantly with friends, such habits may seem awkward or unnecessary in a casual romantic relationship. We seek to investigate the intricacies of deception and availability management across three cohorts: platonic friends, casual hookups, and committed significant others.

Research Question and Hypotheses:

Research Question

RQ: How does romantic relationship status and emotional intimacy affect the type of lie told to a partner?

Hypotheses

In order to answer this question, we defined three variables through two sub-populations, based on the previous research discussed in our literature review. A hookup is a non-exclusive or non-monogamous relationship that can either be consistent or inconsistent. On the other hand, a romantic relationship is considered a consistent, exclusive, monogamous relationship. Within these two subpopulations of participants, we want to test the effect of emotional intimacy on whether they tell butler lies or non-butler lies. For our purposes, a butler lie is defined as any message where a participant lied to manage his or her availability. Any other type of lie (that is, where availability management was not the main purpose of the message) is considered a non-butler lie. Lastly, emotional intimacy is how close the participant feels to his or her partner.

From the literature, we found that since there is a higher expectation for people in romantic relationships to spend time together, people must manage their time better.

Furthermore, those in romantic relationships should feel more emotionally intimate, leading to our first hypothesis, the more emotional intimacy you have in a relationship, the more butler lies you tell as opposed to non-butler lies.

H1: The more emotional intimacy you have in a relationship, the more butler lies you tell as opposed to non-butler lies.

The literature also suggested that people who engaged in a positive hookup experience were more likely to communicate further with that partner and attempt to engage in that experience again. From this we speculated that those in hookup relationships are more likely to tell butler lies than non-butler lies as a means of avoiding their hookup when they did not want to see them. Similarly, people in a romantic relationship are more likely to tell non-butler lies than butler lies because they do need to manage their availability around seeing their partner, but rather they lie to avoid conflict in the relationship.

H2a: People participating in a hookup are more likely to tell butler lies than non-butler lies.

H2b: People participating in a romantic relationship are more likely to tell non-butler lies than butler lies.

Based on the first two hypotheses, we felt overall, people participating in a hookup, non-exclusive relationship, are more likely to tell butler lies than people in a romantic, exclusive relationship. If the first two hypotheses hold true, then this hypothesis should also hold true, generally speaking.

H3: People participating in a hookup, non-exclusive relationship, are more likely to tell butler lies than people in a romantic, exclusive relationship.

Method:

Participants

Participants (N=53) were undergraduate and graduate students at Cornell University ages 18-24. Their partners were required to meet that same standard. Participants were required to be in geographically proximate hookups or romantic relationships and to have had a conversation via text message within the past month (2+ exchanges). There were a total of 264 responses to the survey. Out of these responses, only 53 participants completed all of the questions (20.1%). These 53 completed responses were composed of 47 females (88.7%) and 6 males (11.3%).

Continually, our participants represented multiple colleges within Cornell University, 28 from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (52.8%), 1 from Art, Architecture , and Planning (1.9%), 10 from Arts and Sciences (18.9%), 1 from the School of Hotel Administration (1.9%), 3 from Human Ecology (5.6%), 1 from Industrial and Labor Relations (1.9%), and 9 who preferred not to answer which school they are part of (17.0%). Of these participants, 31 self-identified as being in a romantic relationship (58.5%) and 22 self-identified as being in a “hookup” relationship (41.5%), based on the definitions provided to them.

Procedure

We posted a survey on SONA for undergraduate or graduate students at Cornell University. The survey asked 15 unique questions evaluating different parts of our study. First, we asked about demographics. This included gender, age, ethnicity, and Cornell affiliation.

Next we asked a series of questions about the participant's relationship. First and foremost, we asked what type of relationship the participant was in, either a hookup or a romantic relationship. We also asked for partner's gender, as we felt that might provide us with some interesting results. Our rationale was that if we garnered a significant sample of same-sex couples, we could run tests to see if there were differences in deceptive communication between homosexual and heterosexual couples. Additionally, we asked for partner's age, because we thought we would be able to run tests to see if age affected the type of deception strategies used.

We then asked questions to determine the quality of the relationship. There was a series of semantic differential questions to determine frequency of communication across various mediums -- face-to-face, text messaging, Facebook, and other social media applications. There was also a series of Likert-type questions to evaluate various emotional aspects of the relationship such as overall happiness, goals and expectations, positivity, consistency, self-disclosure, honesty, and closeness.

