

EXPLORING RELATIONSHIP EXPECTATIONS AND COMMUNICATION MOTIVES IN THE USE OF THE DATING APP TINDER

V. Santiago Arias
Saint Louis University
United States of America
ORCID 0000-0002-9498-7891

Narissra M. Punyanunt-Carter
Texas Tech University
United States of America
ORCID 0000-0001-9645-3239

Abstract: *Tinder is one of the most popular dating apps for heterosexual people/people seeking partners different from their own sex. In consequence, Tinder for some analysts the app has a reputation of being a hook-up app, albeit for other scholars, the app is simply a mediated venue for romantic acquaintanceship. In order to contribute on the discussion of the competing debate about Tinder and online dating in general, this study surveyed 278 participants regarding their Tinder usage, relationship expectations, and communication motives for using Tinder. Current Tinder users reported less intent to marry and more negative attitudes about marriage. Findings also revealed that men and women use the Tinder differently in terms of their communication motives. Specifically, men are more likely than women to use Tinder for the motives of affection, control, and escape. Older adults report using the Tinder significantly more for the motive of pleasure compared to college aged adults.*

Keywords: *Tinder, romantic relationships, communication motives, relationship expectations.*



INTRODUCTION

The presence of computer-mediated communication technologies (CMC) has become ubiquitous (Hancock et al., 2020); for example, the population from 8 to 18 years old is 10.45 hours daily (Rideout, et al., 2010). Along to this technological canvas, the adoption of smartphone technology got widespread: there are more than 2500 models of smartphones, 2 million apps, and 7 billion of users; considering that the world population is around 6.8 billion, this means that there is almost one smartphone for every individual in the world (Sun et al., 2022). Thus, derived from this widespread technological adoption, one conclusion can be certainly drawn: the boundaries between ‘mass’ and ‘personal’ communication scholarship are no longer tenable (Pfau et al., 2008; Perloff, 2013), because the formation of the fundamental interpersonal relationships is highly mediated through technology; indeed, one in five marriages is currently sparked online (Sprecher et al., 2014); and, not surprisingly, in 2012, a new online dating app exclusively available for iOS and Android smartphones devices took over the cyberdating market: Tinder. It is important to note that Tinder is not the only online dating app exclusive to phones (Bertoni, 2014a), there are other apps such as Grindr and Match and eharmony online.

Tinder is one of the most popular apps among heterosexual people between 18 to 30 years old (Bertoni, 2014a; Swann, 2015; Sumter, et al., 2017, Wagner et al., 2022); 30 million people used Tinder, which is estimated to make more than 15 million matches daily (i.e., 14 matches per second) among about 1.2 billion profiles (Bertoni, 2014b). The rapid stampede of cyberdating in general results from a combination of online dating matching–software, pervasive access to personal computers, GPS Technology, and its massive dissemination through social networks diffusion effects and mass media advertisement and was originally linked to Facebook profiles (Finkel, et. al., 2012), which was also exponentially enhanced with the actual adoption of smartphone technology (Cecere, et al., 2015). People are attracted to the gamification of Tinder because it is about matching with potential mates and you can swipe on profiles that you are interested or not interested in (Cecere et al., 2015). In consequence, Tinder is in the eye of academic and popular storm: for some analysts the apps has a reputation of being a hook-up app (Hoffman, 2015) because it promotes virtual affairs; whereas for others scholars: “Tinder should not be seen as merely a fun, hook up without any strings attached, but as a new way for emerging adults to initiate committed romantic relationships” (Sumter, et al., 2017, p. 67). However, before understanding media effects or deciding that this app is just a venue for romantic initiation, the characteristics of audience involvement such as motivation and selectivity should be addressed at first place (Rubin, 2009). In fact, individuals are making ‘actual’ romantic decisions in the online dating context (Sprecher, 2014), and then virtual contexts can be applied to face-to-face communication contexts (Lister, et al., 2009); for example in political communication scholarship, Bennet & Iyengar (2008) suggest the importance of recognition of individuals’ subjective aspects of individuals while engaged in the CMC consumption in order to extend the understanding of experimental findings linked to actual communication conditions. Therefore, here is the relevance for this study to analyze users’ expectations and motives to further the comprehension on Tinder to foresee any potential risk of future media dependency, because when needs and motives instigate narrow information-seeking strategies while using a given media outlet this generates dependency,

which also “leads to other attitudinal or behavioral effects and feeds back to alter other relationships in the society” (Rubin, 2009, p. 182).

To our knowledge, research on this Tinder and other new dating apps has primarily focused more on general users’ motivations to explain what individuals do with this app such as socialization, self–boost, infidelity, and so on, then the next important scholarly step is to analyze the particular expectations and motives associated specifically to romantic outcomes (Niehuis, et al., 2020; Weiser et al., 2018). The analysis of expectations and motives is paramount for media effects research because it explains why users choose a given media (Nabi, 2009). Therefore, being modest in its exploratory and descriptive scope, the purpose of the present study is to explore users’ relational expectations and communication motives in Tinder specifically.

While previous online dating sites and apps that ask users to create in-depth personal profiles, Tinder innovates online dating by providing users a seemingly endless selection of photos of potential mates without the need to answer questionnaires or forms (Bertoni, 2014a). It is inferred that the algorithm of the app links users’ contacts from Facebook profiles to provide photographs of potential romantic candidates. After solely looking at photos of potential mates, users swipe right if they like a person and left if they do not (Bertoni, 2014b). If both parties like each other, the platform provides a parallel interface to send messages to one another to decide whether to meet in person and exchange personal contact information.

