Running Head: DIALECTICS AND RELATIONSHIPS

A Study of Dialectical Theory and its Relation to Interpersonal Relationships

Holly Lusk

April 13, 2008

University of Tennessee

A Study of Dialectical Theory and its Relation to Interpersonal Relationships

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to explore how the dialectical theory of communication relates to romantic relationships. The study focuses largely upon interpersonal communication (romantic relationships) and explains in detail the dialectical theory of communication. It first looks at the underlying assumptions of the theory, the tensions associated with the theory, and how these tensions can affect relationships. It discusses possibilities of expanding our understanding of tensions outside of the ones outlined by dialectical theory and which tensions are considered most important. It goes on to examine how couple's manage dialectical tensions and what strategies are most commonly used by couples. Finally, the study is expanded to survey 180 University of Tennessee business speaking students to test nineteen hypotheses regarding the dialectical theory. Test results show that sex and relationship status are good predictors of dialectical tensions, that the tensions are present in relationships, and that they are opposing tensions. The study concludes by proposing further research opportunities.

Introduction

According to psychologist William Schutz, individuals have three fundamental needs within relationships: inclusion, control, and affection (Anderson, 2002, p. 143). What if a person's needs within a relationship are not met? Can a person maintain a healthy relationship with only one need met versus all his/her needs? An even more important question is, "What happens when you have needs within a relationship that seem to contradict?"

Relationships come with their own set of difficulties, especially in the realm of communication. There are constant pushes and pulls on individuals when trying to communicate and build a relationship with another. One day a person may feel the desire to have time to his/herself. The next day the same person may feel lonely and want his/her partner to spend more time with him/her. These two separate desires may seem conflicting; however, this is a normal scenario in which many have found themselves. One can begin to understand this contradiction by studying the Dialectical Theory of Communication.

What is Dialectical Theory? According to Rob Anderson (2002), dialectical theory examines how relationships develop from the interplay of perceived opposite forces or contradictions and how communicators negotiate these ever-changing processes (p. 350). According to Leslie Baxter (1998) dialectical theory is about both unity and difference within relationships (p. 2). Baxter (2004) writes, "The core concept in dialectical perspectives is, after all, the contradiction---a unity of opposites (pp. 182-183). Finally, according to Julia T. Wood (1997), the dialectical theory is an assertion that there are inherent tensions between contradictory impulses or dialectics and that these tensions

and how we respond to them are what we can use to understand how relationships work, and how they grow and change over time (p. 212). All of these definitions stress the same key issues: opposing tensions in relationships and how people respond to them.

One may experience these tensions on a day-to-day basis within his/her relationship. One may want a partner to be closer to them or he/she may want more independence. One may wish for a steady routine with his/her partner or he/she may feel that the relationship is dull and want something new and exciting. One may open up to a partner about things or he/she may feel the need to not tell that partner about certain other things. All of these conflicting tensions can have a huge effect on romantic relationships. The tensions may often place strain on the health of the relationship or cause confusion in the minds of one or both individuals. Therefore in order to truly gain an understanding of why these tensions occur, how they affect relationships, and how one can go about solving conflicts which occur as a result, one can explore the dialectical theory of communication.

This is important because it is something that appears to be inherent within any particular relationship. Thus, the knowledge that can be gained by studying relational dialectics is valuable for many individuals. Dialectical tensions can cause relationships to become stressful and as previously stated, are a huge inducer of conflict. By studying dialectics and these tensions one can acknowledge these facts and do something even more important: look toward finding solutions to conflict.

Communication between humans is studied largely because of the opportunities it presents to discern behavioral patterns. In studying and observing these patterns, one can better understand how these patterns occur, why they occur and look to producing

solutions to any conflict or negatives that may be the result from them. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to explore the ways in which the dialectical theory of communication exists within interpersonal (romantic) relationships and how this has been studied.