Lastly, we asked participants to give us an example of a lie they told to their partner. We provided a few generic examples for reference. Participants were asked to upload a screenshot of a lie they told to their partner over text message within the past month. They were then asked to explain the context of the lie, rate its intended deception, and evaluate how deceived they would feel had they received that message. After the survey was finished, participants were debriefed on the reasoning behind the survey and why the uploaded screenshot was necessary.

Variables and Measures

Participants self-selected into romantic relationships and hookups based on the provided definitions. We coded romantic relationship as 0 and hookup as 1 in order to create binary variables to evaluate with emotional intimacy and type of lie told. To determine whether the participant told a non-butler lie or butler lie, we used the aforementioned definitions. We analyzed the uploaded lie screenshot as well as the explanation they gave of what the lie entailed to see if the lie fit the definition of a butler lie versus a non-butler lie.

In coding our lies, we ran into a few issues. One of the screenshots was in a foreign language, and so we were not able to analyze the content of that lie. Quite a few of the screenshots had to be discarded because they were not images of text messaging conversations or were not within the past month, as per our instructions. Other lies had to be omitted because it was clear from the content of the lie and the explanation that there was no intentional deception. Often in these cases, the “lie” in question was actually a joke, sarcasm, or hyperbole. Though others may think that these figures of speech may be deceptive in some way, these did not fit our definition of deception or either type of lie whereby the message sender sent the message with the expectation that the receiver would believe it to be true.

Many of the lies we encountered contained both butler and non-butler content. This made it difficult to code the lie as strictly one or the other. In these cases, we coded the lie based on what the majority of the content was about and what the explanation of the lie seemed to emphasize. The following is an example of an ambiguous lie within a romantic relationship that we coded as a butler lie:

Partner 1: Hello! I'll be in Library 1 if you want to join me. What are you up to?

Partner 2: I'm at Library 2, maybe I'll come when it closes!

Partner 1: I hope you do. I can meet you if you want to go somewhere else!

Partner 2's explanation: I had actually left the library earlier than I said I would. I wanted to seem independent enough to do work on my own.

This lie contained both butler and non-butler content about the person's location and her feelings. Though the person mentioned wanting to seem independent, this was a side effect that was not manifested in the message other than the ambiguous "maybe." As such, we decided to code this as a Butler Lie, because the actual sent message was in regards to the person's plan and actions. We applied the same reasoning for other messages that contained both kinds of content.

We then evaluated emotional intimacy with participants in a romantic relationship and those in a hookup. In measuring emotional intimacy, we decided to get rid of some of the results from when we asked participants about relationship quality. We believed that questions about goals/expectations and how they felt when they were in physical proximity were not directly related to the emotional quality of the relationship -- some people may not be aware of their partner's goals, and whether they feel happy or sad when with their partner may have a physical component that skews the emotional effects. As such, we determined four aspects of emotional intimacy: consistency, self-disclosure, honesty and closeness. These specific four aspects were chosen because we thought they best reflected the intensity of affection. To ensure that these variables were good predictors of emotional intimacy, ran a reliability analysis on SPSS. Since Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.73$, we deduced that these were good predictors of emotional intimacy.

In our survey, participants had ranked the extent to which they agreed with each variable statement on a Likert Scale (i.e. I feel close with my partner) from 1-5 with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 5 indicating strongly agree. For romantic relationships, we found closeness - 4.16 (SD = 1.04), consistency - 3.97 (SD = 0.98), self-disclosure - 4.19 (SD = 1.11), and honesty -

4.19 (SD = 0.91). We averaged these four means together, giving us a romantic relationship emotional intimacy of 4.13 (SD = 2.024, n = 31). We observed that these means are relatively high ($m > 3$), with most participants in romantic relationships feeling quite emotionally close to their partners. Furthermore, the standard deviations for each aspect are relatively low, which suggests that there is less variation amongst participants in romantic relationships. For hookups we found closeness - 2.14 (SD = 0.99), consistency - 3.00 (SD = 1.15), self-disclosure - 2.64 (SD = 1.14), and honesty - 3.05 (SD = 1.09). We averaged these four means together, giving us a total hookup emotional intimacy average of 2.7 (SD = 2.19, n = 22). We observed that these means are on the lower side (m), with most participants in hookups feeling less emotionally close to their partners. Additionally, the standard deviations for each aspect are relatively high, which suggests that there may be much variation amongst participants in hookups. However, in order to see if our results were statistically significant, we ran a series of tests.