In an attempt to understand why users, immerse in Tinder, Sumter et al. (2017) conducted a study to analyze users’ motivations. Findings suggest that a) ‘love’ motivation was stronger than ‘casual sex’ motivation, b) males users showed a higher motivation for casual sex than females, c) users engage through Tinder because of the ease of communication through this app where men feel to be more benefited, d) in terms of self–validation there were no significant differences between genders, and e) users also immersed themselves in Tinder because of the thrill of excitement were those individuals with higher levels of sensation seeking use it more. This study concludes that “Tinder goes beyond the hook up culture” (p. 74). This asseveration contests Finkel and colleagues (2012) argument about online dating as an unable CMC platform to guarantee successful romantic partnering since: first, online dating algorithms are based on criteria of psychological similarity, compatibility, or a combination of both, but there is no substantial empirical evidence to suggest that homophily assure successful romantic outcomes; additionally, since these algorithms are proprietary of dating companies and they do not release for academic examination, online dating services cannot be subject of further scholarly examination (Finkel, et. al., 2012). Therefore, it seems too early for the present study to make such claim, and scholarly work needs to dig more in individuals’ intentions encompassed in relationships expectations and communication motives to avoid conclusions that end up supporting online dating business rather than extending theory.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Online dating is a new technological advancement to facilitate romantic initiation (Finkel, et al., 2012). Finkel et. al. (2012) delineate online dating functioning on the basis of its three main features: 1) access to a vast number of profiles of which gives users a false perception of having more chances to succeed ; 2) a convenient and discrete communication channel to initiate

contact; and 3) a romantic compatibility–matching algorithm to pair potential romantic candidates. Moreover, Quiroz (2013) suggests that these online dating features were substantially enhanced by merging with the fast development of hand-held devices and satellite app technology transforming online dating into “location-based dating” (Quiroz, 2013). As a result, online dating’s popularity burgeoning is often explained through the massive effects of social networks and increased access to technology which both were not available during previous computer-dating or video dating (Finkel et. al., 2012). The smartphone innovation with GPS technology made cyberdating very appealing.

Notwithstanding, this innovation is not ‘simply’ an advancement of hardware modality; indeed, the type of CMC device or platform has a forceful impact on users’ perceptions of the interactivity experience. Xie and Newhagen (2014) compared the effects of interface proximity in three media platforms (i.e., desktop, laptop, and hand-held devices) while participants received university emergency alerts. Findings suggest that hand-held devices (i.e., iPads and smartphones) significantly enhance more the feelings associated with this alerts (i.e., anxiety in this specific study) compared to the other type of devices; thus, it was shown that interface proximity moderates users’ perceptions of the interactivity experience in a given mediated task. On top of this idea, it can be inferred that Tinder enhances the online dating experience more than others apps because of its particular exclusivity for smartphone technology; thus, the distance between users and the dating event is minimal. Certainly, it will not be surprising to infer that the decision of Tinder (as a Company) of choosing the smartphone technology as its sole platform was purposely to intensify the online dating experience.

Although Tinder is particularly well-suited for smartphones that allows users to quickly look at pictures, most previous and others cyberdating platforms are similarly structured (Rosen, et al., 2008; Finkel, et. al., 2012; Sprecher, 2014): users post a photograph and provide personal information and other relevant demographic information about themselves. Tantamount to the typical combination of visual and textual information of users as the main structure of online dating software configuration, the most used theoretical framework for research on this subject has been the Hyperpersonal model: “the hyperpersonal CMC model (Walther, 1996) posits that CMC users take advantage of the interface and channel characteristics that CMC offers in a dynamic fashion in order to enhance their relational outcomes.” (Walther, 2007, p. 2540). Affordances refers to the properties of the perceived environment that provide possibilities for actions, and this concept is primordial for CMC use because the design of a given technological product should respond to the question about how that product can make users to ‘afford’ a given experience (Pucillo, & Cascini, 2014). For the particular case of online dating, such CMC affordances are described by Walther (1996, 2007) as it follows: a) editability lined up with malleability to transmit messages, b) unlimited time to construct and edit those messages thereafter, and c) physical isolation from receiver. Therefore, these medium characteristics allow users to hide any nonverbal and verbal cues that may jeopardize relationship goals where users execute control on visual and textual information while interacting. In consequence, the overall CMC affordances instigate users to reallocate cognitive resources to message composition (Walther, 2007) for managing impression behavior where, in addition to this, the physical isolation prompts anonymity and makes users experience more disinhibition while interacting (Walther, 2007). In other words, “[...] social evaluations [...] are not impeded by messy hair, lack of makeup, or normal

imperfections” (Walther, 1996, p. 20, *Italics added*), then it is more appealing for individuals to use this technologies for first impression formations.

As a direct denouement of the suitability of this model for online dating, research findings yield results on users’ self–presentation and self–disclosure communication strategies in CMC interactions (e.g., Gibbs, et al., 2011; Rosen, et. al., 2008). Indeed, Segrin and Flora (2011) reported that much of the research has focused on how impressions are managed online, especially with regard to self-disclosure, and how people vary in their use and dependence on technology for dating. Perhaps because of the high stakes involved in creating a positive impression, roughly one third of photos on online dating profiles are rated by independent judges as “not accurate” (Hancock & Toma, 2009). Women’s photos are less accurate than males, either because the photo shows them at a younger age or because it has been retouched in some way. Nonetheless, in one hand, physical attractiveness is one of the features most unclear in online dating profiles; albeit, in the other hand, it is rated as the most important aspect in online dating than the traditional ‘old–fashioned’ FtF dating (Rosen, et al., 2008).

Other online dating forums rely heavily on written profiles that are often a mix of reality and an ideal presentation of oneself (Yurchisin, et al., 2005), and these forums have not become as popular as Tinder did in terms of number of users and the rapidness in which it got that popular. On the other hand, Tinder differs from other online forms by encouraging less self-disclosure before any FtF contact. Ramirez et al. (2015) investigated the association between the amount of time spent online before meeting the potential candidate in real life and motivation to meet the person FtF. Although their investigation did not include analysis of Tinder usage, they found that the more time daters spent on the online platform, the less motivation they had to meet the other person face-to-face because it dampened the perceptions of closeness.

While using Tinder, users primarily swipe pictures, and this mechanic for use rules out momentarily the textual element from the online dating experience. This is crucially important, because the way in which users communicate with others online daters is contingent upon the way the site is set up (Whitty, 2008); in other words, interface design and boundaries plays the leading role on individuals’ communication behavior in CMC settings. Secondly, it seems that as more an online dating interface emulates the naturalness of users’ experience of first impression formation in FTF settings, the more it gets popular.