Literature Review

First, it is important to define the field of communication. According to communication scholar Julia T. Wood (1997), communication can be defined as "A systematic process in which individuals interact with and through symbols to create and interpret meanings." (p. 17). This means that communication is ongoing so as people go about their lives, they are constantly demonstrating communicative behavior. It also means that all variables within the communication process have an effect on each other. These variables are what allow individuals to create and share meaning. Without communication one would never be able to conduct a relationship. According to Susan Scott (2002), the conversation is the relationship (p. 22). Scott (2002) asserts that without communication within a relationship there is no possibility for growth and eventually the relationship will die out. This leads us to a more focused discussion of interpersonal communication (p. 22).

Interpersonal communication has been defined as communication that occurs between two people, typically in a face-to face setting (Trenholm, 2000, p. 24). It is also sometimes referred to as dyadic communication. John Stewart (2006) defines interpersonal communication as, "The type or kind of communication that happens when people involved talk and listen in ways that maximize the presence of the

personal...when communication emphasizes the persons involved rather than just their roles or stereotypical characteristics, interpersonal communication is happening" (p. 33). Characteristics of this type of communication include: it is more informal, roles are relatively flexible, participants receive maximum feedback since there is no audience to compete with, and partners alternately act as senders and receivers. This is the form of communication which allows individuals to build relationships with others (Trenholm, 2000, p. 28). This is because it exists on a much more personal level than any other form of communication.

According to Trenholm (2000), relationships can be viewed in four different ways: 1) As a constellation of behaviors, meaning that the relationship is constructed of interdependent actions of two people, 2) As cognitive constructs, meaning that a relationship is how people think about behaviors with one another and develop an idea of what a person should be in a relationship, 3) As mini-cultures, meaning that two people involved in a relationship share common perceptions about the world and agree to certain rules in order to co-exist peacefully, and 4)As collections of contradictory forces (pp. 28-29). This fourth and final viewpoint is where we come to understand dialectical theory. Trenholm (2000) writes, "Relationships (are) dialogues between opposing 'voices,' each expressing a different and contradictory impulse" (29).

As previously stated, dialectical theory has been defined as "Looking at how relationships develop from the interplay of perceived opposite forces or contradictions and how communicators negotiate these ever-changing processes" (Anderson, 2002, p. 350). This can be broken down into simpler terms. As a relationship develops, or as people get to know one another, there are certain needs that are also present. These needs

can often seem to contradict. In addition to discovering these opposing needs, the process of dealing with these needs showcases the dialectical theory. Baxter (2004) writes, "From a dialectical perspective, contradictions are located in the communication between relationship parties" (p. 184). To further understand the theory, one must define a two terms.

The first term is dialectics. Dialectics are the contradictory impulses that are felt by individuals within relationships. Those who are interested in dialectics are not necessarily interested in the two extremes; but, more so in the conflict that may arise as a result of them (Wood, 1997, p. 202). What is of interest is the difference of beliefs about the results of dialectics. Baxter, a leading scholar of dialectical theory believes that dialectical tensions are inevitable and fundamental foundations of all personal relationships (Wood, 1997, p. 203). Wood (1997) writes, "Baxter believes that tensions between contradictory impulses are continuous and have no ultimate resolution or endpoint. In opposition, Marxist and Hegelian viewpoint suggests that contradictions could be resolved (p. 203). Wood (1997) provides a good clarification of their view by writing, "Marx and Hegel saw dialectics as involving a thesis (we are independent) and an antithesis (we are dependent) that are reconciled by a synthesis of the two opposing sides (we are interdependent)" (p. 203). One final note about these views is that Baxter does acknowledge that there are times when contradictions may not create conflict; however, this does not denote that when conflict does occur, she believes there is no ultimate resolution (Wood, 1997, 203).

The second term is dialectical moments. Dialectical moments are periods of equilibrium between opposing dialects in the larger pattern of continuous change that

marks relationships. Dialectical theory dictates that change is a constant therefore relationships are continuously evolving and changing. The relationship may have dialectical moments (where less tension occurs) but these times are temporary (Wood, 1997, p. 204). Now that these terms have been defined, one can move on to the roots of dialectical theory.