Results:

We first examined the level of emotional intimacy across the two types of relationships. We wanted to see if the difference in emotional intimacy between romantic relationships (n = 31) and hookups (n = 22) was statistically significant. In order to do this, we ran a two-sample T-test ($t > 2.372$, $p = 0.022$, at $\alpha = 0.05$). The results indicate that the difference between the means is statistically significant. As such, our speculation that people in romantic relationships are more emotionally intimate than people in hookups was correct. Due to the fact that emotional intimacy varies across the different types of relationships, we wanted to see if the same was true for type of lie told.

We evaluated the means of emotional intimacy between two populations of participants, those who told butler lies ($n = 26$, mean EI = 3.62, SD = 1.03) and those who told non-butler lies ($n = 27$, mean EI = 3.46, SD = 1.09). To determine if the difference between the means for emotional intimacy in romantic relationships and emotional intimacy in butler lies was statistically significant, we ran a two-sample t-test ($t > 2.01$, $p = 0.603$, at $\alpha = 0.05$)¹. The results are not statistically significant. The level of emotional intimacy does not differ whether a person told a butler lie or a non-butler lie.

Next, we examined the means of emotional intimacy between the two sub-populations of people in hookups who told butler lies ($n = 11$, mean EI = 3.82, SD = 0.88) and people in hookups who told non-butler lies ($n = 11$, mean EI = 2.59, SD = 0.78). We ran a two-sample t-test to determine if the difference between these means were statistically significant ($t > 2.08$, $p = 0.53$, at $\alpha = 0.05$)². The results were not statistically significant. The level of emotional intimacy between partners in a hookup does not influence whether someone will tell a butler lie or a non-butler lie to their hookup.

Similarly, we calculated the means of emotional intimacy between the two subpopulations of people who told butler lies ($n = 15$, mean EI = 4.2, SD = 0.7) and people who told non-butler lies ($n = 16$, mean EI = 4.06, SD = 0.83) in romantic relationships. Evaluating the data through a two-sample t-test we found that the results were not statistically significant ($t > 2.05$, $p = 0.62$, $\alpha = 0.05$)³. Within a romantic relationship, the level of emotional intimacy does not play a role in whether a person tells a butler lie or non-butler lie to his or her partner.

¹ Figure 1

² Figure 2a

³ Figure 2b

Lastly we tested whether the type of lie told (butler or non-butler) was independent of the type of relationship a person was in (romantic relationship or hookup). Since the type of lie variables are categorical, we ran a chi-squared test to determine statistical significance ($= 0.0134$, $p = 0.9$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $P(> 0.0134) = 0.91$)⁴. There was not any statistical significant between the type of relationship and the type of lie told to a partner.

In order to determine the effect of all our observed independent variables (emotional intimacy, gender, type of relationship, and frequency of communication) affected our dependent variable (length of relationship) we performed a multiple regression analysis. Due to the nature of our variables, we had to use the continuous variable (emotional intimacy) as the dependent variable, rather than one of the independent ones. In other words, rather than testing the effects of gender, type of relationship, and emotional intimacy on the type of lie told, we determined the influence of gender, type of lie told, and relationship type on emotional intimacy. We replaced the categorical variables (type of lie, gender, and type of relationship) with dummy variables (0 = butler lie, female, romantic relationship and 1 = non-butler lie, male, hookup).

Through the regression analysis we discovered that relationship type has a significant effect on emotional intimacy ($p < 0.05$)⁵. We found a regression coefficient of -1.347 showing that people in hookups are 27% less emotionally intimate than people in romantic relationships⁶. Furthermore, in a t-test we calculated that people in romantic relationships have higher emotional intimacy than those in hookups ($p = 0.025$, $df = 41$, $T = 3.72$)⁷. Similarly, gender has a significant effect on emotional intimacy ($p = 0.044$) with males feeling 14% more emotionally

⁴ Figure 3,

⁵ Figure 4

⁶ Figure 4

⁷ Figure 5

intimate than females (coefficient = 0.7)⁸. The type of lie told had no statistically significant effect on the level of emotional intimacy ($p = 0.296$)⁹.