Nonverbal Research on interpersonal relationships formation indicates that physical attractiveness is what actually motivates individuals for initial approach at large (Richmond, et al., 2007), and even more for romantic initiation: the level of physical attractiveness is a better predictor for initial encounters than psychological traits (Tidwell, et al., 2012). Not surprisingly, the same pattern is present in online dating, but even in a more pronounced fashion: Whitty (2008) conducted a qualitative study to understand how individuals present themselves on an online dating site, as well as their judgments on how others present themselves on this site. Sixty online daters (e.g. 30 men and 30 women) were interviewed for this research; the findings suggested that participants consistently believed on a supreme importance of posting an outstanding personal picture over any other personal characteristic. Then, she found that what really triggers contact initiation in cyberdating is individuals’ attractiveness with no significant differences between genders, and this is surprising nonetheless, because physical attractiveness has been found to be a larger predictor to make the decision for contact initiation more for men than women (Deyo, et. al., 2011).

Therefore, in a given online dating setting in which the visual aspect is the most salient aspect where the space for negotiation of textual meanings is reduced to its minimal condition possible such as Tinder, then the analysis of users' expectations and motives becomes more critical because: first, the selection and use of a given media, and the communication behavior displayed in CMC context is a goal-directed, purposive, and motivated task (Rubin, 2009), and only these elements are at hand; on top of this idea, the reduced amount of textual information does not give enough space to apply the Hyperpersonal model to understand users' communication strategies, but expectation and motives instead. Additionally, structural differences or the way in which information can be accessed and sent it play an important role on users' communication behavior as Whitty (2008) suggested earlier.

The analysis of Tinder on this matter is important due to its specific differences in software configuration (i.e., swiping faces) and platform exclusivity (i.e., smartphone) compared to other online dating services. To conclude this section, Tinder is noted for prompting quick progression to face-to-face interaction. Tinder avoids in-depth written profiles; photos appear to be especially crucial. Tinder's interface architecture and its modus operandi perhaps suits better to human perception of forming impressions based on physical appearance assessment (Arias & Punyanunt-Carter, 2016). And, being emotions the driving force for humans to adapt to situational conditions that are externalized as intentions; thus, an examination of the relationship expectations and communication motives along with the communication nature of online dating is paramount.

CMC Impact on Expectations And Motives

The analysis of relationship expectations and communication goes beyond its descriptive nature. Pucillo and Cascini (2013) explain that the design of interactive devices should address users' experiences, and the experimental outcome takes place at the moment of using it and in the context of interaction; in consequence, artifacts design must consider users' personal goals, expectations and emotional aspects along user's agency while interacting with technology (Pucillo & Cascini, 2013). Therefore, as an inversed engineering process, it is worth analyzing specifics users' expectations and goals to understand any technological innovation either for design or use.

In fact, scholars have emphasized over and over the role of anticipation in online dating as its intrinsic nature (Gibbs, et al., 2006; Rosen, et. al., 2008; Sprecher, 2014). Additionally, Finkel and colleagues (2012) indicate that "[...] Rather than meeting potential partners and then slowly learning various facts about them, users of online dating sites typically learn a broad range of facts about potential partners (and vice versa) before deciding whether a first meeting is desirable" (Finkel, et. al. 2012, p. 19, italics added). Thus, this suggests that users have more time for planning to manage their impressions for romantic initiation. Subsequently, if any media evoke a wide range of emotions which prompt users to select a given media (Nabi, 2009), then individuals may focus firstly on their expectations and communication motives before choosing Tinder or any other online dating venue.

Relationship Expectations

Although the average age of first marriage is climbing, young adults are not delaying participation in romantic relationships (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001). In part, this has led to a changing architecture of premarital relationships and less stigma associated with short-term dating. People now spend more time than ever before in romantic relationships outside of marriage (Sassler, 2016). Moreover, the relationship patterns of those who marry in their early 20s are different from those who delay marriage (Sassler, 2016). Those who delay marriage tend to have more premarital relationships, are more likely to cohabit in those relationships, have more liberal sexual attitudes, and engage in more risky behaviors in those relationships (e.g., binge drinking, use of illegal drugs) (Carroll et al., 2007; Uecker, 2008). College graduates, for example, are a group who tends to delay marriage in pursuit of education, career, and financial goals, yet they go on to marry at a higher rate than less educated or lower income counterparts; thus, the social and economic context in which these individuals make romantic decisions influence their expectations. Notwithstanding, it is not clear to what extent online dating reflects this generational shift, or, it is an outcome from CMC adoption.

The romantic outcome dependency theory posits that one's behavior is affected by the context and others' behavior in the same context, and romantic expectations and motives are not simply representing individuals' goals, by contrary it reflect relational patterns in terms of actual outcomes. Given that Tinder appears to be a platform for quickly meeting a large number of available candidates to fulfill short-term relational goals, the intentions and motives may need to match with these desired outcomes, and then the question is: do Tinder users, who may be well-educated young adults delaying marriage, have different relational expectations and motives in those premarital relationships? Tinder has carved a unique market niche that facilitates simply the meeting-up of people who presumably have less intent to marry at present. The structure of Tinder, which provides little information about potential users aside from physical appearance, perhaps is compatible with short-term sexual selection strategies that are more focused on physical appearance as opposed to long-term sexual selection strategies that predict people will assess partners on other more in-depth qualities (Buss & Schmidt, 1993).

