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Research Question:
The purpose of this paper was to assess the quality of relationships in terms of trust, involvement, meaning and perception through the transmission of electronic messages.

Thesis:
Some estimate that short-messaging-service (SMS) text messaging will reach 9.4 trillion messages per year by 2016, not including billions of messages sent by other forms of texting, such as MMS and iPhone’s iMessage service. Research shows that habitually using methods of instant communication in romantic relationships has changed the way we communicate with our partners. Direct or inferred meanings sent electronically are often misconstrued by the “receiver” of the messages. Societal norms, such as texting and Instant Messaging (on social networking sites such as Facebook) have introduced new stressors to communication. This project will present research to analyze how the way we transmit messages in romantic relationships can lead to a change in their meanings and the quality of our romantic relationships.

Summary:
Society constantly integrates new communication techniques that assimilate stressors such as misperception and exploitation. These modern stressors of communication have changed the way romantic partners evaluate the quality of romantic relationships. As technology continues to advance, so will the complexity in the misperception it causes. Future romantic couples will have to re-evaluate and attempt to avoid technology’s unintended consequences to mutually progress with it as a significant factor of a relationship.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Studies:
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach: Human Factors Psychology
Analyzing effects of Social Media Sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) on Interpersonal Communication

Misperception of Text:
- Lack of visual and vocal cues
- Personal Experience
- Anxiety- Response Time
- 3 Scenario Rating-test

Symbols, Word Choice, and Punctuation:
- ;) :P :O :D
- Slang
- CAPS!!

Fig. 1. — Schematic diagram of a general communication system. (Shannon, 1948)