Discussion:

Although none of our hypotheses were supported by our findings, we still discovered some interesting results. Hypothesis 1 stated, the more emotional intimacy you have in a relationship, the more butler lies you tell as opposed to non-butler lies. We found that in fact emotional intimacy does not play a significant role in whether a person tells a butler lie or non-butler lie to his or her partner. The level of emotional intimacy, whether in a hookup or romantic relationship, does not impact the type of lie people tell. This finding is surprising because previous research suggests that the more emotionally intimate two people are, the more likely they are to spend time together, and therefore the more necessary it is for them to manage their availability. In essence, telling a butler lie to a partner is often needed as a way to have time to oneself without upsetting or hurting the other person. However, this is not what our research found. Rather, people are equally likely to tell a butler or non-butler lie to their partners. This could be due to butler lies being rare by nature.

In Hypothesis 2a we proposed that people in a hookup are more likely to tell butler lies than non-butler lies. In a hookup, it was expected that people tell butler lies to their partners to avoid seeing them. Since often times hookups do not share the same interests or friend groups as their partners, it is easy to send a text based lie to manage availability. However, our results did not support this and showed that people in a hookup are equally as likely to tell butler lies as they

⁸ Figure 5

⁹ Figure 5

are to tell non-butler lies. Our findings could be influenced by the way we defined non-butler lies. Rather than grouping different types of lies together (i.e. lies about facts versus lies about opinions and feelings), we only looked at whether availability management was present or not present.

Similarly, Hypothesis 2b predicted that people in a romantic relationships are more likely to tell non-butler lies than butler lies. The results indicated that there is no difference in the amount of one lie people tell in romantic relationships over the amount they tell of the other type. Since we already found through hypothesis 1 that the type of lie told does not predict the level of emotional intimacy, it is not surprising that both hypotheses 2a and 2b were not supported either. Although people in romantic relationships feel more emotional intimacy than those in hookups, their text-based lying behavior is the same.

However, this result may be for the best. Guthrie (2010) explains, “Although romantic partners may want to believe their relationship is built on trust and honesty, the use of deception may actually serve a positive function in romantic relationships as a means for avoiding conflict or protecting the others’ interests” (Guthrie, 2010, p.15). In essence, lying to a romantic partner can be positive for the relationship. In fact, research has shown that “... ‘An individual obsessed with being totally honest might, in fact, become a social isolate’ and complete honesty could make relationships tedious, if not conflict laden” (Guthrie, 2010, p.14) For this reason, our finding is optimistic. People may lie to their romantic partners in the same ways that people lie to hookups, but, although it seems counter-intuitive, that may mean they are in a healthier relationship.

Our third hypothesized result said, people participating in a hookup, non-exclusive relationship, are more likely to tell butler lies than people in a romantic, exclusive relationship.

Once again this was not supported by our findings. There is no statistically significant difference between the frequency of butler lies hookups tell each other and the amount of butler lies people in a relationships tell each other. The finding is consist with the previous three, the type of lie told is independent from the level of emotional intimacy a person feels with their partner; therefore, people in a hookup would not tell more butler lies than people in a romantic relationship.

One of the more intriguing results we calculated is that men are 14% more emotionally intimate than women. At first this seemed very surprising. Women are generally considered to feel more emotional intimacy than men, so why did our results indicate otherwise? When we analyzed the sample further, we discovered that out of the six men in the study, five were in a romantic relationship. Since we also calculated that people in romantic relationships feel more emotionally intimate than those in hookups, our findings make sense. The sample of men is not representative of the general population. All except for one of the males were in romantic relationships which is why they feel more emotional intimacy than females, who were more evenly split into the two sub-populations.

Limitations and Future Research:

Limitations

While our research yielded many interesting results, the study had a few limitations. First of all, we did not have a representative male sample. Only six men participated in our survey and five indicated they were in a romantic relationship. This discrepancy prevented us from calculating differences in the level of emotional intimacy between males and females in hookups.

Currently, our results indicate that men feel 14% more emotionally intimate than females. If more men were sampled, this finding most likely would have changed.

Another limitation of our research is that participants only uploaded one instance of a lie. Most likely, participants submitted either their most recent lie because they had to scroll back through their text-based conversation to screenshot for our survey. Some people may have uploaded a significant lie they remember telling, but once again, depending how often they exchange texts with their partner, this lie may be hard to find and screenshot, so it would have to be relatively recent. Lastly, we only sampled participants from geographically proximate relationships. People in long-distance relationships may use more butler lies because the other person is less likely to know their whereabouts. Those in geographically proximate relationships could be less likely to tell butler lies out of fear of getting caught.

Implications and Future Research

Our research findings suggest that the the type of lie (butler or non-butler) that a hookup or romantic partner tells is not a good indicator of emotional intimacy between the two people. Although this contradicts our initial hypotheses, it has interesting implications. It seems that people will lie to their partners even if they feel close to the person. Perhaps people do not see all lies as negative and deceptive. Many of the lies people told were marked as “not deceptive,” implying that although it was a lie, nobody was hurt by telling it.