Before the advent of Tinder, Stephure et al. (2009) explored the idea that age, or the perception of having limited time left, might change people's involvement in online dating. In doing so, they uniquely applied Socioemotional Selectivity Theory (Carstensen, 1993, 1995), which suggests that time changes people's perspectives and social goals. Carstensen proposes that life stage changes one's perspective with regard to goals for information seeking, self-concept development, and emotional comfort and gratification. In theory, social goals focused on self-concept and information-seeking peak in adolescence and young adulthood. Self-concept motives prompt people to interact with a variety of people to get feedback about oneself, by comparing oneself to others, seeking feedback about how one is viewed, and by monitoring views about oneself. Information-seeking motives prompt people to experience and learn about the world. Through interactions with people, even novel and unfamiliar people, who help gain information about what other people and the world are like. Indeed, gaining information and making numerous social connections might prove to be helpful in years ahead as young adults develop careers and future opportunities. In short, self-concept and information seeking goals tend to be focused on self-development with an eye toward the future; and, again

the goal of emotion regulation is focused on surrounding oneself with emotionally meaningful relationships that are high in emotional intimacy.

This is a very present-oriented goal for people, and one that becomes especially important when people perceive that time is running out, and this feeling is more enhanced when the CMC platform makes the experience so close between the user and the dating event (see Xie & Newhagen, 2014). With limited time left in life and the impression of being there endured by technological innovation of the app, there is more urgency to focus on seeking a lot of new, exciting, and expanding relationships rather than the meaningful relationships that matter most. Also, one's self-concept is likely already stabilized later in life. On the other hand, Stephure et al. (2009) hypothesized that involvement in online dating increases with age, presumably because as people get older and perceive that they have limited time left to meet a life partner, they are more likely to turn to online dating as a means of more quickly finding an emotionally meaningful romantic relationship, but Tinder is among young adults. Contrary to Stephure et al. (2009), it is argued that only a certain type of involvement in online dating (such as *eHarmony*, *Match*, *Perfect Match*) increases with age because of how the information is structured differently compared to Tinder. As people age, they may be increasingly interested in online sites that help them meet an emotionally meaningful long-term partner, then more textual information is needed to achieve this goal.

However, Tinder appears more geared toward finding lots of short-term dates may be more appealing to young adults, or any adult with less intent to marry at present. In this research, Tinder users' intentions to marry and attitudes toward marriage as a means of exploring whether Tinder is used most for short-term date selection rather than long-term mate selection was assessed. Considering their age, most young adult Tinder users should theoretically be at the peak of the self-concept and information seeking social goals of Socioemotional Selectivity Theory. Thus, some Tinder users may attempt to affirm their self-concept needs and seek a wide variety of new experiences, especially if they felt they had plenty of time to find a more emotionally intimate, longer-term marital relationship or if they have negative attitudes about the possibilities of doing so.

RQ1: Do current and non-current Tinder users differ with regard to relational expectations, in the form of (a) intent to marry and (b) attitudes toward marriage?

Communication Motives

What are the reasons why young people communicate via Tinder? Or what are the reasons to communicate through Tinder rather than other online dating venues? According to Rubin, et al. (1988), people generally communicate to either gain control or compliance, to relax or to avoid other activities, to express emotion, to express love, and to share enjoyment. Communication motives affect what, how, and who individuals talk to (Graham, et al., 1993); in other words, communication motives are reasons which reflect why people communicate with each other, and it is possible perhaps individuals have specific communication motives when using Tinder.

Older individuals tend to communicate more for affection, whereas younger individuals do so more for pleasure, escape, control and inclusion. Women tend to communicate more for

relaxation, inclusion, affection, and pleasure than men (Rubin et al., 1988). Given that Tinder users are likely younger, it is expected that people communicate primarily for pleasure, escape, control, and inclusion. It is also expected that women more so than men to communicate for relaxation, inclusion, affection, and pleasure.

RQ2: Is there a difference between males and females and their reported Tinder communication motives?

RQ3: Is there a difference among age groups and Tinder communication motives?

METHODS

Sample

Research participants were 287 college students from a variety of majors enrolled in an introductory communication course at large public southwestern university in America. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 32 years old ($M = 20.88$, $SD = 1.78$). The sample consisted of 83 males (28.9%) and 204 (71%) females. In terms of sexual orientation, 6 (2.1%) said they were gay, 2 (.7%) said lesbian, 273 (93.4%) were heterosexual, and 7 (2.4%) bisexual. The ethnic or racial background of the participants included: 194 (67.6%) white, 1 (.3%) Native American, 28 (9.8%) Black, 1 (.3%) Pacific Islander, 4 (1.4%) Asian, 49 (17.1%) Hispanic/Latino, and 9 (3.1%) other/multi-ethnic. A majority of the participants stated that have used Tinder in the past: 260 (90.6%) said yes and 27 (9.4%) said no. In terms of political affiliation, 67 (23.6%) were Democrat, 157 (54.7%) were Republican, 47 (16.4%) were Independent, 13 (4.5%) were classified as “other.” In terms of frequency in the past 30 days, 114 (39.7%) said that they never used it, 39 (13.6%) said once, 74 (25.8%) said a few times, 20 (7.0%) said weekly, 13 (4.5%) said daily. When asked about how much time they spend when they use/view Tinder, 36 (12.5%) said 1 minute, 170 (59.2%) said 10 minutes, 43 (15%) said 30 minutes, 7 (2.4%) said about 45 minutes, and 4 (1.4%) said about 60 minutes. In terms of relationship status, 147 (51.2%) were currently not in a relationship, 108 (37.6%) stated that they were dating one person, 18 (6.3%) said they were dating multiple people, 9 (3.1%) were cohabitating with a relational partner, 2 (.7%) were engaged to marry and 2 (.7%) were married.

Procedures

Once the study was approved by the Human Subjects Review Board, the following procedures were used in the data collection process. Two hundred and eighty-seven college-aged participants enrolled in the basic communication course were asked to complete the survey if they used Tinder or are current users of Tinder. Participants were told that their responses would be kept confidential and anonymous. Students who participated were offered course research credit. Students who did not choose to participate were given other opportunities to obtain their required research credit.

Instruments

Marital Attitudes and Intentions

Marital attitudes were assessed using Park and Rosen's (2013) 10-item General Attitudes Toward Marriage Scale. The Likert-type items range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), with higher scores representing more positive attitudes toward marriage. Sample items include, "I intend to get married someday," "I have doubts about marriage" (reverse scored), and "Most marriages are unhappy situations" (reverse scored). Cronbach's α was .84.