Baxter states that there are two roots that set up the basis for the theory. These are 1) contradiction and 2) process. First, contradiction is quite simply conflict, opposition, contrast, or discrepancy between two things (Wood, 1997, p. 204). For example, you want to eat; however, you want to lose weight. This is a set of two contradicting desires. Delving deeper into to this concept is the belief that is held by Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian philologist who developed a theory of personal dialogue. Bakhtin believed that in order for one thing to exist, its counterpoint or contradiction also had to exist. Meaning that one would not understand hunger if he/she did not know what it was like to be full. This leads one to an interesting assertion that these tensions between people are what promote communication and this ultimately allows people to grow in relationships (Wood, 1997, p. 204).

Process, which is the second basis for dialectical theory, points to the fact that dialectics are ongoing and continuous. If one believes this then he/she can also understand that relationships are evolving entities and that change plays an essential role in the relationship. This is considered to be a positive process, as well. By the constant involvement of dialectics, people are given a chance to make progress and grow. It causes couples to work together to deal with these tensions. Going back to Bakhtin's

belief in contradictory counterpoints, the existence of contradictions then gives people a complementary relationship. The uniqueness of the theory is that unlike many who regard change as a negative, dialectical theory regards change as a normal and ever-present part of every relationship. By doing so it allows one to look at change as a positive and deal with tensions having a better outlook. (Wood, 1997, p. 205). Next, it is important to examine these dialects in a more specific manner.

There are three main dialectical tensions within relationships. They are: integration/separation, stability/change, and expression/privacy. Each of these tensions contains two separate forms. There is an internal form which is how the tension exists within the private sphere of the couple and an external form which exists when the couple is in a public setting. Integration/separation is the tension that occurs when a couple desires to be near one another and concurrently desires space individually.

The internal form of this tension is referred to as autonomy/connection. A good idea of what this tension involves can be viewed in the following example:

Timothy and his girlfriend Lisa spend every afternoon together. They go shopping, they ride bikes, etc. They have been dating for two years and seldom do they spend an afternoon apart. After all this time, Lisa begins to feel to smothered. She does everything with Timothy and wonders if she will ever have any independence. She begins to feel stressed and unhappy because of this. Shortly after experiencing this, Timothy's grandma becomes ill and he has to go out of town for a week, meaning that Lisa will not be spending afternoons with him. At first Lisa feels a little relieved to have some of her independence back; however, after a few days she begins to miss Timothy greatly.

This shows the internal struggle between wanting to spend time with a partner and feeling the need for space and independence of one's own. According to research, this dialectic is particularly present in long-term relationships (Wood, 1997, p. 207).

The external form of integration/separation is called inclusion/seclusion. This deals with the couple's desire to make their relationship viewed publicly verses keeping it more private. Examples of this would be introducing a partner to family and friends (inclusion) or mainly sticking close to the home and trying to avoid outside pressures or judgments by others (seclusion) (Wood, 1997, p. 207).

The second main tension or dialectic is that of stability/change. This dialectic involves individual's needs for a steady routine, comfort, and consistency in opposition to wanting excitement, surprises, and stimulation. The internal form of this dialectic is called novelty/predictability. The following is an example of this tension:

The same couple, Timothy and Lisa, who have been dating for three years now, would say that they know each other very well. They have their afternoon rituals. They seldom alter their plans. A typical day includes a stroll through the park, maybe a bike ride, and watching television. Lisa loves that she feels completely comfortable with Timothy. She knows that he always shows up at her house at 12:15 pm and will be wearing jeans and a collared shirt. She can almost predict what things will make him laugh and what things will make him angry. She feels safe in the relationship because of this. Sometimes Lisa feels bored, however. She wishes that every so often she and Timothy could try a new restaurant or go on a weekend trip. She longs for him to surprise her with flowers or chocolates.

This scenario highlights novelty/predictability. Often couples feel more comfortable being able to predict the behaviors of their partners while also wanting an occasional surprise.