Being “always on” in today’s culture creates a complex basis for social interactions. People expect everyone to have the ability to be in constant communication, anywhere at any time. The media multiplexity theory suggests that people interact more with their strong ties on media channels than they do with their weak ties. Romantic relationships would be considered

strong ties, which according to the theory, means that partners talk often and via many forms of media. It is not surprising, then, that they feel emotionally intimate since they have more opportunities to disclose information to each other. However, this begs the question of whether a hookup is considered a strong tie or a weak tie. If a hookup is a strong tie, then they should have a close level of emotional intimacy to people in romantic relationships. Since our findings indicate that they do not have the same level of emotional intimacy, it can be assumed that hookups are weak ties and spend less time communicating over different media.

The emotional intimacy results from our study relate to the interpersonal process model of intimacy. The model developed by Reis and Shaver (1988) explains how perceived disclosure coupled with self-disclosure in a relationship leads to perceived responsiveness from a partner which in turn influences intimacy. The results to our study show no support for this model because the type of lie told did not influence participants' levels of emotional intimacy. This is interesting because Reis and Shaver discovered this relationship in 1988, before people engaged in text-based conversations. On one hand it can be suggested that in light of the new technology people use to communicate with each other, the relationships between disclosure are no longer valid. However, on the other hand, our research looked specifically at lying and not on overall disclosure levels. It is more likely that our data only holds true in the unique conditions of lies.

In future studies, it would be interesting to have participants report their motivations behind the lie they told. Rather than just knowing if people are more likely to tell butler lies or non-butler lies based on their relationship status or level of emotional intimacy, we could develop a better understanding about why people lie to each other and in what contexts. Another area for future research could be looking into how length of relationship play a role in emotional

intimacy and lying. Perhaps people who know each other for longer tell one type of lie over the other because they know their partner knows their behaviors better.

Another area of research would be to have more variety in the age demographics. Due to the nature of our data collection, we had a very narrow age range (18-24) in our sample. It would be interesting to collect data from people of different ages to see if the amount and type of deception varies amongst older couples. We think that with age may come a change in attitudes about social availability and more of a desire to have sustainable long-term relationships. As such, it would be interesting to compare college-age students to working-age and retirement-age adults.

Furthermore, future research should attempt to get representative samples of same-sex couples. In our study, we had no participants from homosexual relationships, and were not able to run analyses with homosexual versus heterosexual as a categorical variable. However, with the advent of gay marriage as a social movement, homosexual couples are becoming a lot more prominent in our culture. Though much research has been done on the differences between how males and females communicate individually, amongst their gender cohort, and in heterosexual couples, no current research has examined deceptive communication amongst homosexual couples. This is an exciting new area for research, and one that we think is worth pursuing.

Conclusion

In this work, we evaluated the effects of deception in romantic or hookups relationships. Over the past few decades, technology has completely changed the way we interact with one another, facilitating deception. People are expected to be “always on” and reachable at all times on their mobile devices, which forces them to find some way to manage their availability.

Availability management in relationships is extremely interesting because often times, partners manage their availability by lying. These lies consist of butler, non-deceptive lies, and deceptive, non-butler lies. Our goal was to see whether relationship status and the type of lies told to a partner affected participants' levels of emotional intimacy.

When we began our research about deception in hookups and romantic relationships, we decided to evaluate emotional intimacy because we felt it was a key component of relationships. We believed that the greater the emotional intimacy, the more butler lies you told as opposed to non-butler lies. After administering a study on SONA where we sent out a survey to 264 people and received 53 completed responses, we found some interesting results. Results indicated that emotional intimacy does not differ across the groups of people that tell different types of lies. For this reason, within a hookup, the level of emotional intimacy does not differ across the groups of people that tell different types of lies. Within a romantic relationship, the level of emotional intimacy does not differ across the groups of people that tell different types of lies. We found that relationship type does have an effect on emotional intimacy, as suspected. Gender also had a significant effect on emotional intimacy, but this result was not reliable due to the fact that 5 of the 6 male participants were in a relationship. Lastly, type of lie had no effect on emotional intimacy.

While the literature we reviewed led us to believe that type of relationship influenced the type of lie told, we found that there was not, in fact, a significant association between the type of relationship and the type of lie told.