Marital intent was measured using Park and Rosen's (2013) 3-item Intent to Marry Scale, which allows intent to marry to be evaluated as a construct separate from positive or negative attitudes toward marriage. The Likert-type items range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), with higher scores representing more intent to marry. Items include: "I intend to get married someday," "I want to marry," and "I do not hope to marry" (reverse scored). Cronbach's α was .84.

The Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale

To explore why college students communicate via Tinder, participants completed the Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale (ICM) (Rubin et al., 1988). The scale contains six subscales: Control, Relaxation, Escape, Inclusion, Affection, and Pleasure.

The scale consists of 28 Likert-type items that ranged from 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (exactly like me). Items for each subscale were summed and averaged. For this study, Cronbach's α for the subscales were: Control (.73), Relaxation (.87), Escape (.75), Inclusion (.83), Affection (.80), and Pleasure (.88). Table 1 contains the lists of all 3 items for each subscale as well as means and standard deviations of for male and female participants' communication motive items. The average used across each sub-item is summed together to obtain a composite score for the participants. Table 2 shows the Cronbach α for males and females.

RESULTS

To examine the first research question, whether there was a statistically significant difference in intent to marry between people who currently use Tinder ($M = 5.76$, $SD = 1.47$), as opposed to those who do not currently use Tinder ($M = 6.28$, $SD = 1.08$), an independent t-test was conducted. The test was significant, $t(279) = 3.31$, $p < .001$, suggesting that current Tinder users had significantly less intent to marry. Cohen's d was estimated at .62, which is a medium to large effect size (Cohen, 1992).

To examine whether there was a statistically significant difference in attitudes toward marriage between people who currently use Tinder ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 1.10$) as opposed to those who do not ($M = 5.12$, $SD = .94$), an independent t-test was conducted. The test was significant, $t(259) = 2.06$, $p < .05$, indicating that current Tinder users had significantly more negative attitudes toward marriage. Cohen's d was estimated at .26, which is a small effect size (Cohen, 1992).

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for the Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale.

Items		<u>Male^a</u>		<u>Female^b</u>	
		M	SD	M	SD
I use Tinder....					
Pleasure					
1.	Because it's fun	5.12	1.33	4.88	1.55
2.	Because it's exciting	4.76	1.47	4.40	1.69
3.	To have a good time	5.08	1.42	4.48	1.72
Affection					
4.	To help others	3.00	1.65	2.31	1.46
5.	To let him/her know I care about him/her feelings	2.85	1.73	2.38	1.47
6.	To thank him/her	2.57	1.854	2.19	1.37
Inclusion					
7.	Because I need someone to talk to or be with	3.64	1.89	3.52	1.78
8.	Because I just need to talk about my problems	2.78	1.69	2.45	1.55
9.	Because it makes me feel less lonely	3.95	1.26	3.98	1.75
Escape					
10.	To put off something I should be doing	4.61	1.62	4.67	1.82
11.	To get away from what I am doing	4.42	1.57	4.05	1.75
12.	Because I have nothing better to do	5.15	1.49	5.15	1.68
Relaxation					
13.	Because it relaxes me	3.93	1.66	3.19	1.58
14.	Because it allows me to unwind	3.99	1.58	3.68	1.65
15.	Because it's a pleasant rest	4.37	1.57	3.60	1.72
Control					
16.	Because I want him/her to do something for me	3.91	1.16	2.78	1.74
17.	To tell him/her what to do	2.67	1.54	2.19	1.30
18.	To get something I don't have	4.31	1.51	3.52	1.86

^aN = 83. ^bN = 204.**Table 2.** Cronbach α 's for the Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale.

I use Tinder....	Males	Females
Pleasure	.87	.88
Affection	.80	.80
Escape	.75	.76
Relaxation	.87	.87
Control	.73	.74
Inclusion	.83	.84

For the second research question, an independent t-test examining the differences between men and women and their communication motives for using Tinder showed significant differences between men and women with regard to their motives of affection, escape, and control. Men were more likely than women to use Tinder for affection, $t(274) = 5.96, p < .05$; escape, $t(274) = 4.88, p < .05$, and control, $t(274) = 7.04, p < .05$. Cohen's d for the affection motive was estimated at .35, which is a small effect size. Cohen's d for the escape motive was estimated at .11, which is a very small effect (Cohen, 1992). However, Cohen's d for the control motive was estimated at .62, which is a medium to large effect size based on Cohen's guidelines (1992). See Table 1 for mean differences for each item of the communication motives scale.

For the third research question, participants were grouped into two categories: (1) college aged (18-22) and (2) anyone 23 or older. An independent t-test was conducted and showed that older young adults ($M = 14.95, SD = 3.08$) use Tinder significantly more for pleasure $t(254) = 6.91, p < .05$ compared to college aged adults ($M = 13.95, SD = 4.36$). Cohen's d was estimated at .26, which is a small effect size (Cohen, 1992).

DISCUSSION

Lined up to the Uses & Gratification Theory proposed in the literature review section, the purpose of the present study was to explore and describe the particular relationship expectations and communication motives that may explain users' preference for Tinder for dating. As research on technology design indicate (e.g., Pusillo & Casini, 2014; Tuch, et. al., 2012), the description of users' intentions to use a given media goes beyond its taxonomic nature: it becomes an efficient measurement of the user experience of interactive products, and it is one of the first considerations for technology design in terms of hardware and software that impact any CMC device popularity (Cecere, et. al., 2015), because the design itself should suggest use for an specific experience otherwise users may not use it (Puscillo & Cascini, 2014). Our findings reveal that current Tinder users have a significant difference in terms of relationship expectations than non-users; this is important because users establish goals before engaging with a given media, and these goals are evaluated in terms of its extent in which mirror the original internal representations (i.e., expectations and motives) of the desired outcome (Wilson, 2015). Specifically, current Tinder users had less intent to marry and more negative attitudes toward marriage; additionally, these attitudes and intentions may in part explain the appeal for an app with less in-depth personal profiles and more focus on immediate impressions based on appearance in photos.