The external form of this dialectic is referred to as conventionality/uniqueness. This is the same as novelty/predictability only since it is present in the public sphere or external world it deals with social expectations. It involves how a couple deals with wanting to be accepted by society. Perhaps a couple has been dating for five years and parents are starting to ask, "When are you getting married?" Society may dictate that it is time for a proposal; however, the couple may want to be unique and not get engaged for another twenty years. This tension is often a balancing act between copying a "normal" relationship and maintaining a couple's own desires and needs (Wood, 1997, p. 207).

The third main dialectic is called expression/privacy. Wood (1997) writes, "This dialectic pivots on tension between the desire to be open and expressive, on the one hand, and to be closed and private on the other" (p. 208). She discusses the ideal that all relationships could be completely open and self-disclosing. This would never work in the real world and it actually thought of as undesirable even though honesty is a large part of relationships and trust, as well. Complete openness could be detrimental in some cases though.

The internal form of this dialectic is openness/closedness. This is, again, involving the amount of self-disclosure a partner acts out in a relationship. The following example highlights this tension:

Lisa had a rough day. She was in a very bad mood when she met up with Timothy to have dinner. When Timothy asked her about her day she proceeded to talk for forty straight minutes about every single horrid detail. While Timothy wanted to her to vent her frustrations he wished she had stopped talking after the first twenty minutes.

This illustrates a time in which too much was disclosed. Lisa rambled for forty minutes when a simple explanation could have been given. Now, consider this next example:

Two days later, Timothy had just as bad of a day as Lisa previously had. He came to dinner in a terrible mood and was banging plates around and glaring at the waiter. Lisa asked him what was wrong. Timothy refused to tell her. He said, "Nothing! I'm fine!" Lisa knew this was not the case and it made her angry that he would not tell her the truth.

This illustrates the opposite extreme of closedness. Timothy could have opened up to Lisa and she may have felt much better and been more understanding of his bad day. Instead he shut himself off to her and made the tension worse.

The external form of this dialectic is revealation/concealment. Wood writes (1997) writes, "We want to reveal a relationship because that is a standard route to social acceptance and approval. Sometimes we also want to talk with others about particular experiences, problems, and so forth in our relationships. Yet, once others know about a relationship, or particular issues in it, they can interfere. Others can offer unsolicited and unwanted advice, make judgments of our partners or patterns in our relationships, and otherwise butt into what we regard as a private relationship" (p. 208). This is why many times people keep their relationships more concealed from the public or even from friends because undesired opinions can cause much strain. However, there are many cases in which outside opinions are desired and even necessary.

While these are the three main dialectics that are studied, communication scholars often assert that there is the possibility for many more dialectical tensions to exist. In study conducted by scholars at the University of Iowa, it was found that out of 1,092

accounts of tensions, there were nine different tension concerning loyalty dilemmas on an external level and six on an internal level (Baxter, 1997, p. 547). Baxter (1998) writes, "Dialectical contradictions are not represented well with simple, binary oppositions, which has been the tendency among most scholars currently working from a dialectical perspective. We have come to realize that it is much to simple and mechanistic to reduce the dialectics of relationships to a series of polar oppositions like certainty versus novelty, autonomy versus connection, and openness versus closedness. Rather, contradictions are better conceived as complex, overlapping domains of centripetal or dominant forces juxtaposed with centrifugal or countervailing forces" (p. 157).

What Baxter is describing is that tensions instead of only being two opposites are groupings of concepts such as openness/lying, openness/discretion, openness/silence and so on. Thus, within each tension, if broken down more specifically, one can explore the presence of many more sub-tensions. Baxter believes that there is no finite set of contradiction in personal relationships. She writes, "Infinite possibilities for relational oppositions exist, depending on historically, culturally, and relationally salient types of conversation...As couples co-create their relational world in the dynamic context of a society, they are bound to realize differences, oppositions, and contradictions" (Baxter, 1998, p. 158).