These results were very interesting as some of them disproved our hypotheses and some were not statistically significant. However, as we continue with future research on lying and deception in relationships, we hope to find more information on why we lie to the people we are

romantically involved with. Despite that fact that many of our results were not statistically significant, we believe that this topic has so much more room for exploration. It will be interesting to see how future researchers approach this subject and to see what they do differently. Lying and deception in romantic relationships is just the beginning of the larger question about technology and how it is affecting our relationships each day for the better and for the worst.

Appendix

figure 1:

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances		
	<i>Butler Lie</i>	<i>Non-Butler Lie</i>
Mean	3.615384615	3.462962963
Variance	1.066153846	1.181267806
Observations	26	27
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	51	
t Stat	0.523552168	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.301428878	
t Critical one-tail	1.67528495	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.602857755	
t Critical two-tail	2.00758377	

figure 2a:

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances		
	<i>Emotional Intimacy in people who tell Butler Lies</i>	<i>Emotional Intimacy in people who tell Non-Butler Lies</i>
Mean	2.818181818	2.590909091
Variance	0.776136364	0.615909091
Observations	11	11
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	20	
t Stat	0.638876565	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.265076288	
t Critical one-tail	1.724718243	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.530152576	
t Critical two-tail	2.085963447	

Figure 3:

	How does type of relationship affect the type of lie told?		
	Romantic Relationship	Hookup	Marginal Row Totals
Butler Lies	11 (10.79)	15 (15.21)	26
Non-Butler	11 (11.21)	16 (15.79)	27
Marginal Column Totals	22	31	53 (Grand Total)

Figure 4:

ANOVA					
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	3	29.00974778	9.669915926	16.52989738	1.49E-07
Residual	49	28.66478052	0.584995521		
Total	52	57.6745283			

Figure 5:

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value
Intercept	4.131375773	0.180139403	22.93432588	7.43753E-28
Type of Lie	-0.223413407	0.211499654	-1.056329893	0.295997904
Gender	0.700393109	0.33920494	2.064808107	0.044253934
Type of Relationship	-1.346959665	0.216765271	-6.213908987	1.09454E-07

Works Cited

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(4)*, 463-476. Retrieved from spr.sagepub.com/content/18/4/463.full.pdf+html

Cole, T. (2006). Intimacy, deception, truth and lies: The paradox of being close. *Entelechy*. Retrieved from <http://www.entelechyjournal.com/timcole.htm>

- DePaulo, B.M. (2004). The many faces of lies. In A. G. Miller (Ed.) (2004), *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil*. New York: Guilford Press. Chapter 12, pp. 303-326.
Retrieved from smg.media.mit.edu/library/DePaulo.ManyFacesOfLies.pdf
- Guthrie, J. & Kunkel, A. (2013). Tell me sweet (and not-so-sweet) little lies: Deception in romantic relationships. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 64(2), 141-157. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2012.755637>
- Guthrie, J. (2010). Sweet little lies: Deception in romantic relationships. Retrieved from UMI Dissertations. (147766)
- Hancock, J., Birnholtz, J., Bazarova, N. Guillory, J., Perlin, J., & Amos, B. (2009). Butler lies: Awareness, deception, and design. *Computer Mediated Communication*, 517-526.
Retrieved from <https://www.sfu.ca/cmns/courses/2011/260/1-Readings/Hancock%20et%20al%20Butler%20Lies.pdf>
- Haythornthwaite, C (2002). Media Multiplexity Theory. *Information, Communication, and Society*, 8(2), 125-147.
- 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. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00094.x

Paul, E.L. & Hayes, K.A. (2002). The casualties of ‘casual’ sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students’ hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19(5), 639-661. Retrieved from <http://spr.sagepub.com/content/19/5/639>

Quirk, K., Owen, J., & Fincham, F. (2014). Perceptions of partner’s deception in friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/0092623X.2012.668513

Reis, H., & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an Interpersonal Process. *Handbook of personal relationships*, 367-389.

Reynolds, L., Smith, M.E., Birnholtz, J., & Hancock, J. (2013). Butler lies from both sides: Actions and perceptions of unavailability management in texting. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 769-778. Retrieved from socialmedia.northwestern.edu/.../butler_cscw13_revs_testcamready1.pdf

Turner , R. E. , Edgley , C. , & Olmstead , G. (1975). Information control in conversations: Honesty is not always the best policy . *Kansas Journal of Sociology* , 11 , 69 – 89. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23255229>