Individuals may not screen and scrutinize short-term dates in the way that they do long-term partners (Buss & Schmidt, 1993). Consequently, tethered to Whitty (2008) our results suggest that the structure in which information is accessed and sent in Tinder appear to be highly suitable for this type of goals compared to the heavy text and old fashioned combination of visuals and text embedded in other and previous online dating services, and this specific structure seem to prompt short term relationships expectations because of its emphasis on the visual information aspect. Therefore, our findings also corroborate to socioemotional selectivity theory, because current Tinder users with less intent to marry seem to be interested in using the app to fulfill short-term connections that boost their self-esteem and allow them to explore the social world.

This research further explored communication motives, with inquiry about possible female and male differences in communication motives. Based on an individual breakdown of the scale items, men reported they “talk to others on Tinder to get something that they don’t have” more so than females. That something might refer to sex, but it also might be referring to a romantic connection. The communication motives scale is insightful because it is important to understand why others chose this medium to communicate with others. Most importantly, men reported using Tinder more than women for the motives of affection, control, and escape. Tinder allows male users a way to approach partners without the FTF potential humiliation or rejection. Indeed, Tinder’s CEO, Sean Rad, claims that Tinder takes rejection out of dating. Further, men may be able to find several partners in a rapid fashion also explaining the findings that males are more likely to use Tinder than females for reasons linked to the same motives aforementioned.

The online dating experience seems to be enhanced through smartphone technology, because users’ perceptions of psychological and physical proximity are almost reduced to zero while using mobile devices compared to computer devices (e.g., Xie & Newhagen, 2012). Thus, the sensation of being there for dating is heightened to the maximum level giving users the perception of quickly achieving their original relationship expectations and communication motives. And this is reflected on the Cohen’s effect size obtained for users’ intent to marry which was moderate to high indicating that users with more short-term expectations fits better with the app as a recursive association.

Swann (2015) noted that older adults were not using that app due to age discrimination. Older adults tend to be more comfortable with FtF interactions. It would make sense that Tinder may be seen as a pleasure motive for older adults because for older adults Tinder is fun to use, it is exciting, and it provides for a good time; notwithstanding, our Cohen’s size was low compared to intent to marry score, and this may indicate that the short-term expectation is the overall more powerful intrinsic motivation that separates Tinder’s users from other dating apps.

CONCLUSIONS

Our findings seem to be competing with Sumter et. al., (2017), because for this study users with less intent to marry –understood as less level of romantic commitment, not only to the actual willingness of getting married– are considered to have short-term romantic intentions. Thus, for this study, less romantic commitment does not go beyond the hook up culture, and it is believed that the nature of attachment relationships has important denouements in romantic relationships: first because self-efficacy in romantic relationships (SERR) has been found to be predictive of current relationships outcomes (see for a review Riggio, et .al., 2013); second, research has also shown that “the longer couple members had known each other before they started dating, the less likely they were to be matched for attractiveness [...] and [T] this moderator (i.e., attractiveness) reinforces the point that relationship initiation and maintenance must be understood as parts of the same continuous process in humans; to consider these two relationships stages separately may preclude a complete understanding of human naming” (Hunt, et al., 2015,p. 1048).

On the other hand, in terms of affection, escape, and control motives, men reported to displayed more. Specifically, the control motive was estimated at .62 showing a large effect on

the basis of Cohen's guidelines. This may reflect an attempt to seize and control the gender role during romantic initiation in which men ask, and women decide; nonetheless, this may indicate an accentuation of traditional gender roles which is not desirable for our society. This study was not an attempt to lambast Sumter, et. al. (2017) analysis, but only to bring in attention on avoiding naïve conclusions that end up overlooking potential future risks derived from online dating use. Moreover, because of the current media consumption and the need of incorporating interpersonal communication theories to CMC and media effects research (Jeffres, 2015), it is crucial to cross validate online dating research with speed dating research and other FtF dating modalities.

As with all research, the current study is not without limitations. First, our measures of communication motives and relationship expectations were embedded into a larger survey that averaged about half an hour to complete. Therefore, the length of the questionnaire invites the possibility of fatigue. Second, the sample was predominantly female, and composed primarily of college students. Future research should ascertain the generality of our findings using samples of other demographic makeups. Third, even though participants were told that the study was confidential and anonymous, Tinder is typically perceived as a "hook-up" app to obtain sexual partners. Thus participants could have been providing socially desirable answers. However, social desirability should have led to fewer participants, and a majority of our participants reported using Tinder at least once.

Further, drawing conclusions about relationship behavior likely requires the measurement of actual behavior. Future researchers should gather the Tinder messages that are exchanged between the sender and the receiver of the message(s). What specifically do people communicate to their Tinder partners to convey that they want a sexual and/or romantic relationship? Does channel matter at all in this romantic pursuit (e.g., text messaging, Facebook, face to face)? How do motives, relationship expectations, and apprehension appear when one accounts for actual behavior? Is there truly a difference between relationship status and perceptions of Tinder, because most people who use Tinder are single rather than married? These are interesting questions and a logical next step for Tinder research. In addition, to access the impact of the technology device on online dating outcomes, researchers should explore the difference between personal computers and mobile devices.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

The analysis of relationships expectations and communication motives serve to understand why users choose a given online dating venue, and, additionally, this also shed a light on considerations of interface design. In other words, the Uses and Gratifications theory may help to perform inverse engineering to comprehend the reasons behind specific CMC characteristics (e.g., age, gender, etc.) rather than simply describing users' intentions and goals, and this is an original contribution of the present study. Unfortunately, the current understanding of interactivity is tethered to the CMC device itself rather than as an experience between the users and the event; consequently, users are not always aware of how the specifics characteristics and architecture of an online dating app or site affect them or why it appeals to them (Arias, et al., 2017; Finkel et. al., 2012). Furthermore, the present study is recursive in nature, but it is important to consider that CMC technologies influences also in a non- recursive way, then the

normalization and standardization of online dating as “a new way of romantic initiation” should not be seen without empirical criticism. Our findings show how the Tinder app relates to individuals’ relational expectations and communication motives, but also Tinder may affect other users’ expectations and motives as MMT posits through an easy way for individuals to find potential romantic/sexual partners. It is important to understand how Tinder is different from other online dating sites/apps because its design was not done by chance, and how these differences may affect relationships initiation and development. Longitudinal studies are needed to compare the impact of using online dating apps of this type to others, and experimental research is required to establish how Tinder specific affordances impact users’ emotions, expectations, and motives. Results from this study indicated that perceptions of relationship expectation and motives influence dating app use.