A good question to explore next is, "If there are inherent dialectics with relationships, how do couples manage these dialectics?" Different scholars note different strategies. According to Trenholm (2000), couples manage tensions by using six different strategies which are: selection, cyclic alternation, topical segmentation, moderation, disqualification, and reframing (p. 315). Selection is when a couple chooses

which extreme within the tension they are going to act out. For example, the couple chooses connection and spends all their time together or the couple chooses autonomy and remains highly independent. In cyclic alternation the couple goes through times of each extreme. They may spend a lot of time together for a few weeks then spend a few weeks apart (Trenholm, 2000, p. 315).

Topical segmentation is when a couple would select one extreme in one circumstance and the other extreme in another circumstance. This is displayed by choosing to try something new every Friday night, but maintain a routine the rest of the week. Moderation is when a couple compromises or blends the two extremes. Disqualification is when a couple hints toward solving problems; however they never discuss problems openly. Finally, reframing is when the couple completely changes the issue so that it has new meaning. The example Trenholm (2000) gives is that a couple may redefine autonomy as meaning an enhancement of time spent together instead of as the opposite of togetherness (p. 315).

Studies found that most couples used cyclic separation to manage the autonomy/connection dialectic and used segmenting or moderating to manage openness/closedness. They used segmentation to manage novelty/predictability, as well. They tried to maintain novelty in certain activities they did; however, kept discussions about the relationship and faithfulness more predictable (Trenholm, 2000, p. 315). Julia T. Wood outlines only four responses that couples use to deal with dialectics.

Wood says that couples use selection, separation, neutralization, and/or reframing. Selection, according to Wood, is when couples satisfy one need and ignore the other. Separation is like basically the same as Trenholm's topical segmentation. It attempts to

meet both needs in separate situations. Neutralization is the same as Trenholm's moderation. Wood says that neutralization is a compromise that meets both needs somewhat, but neither need completely. Reframing according to Wood and Trenholm are defined in the same way. Wood considers reframing to be the most difficult and least frequently employed response to dialectics. Wood also says that most common response to tensions is separation (Wood, 1997, p. 211).

Wood (1997) writes, "The existence or intensity of dialectics doesn't appear to have a noticeable effect on partner's satisfaction with a relationship. There is evidence, however, that satisfaction does vary, depending on how couples respond to dialectical tensions. The selection strategy is not a satisfying response to the dialectics of stability/change or autonomy/connection" (p. 211). In a study by Leslie Baxter and Larry Ebert (1999), the two found that for their sample of 100 males and females drawn from fifty heterosexual romantic couples, the contradictions of autonomy/connection and openness/closedness were attributed greatest importance across a wide range of turning point events within the relationship. The lowest ranking contradiction in the study was conventionality/uniqueness (p. 547).

In another study conducted by Larry Ebert (2000), he examined dialectical conflicts versus non-dialectical conflicts within marriages. He found that the dialectical tensions of autonomy/connection and openness/closedness were perceived to be significantly more important than non-dialectical tensions (p. 638). A separate study by Baxter and West (2003) looked at 14 romantic couples and examined the dialectics of positivity/negativity and similarity/difference (p. 491). This study found the existence of each within the areas of personality, leisure pursuits, attitudes and beliefs, communication

style, and demographic/family background. They found that similarities and differences were both positive because they contributed to individual growth and the facilitation of communication; however, this also could lead to conflict or other challenges to communication, as well (Baxter, 2003, p. 491).

A study Baxter did in 1990 at the University of California-Davis, revealed that dialectical contradictions were found in three-quarters of all relationship stages. Baxter also found that current relationship satisfaction did not correlate significantly with the reported presence of the contradictions but did correlate with the ways in which the contradictions were managed (p. 69). A final study of note was done by Sally Planalp in 2003. Planalp (2003) writes, "Emotion clearly plays a leading role in close relationships and may even direct their development, durability, and dissolution...dialectical theories could be enriched by incorporation emotions that provide feelings of dialectical tension and drive movement between poles" (p. 78).