ENDNOTES

1. This false impression refers to the endowed progress effect (see Nunez & Dreze, 2006), which refers to when individuals are provided with artificial advancement to perform a given task, the task is reframed in a way that goal completion is redirected to persistence giving a false perception of completion.
2. In addition, the decision field theory shows that as the number of choices increases, the quality decisions decreases (see for a review Jessup, Veinott, Todd & Busemeyer, 2009).
3. Hand-held devices refers to any kind of electronic communication devices that can be used anywhere at any time such as tablets, smartphones, androids, etc. (Xie & Newhagen, 2014).
4. The term “Apps” is shorthand for “application”; Apps constitutes software that can be run on any electronic device which also may include GPS technology (Quiroz, 2013).
5. Thus, in addition to the three main features, the new version of online dating provide potential candidates’ profiles to users on the basis of users’ location proximity convenience.

REFERENCES

- Arias, V. S., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2018). Online Dating/Dating apps. *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition*, 7069–7076. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-2255-3.ch613>
- Arias, V.S., Punyanunt-Carter, N.M., & Wrench, J.S. (2017). Future directions for swiping right: The Impact of Technology on Modern Dating. In Punyanunt-Carter, N.M., & Wrench, J.S. (Eds), *The Impact of Social Media in Modern Romantic Relationships*. Lexington Press. Lanham: Maryland.
- Bennett, W. L., & Iyengar, S. (2008). A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 707-731.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00410.x>
- Bertoni, S. (2014a, December). Sex, Lies and iphones. *Forbes*, 194 (7), Retrieved from https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&sl=th&u=http://www.forbesthailand.com/article_detail.php%3Farticle_id%3D333&prev=search.
- Bertoni, S. (2014b, November). Exclusive: Sean Rad Out As Tinder CEO. Inside The Crazy Saga. *Forbes*, 10 (14), retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevenbertoni/2014/11/04/exclusive-sean-rad-out-as-tinder-ceo-inside-the-crazy-saga/#76532fff22fd>.
- Bertoni, S. (2014c, October). Tinder swipes right to revenue will add premium service in November. *Forbes.com*, Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevenbertoni/2014/10/20/tinder-swipes-right-to-revenue-will-add-premium-service-in-november/#61d502221092>.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204–232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204>

- Carroll, J. S., Willoughby, B., Badger, S., Nelson, L. J., Barry, C. M., & Madsen, S. D. (2007). So close, yet so far away: The impact of varying marital horizons on emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22, 219-247. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0743558407299697>
- Carstensen, L.L. (1993). Motivation for social contact across the life span: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 40, 209-254.
- Carstensen, L.L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 151-156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep11512261>
- Cecere, G., Corrocher, N., & Battaglia, R. D. (2015). Innovation and competition in the smartphone industry: Is there a dominant design?. *Telecommunications Policy*, 39(3-4), 162-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2014.07.002>
- Cherlin, A.J. (2010). Demographic trends in the United States: A review of research in the 2000s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 403-419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00710.x>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2015-32022-018>
- De La Cruz, J., Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., & Wrench, J. S. (2023). Dating App Communication: Personal Characteristics, Motives and Behavioural Intent. *Media Watch*, 14(2), 131-154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0976091123116024>
- Deyo, J., Walt, P., & Davis, L. (2011). Rapidly recognizing relationships: Observing speed dating in the south. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 12(1), 71-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2011.601527>
- Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: a critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13(1), 3-66. doi: 10.1177/1529100612436522.
- Gatter, K., & Hodkinson, K. (2016). On the differences between Tinder™ versus online dating agencies: Questioning a myth. An exploratory study. *Cogent Psychology*, 3(1), 1162414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2016.1162414>
- Gibbs, J. L., Ellison, N. B., & Heino, R. D. (2006). Self-Presentation in online personals the role of anticipated future interaction, self-disclosure, and perceived success in internet dating. *Journal of Communication Research*, 33 (2), 152-177. doi: 10.1177/0093650205285368.
- Graham, E. E., Barbato, C. A., & Perse, E. M. (1993). The interpersonal communication motives model. *Communication Quarterly*, 41(2), 172-186. Graham, E. E., Barbato, C. A., & Perse, E. M. (1993). The interpersonal communication motives model. *Communication Quarterly*, 41(2), 172-186.
- Hancock, J. T., Naaman, M., & Levy, K. (2020). AI-mediated communication: Definition, research agenda, and ethical considerations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmz022>
- Hancock, J. T., & Toma, C. L. (2009). Putting your best face forward: The accuracy of online dating photographs. *Journal of Communication*, 59, 367-386. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01420.x
- Hoffman, D. (2015). How Old People Took Over Tinder. *HuffPostStyle.com*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/damona-hoffman/how-old-people-took-over-tinder_b_6626524.html
- Hunt, L. L., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2015). Leveling the Playing Field: Longer Acquaintance Predicts Reduced Assortative Mating on Attractiveness. *Psychological Science*, 26(7), 1046-1053. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615579273>
- Jessup, R. K., Veinott, E. S., Todd, P. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009). Leaving the store empty-handed: Testing explanations for the too-much-choice effect using decision field theory. *Psychology & Marketing*, 26(3), 299-320. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20274>
- Loveless, M., Powers, W. G., & Jordan, W. (2008). Dating partner communication apprehension, self disclosure, and the first big fight. *Human Communication*, 11(2), 231-239.