Now that dialectical theory has been discussed in detail, one should have gained an understanding of how it is such a key part of relationships. As a relationship develops a couple is going to experience many of these dialectics. By knowing that this is a normal part of any relationship, one can begin to understand how to better deal with these tensions. The three main dialectics of integration/separation, stability/change, and expression/privacy appear to be the most prevalent and most studied tensions. These are what studies have shown to be significantly involved within relationships. More specifically, studies show that autonomy/connection and openness/closedness are reported as the most important to individuals.

There are opportunities for numerous other tensions to exist. Baxter, in particular, discusses these opportunities and points out that within a main tension there could be many more sublevels. While each scholar may also report different ways in which to deal with the tensions, the four responses to dialectics that Wood discusses: selection, separation, neutralization, and reframing; seem to most succinctly summarize response strategies. Most consider reframing to be the best strategy; however, it is also the most difficult because it involves completely changing one's viewpoint of the tension. All of this knowledge leads toward possibilities for further research.

Since one now understands that tensions are inherent within relationships, it would be helpful to further explore which of the tensions truly is the most important within relationships. It also would be helpful to know whether or not couples recognize these tensions and how they would go about solving them if they were more aware. By looking at all these strategies it would be useful to explore the effects of each strategy on couples. Some questions to conduct research on would be: "Which of the strategies would be most effective and not considerably difficult?" and "Are there other strategies that couples use which have not been highlighted yet?"

All of these questions are ways in which studies could be developed. By using knowledge of dialectical theory, couples could develop relationships in a much healthier manner and also understand and deal with tension. Therefore by studying and understanding why dialectical tensions occur, how they affect relationships, and how one can go about solving conflicts which occur as a result, one can conduct a healthier romantic relationship.

Methods

The study which was developed to further explore dialectical tensions within interpersonal relationships was a survey. The survey consisted of three demographic questions (age, sex, and relationship status) and thirty questions regarding the three most common dialectical paired tensions (autonomy/connection, novelty/predictability, openness/closedness). Since the survey was created to measure these three dialectical pairs, it contained six scales (i.e. one scale per tension). The autonomy scale consisted of questions one, four, seven, ten, and thirteen. The connection scale consisted of questions sixteen, nineteen, twenty-two, twenty-five, and twenty-eight. The novelty scale was questions twelve, fifteen, twenty-one, and twenty-four. The prediction scale consisted of questions three, six, nine, eighteen, twenty-seven, and thirty. The openness scale was questions two, five, eight, eleven, twenty-three, and twenty-nine. The closedness scale was questions fourteen, seventeen, twenty, and twenty-six. The reliability coefficient for each of the six scales is shown in the following table.

Scale	Reliability Coefficient
Autonomy	.635
Connection	.403
Novelty	.710
Prediction	.595
Openness	.587
Closedness	.746

A reliability coefficient of .7 or greater is needed for a scale to be considered reliable. No questions were deleted from the survey to obtain these coefficients. Therefore, the scales for novelty and closedness were the only scales considered to be reliable.

Each of these scales can be combined with its pair (ex: autonomy/connection) to collect a full measure of its dialectical tension. A reliability coefficient was taken for each of these paired scales, as well. In order to create the scales for the pairs the questions which measured the latter tension of each pair were recoded in the negative. For example, to create a scale measuring the autonomy/connection pair, questions sixteen, nineteen, twenty-two, twenty-five, and twenty-eight (the connection scale) were recoded in the negative. The reliability coefficients for these paired scales are displayed in the table below.

Scale	**Reliability Coefficient**
Autonomy/Connection	.581
Novelty/Prediction	.572
Openness/Closedness	.765

The table shows that the scale for openness/closedness was reliable. The other two scales cannot be considered as a reliable measure.