- Lundberg, S., Pollak, R. A., & Stearns, J. (2016). Family inequality: Diverging patterns in marriage, cohabitation, and childbearing. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30(2), 79-101. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.30.2.79>
- Nabi, R. L. (2009). Cosmetic surgery makeover programs and intentions to undergo cosmetic enhancements: A consideration of three models of media effects. *Human Communication Research*, 35(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.01336.x>
- Niehuis, S., Reifman, A., Weiser, D. A., Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., Flora, J., Arias, V. S., & Oldham, C. R. (2020). Guilty pleasure? Communicating sexually explicit content on dating apps and disillusionment with app usage. *Human Communication Research*, 46(1), 55-85. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqz013>
- Nunes, J. C., & Dreze, X. (2006). The endowed progress effect: How artificial advancement increases effort. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(4), 504-512. <https://doi.org/10.1086/500480>
- Park, S. S., & Rosén, L. A. (2013). The marital scales: Measurement of intent, attitudes, and aspects regarding marital relationships. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 54(4), 295-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2013.780491>
- Perloff, R. M. (2013). Progress, paradigms, and a discipline engaged: A response to Lang and reflections on media effects research. *Communication Theory*, 23(4), 317-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12024>
- Pfau, M., Haigh, M. M., Shannon, T., Tones, T., Mercurio, D., Williams, R., ... & Melendez, J. (2008). The influence of television news depictions of the images of war on viewers. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 52(2), 303-322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838150801992128>
- Pucillo, F., & Cascini, G. (2014). A framework for user experience, needs and affordances. *Design Studies*, 35(2), 160-179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2013.10.001>
- Quiroz, P. A. (2013). From Finding the Perfect Love Online to Satellite Dating and 'Loving-the-One-You're Near' A Look at Grindr, Skout, Plenty of Fish, Meet Moi, Zoosk and Assisted Serendipity. *Humanity & Society*, 37(2), 181-185. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0160597613481727>
- Ramirez, A., Summer, E. M., Fleuriot, C., & Cole, M. (2015). When online dating partners meet offline: the effect of modality switching on relational communication between online daters. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20, 99-114. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12101
- Rideout, V. J., Foehr, U. G., & Roberts, D. F. (2010). *Generation M 2: Media in the Lives of 8-to 18-Year-Olds*. Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Riggio, H. R., Weiser, D. A., Valenzuela, A. M., Lui, P. P., Montes, R., & Heuer, J. (2013). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: Prediction of relationship attitudes and outcomes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 153(6), 629-650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2013.801826>
- Rosen, L. D., Cheever, N. A., Cummings, C., & Felt, J. (2008). The impact of emotionality and self-disclosure on online dating versus traditional dating. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, 2124-2157. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2007.10.003
- Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In *Media Effects* (pp. 181-200). Routledge.
- Rubin, R. B., Perse, E. M., & Barbato, C. A. (1988). Conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication motives. *Human Communication Research*, 14(4), 602-628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1988.tb00169.x>
- Sassler, L. (2016). Partnering across the life course: Sex, relationships, and mate selection. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 72, 557-575. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00718.x
- Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2011). *Family communication*. Routledge.
- Sprecher, S., Zimmerman, C., & Fehr, B. (2014). The influence of compassionate love on strategies used to end a relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31(5), 697-705. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0265407513517958>

- Stephure, R.J., Boon, S.D., MacKinnon, S.L., Deveau, V.L. (2009). Internet initiated relationships: Associations between age and involvement in online dating. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 658-681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01457.x>
- Sumter, S. R., Vandenbosch, L., & Ligtenberg, L. (2017). Love me Tinder: Untangling emerging adults' motivations for using the dating application Tinder. *Telematics & Informatics*, 34(1), 67-78. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2016.04.009
- Sun, C., Sun, B., Lin, Y., & Zhou, H. (2022). Problematic Mobile Phone Use Increases with the Fear of Missing Out Among College Students: The Effects of Self-Control, Perceived Social Support and Future Orientation. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 15, 1-8. doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S345650
- Swann, J. (2015, March 3). Singles are boycotting a popular dating app because of age discrimination. *Takepart*. Retrieved from <http://takepart.com/article/2015/03/03/tinder-ageism>
- Thornton, A., & Young-DeMarco, L. (2001). Four decades of trends in attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63, 1009-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.01009.x>
- Tidwell, N. D., Eastwick, P. W., & Kim, A. (2017). She's not one of us: Group membership moderates the effect of fertility cues on attractiveness ratings. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(6), 689-697. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1948550616676878>
- Uecker, J. E. (2008). Religion, pledging, and the premarital sexual behavior of married young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 728-744. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00517.x>
- Wagner, T., Punyanunt-Carter, N., & McCarthy, E. (2022). Rules, Reciprocity, and Emojis: An Exploratory Study on Flirtatious Texting with Romantic Partners. *Southern Communication Journal*, 87(5), 461-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2022.2108889>
- Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5), 2538-2557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.05.002>
- Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23(1), 3-43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00936509602300100>
- Weiser, D. A., Niehuis, S., Flora, J., Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., Arias, V. S., & Baird, R. H. (2018). Swiping right: Sociosexuality, intentions to engage in infidelity, and infidelity experiences on Tinder. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133, 29-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.10.025>
- Whitty, M. T. (2008). Revealing the 'real' me, searching for the 'actual' you: Presentations of self on an internet dating site. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(4), 1707-1723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2007.07.002>
- Xie, W., & Newhagen, J. E. (2014). The effects of communication interface proximity on user anxiety for crime alerts received on desktop, laptop, and hand-held devices. *Communication Research*, 41(3), 375-403. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0093650212448670>
- Yurchisin, J., Watchraversringkan, K., & Brown-McCabe, D. (2005). An exploration of identity re-creation in the context of internet dating. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(8), 735-750.

Authors' Note

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Narissra Maria Punyanunt-Carter
Texas Tech University
3003 15th. Street Lubbock, TX 79407
n.punyanunt@ttu.edu

Human Technology
ISSN 1795-6889
<https://ht.csr-pub.eu>