Participants of the study were a non-random convenience sample. They were University of Tennessee students enrolled in Communication Studies 240. 180 surveys were collected by the researcher. The number of usable surveys fluctuated due to missing data. There were 103 female respondents, seventy-five male respondents, and two respondents who did not select a sex. The age demographic question was split into four choices of age ranges: 18-22, 23-30, 31-50, and 50-older. There were 166

respondents in the 18-22 range, eleven respondents in the 23-30 range, one respondent in the 31-50 range, and zero respondents older than 50. The status demographic was also split into four choices: single, in a relationship, engaged, and married. There were ninety-eight single respondents, seventy-one respondents in a relationship, six engaged respondents, and three married respondents.

The dependent variables of the study were the scales measuring each of the dialectical tensions. The survey was created by taking the three dialectical tensions of autonomy/connection, novelty/prediction, and openness/closedness and developing ten questions for each pair. In order to maintain the focus of the participant about half of the questions for each pair were worded in the negative.

Because each pair contains two contradicting tensions, when a question was worded in the negative, it, in turn, became a measure of the opposing tension. Each of the questions for the autonomy/connection scale are a measure of a person's desire to be independent from their partner. Each of the questions for the novelty/predictability scale are a measure of a person's desire to have a set routine or predictability with their romantic partner. Finally, each of the questions in the openness/closedness scale are a measure of a person's desire to disclose information with a romantic partner. Each of these scales was created using a five point Likert scale of responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The independent variables of the study were the demographics collected by the researcher. As previously stated, the demographics that were collected were age, sex, and relationship status. These variables were analyzed to see if any had a significant effect, correlation, or were a good predictor for each of the scales.

Procedures of the study were as follows: The study began with a fascination of the three main dialectical tensions. A study of previous research was conducted and the researcher wanted to further explore the tensions. The current survey was created by the researcher as a means of investigating whether the tensions did exist within interpersonal romantic relationships, which of these tensions were most prevalent, and how demographics may play a role in the existence of the tensions. The survey questions were created using basic statements that represented a particular tension. Each of the three main tensions were equally represented by ten questions apiece. The surveys were collected over a two month time span from the University of Tennessee students enrolled in Communication 240 (business speaking). 180 total surveys were collected; however, due to some instances of incomplete surveys, the number of surveys varies upon the variable being tested. Survey data was then entered using SPSS version 15 software and analyzed.

The following hypotheses were developed:

1. Men will want more autonomy in a relationship than women.
2. Women will want more predictability in a relationship than men.
3. Men will want less openness in a relationship than women.
4. Respondents aged 18-22 will want more autonomy than respondents aged 23-30.
5. Respondents aged 18-22 will want more novelty than the respondents aged 23-30.
6. Respondents 23-30 will want less openness than respondents aged 18-22.
7. Single respondents and respondents in a relationship will want more connection than engaged and married respondents.
8. Engaged and married respondents will want more novelty than single respondents and respondents in a relationship.

9. Single respondents and respondents in a relationship will want more openness than engaged and married respondents.
10. Single respondents will want more autonomy than respondents in a relationship.
11. Single respondents will want less novelty than those respondents in a relationship.
12. Single respondents will want more openness than those respondents in a relationship.
13. Respondents in a relationship will want more autonomy than those who are married.
14. Married respondents will want less predictability than those in a relationship.
15. Married respondents will want more openness than those in a relationship.
16. There will be a strong negative correlation between each of the three pairs of scales (autonomy vs. connection, novelty vs. predictability, openness vs. closedness).
17. Sex will be a good predictor of all three paired scales.
18. Age will not be a good predictor of all three paired scales.
19. Status will be a good predictor of all three paired scales.

Results

The mean score of the full survey was 2.64 with a standard deviation of .306. The mean, standard deviation, number of surveys, and min/max scores for each of the six individual scales is shown in the tables below.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Autonomyscale	177	1.00	4.60	2.4418	.61075
Valid N (listwise)	177				

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Connectionscale	178	1.00	4.00	2.6382	.52969
Valid N (listwise)	178				

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Noveltyscale	177	1.00	4.50	2.0268	.70079
Valid N (listwise)	177				

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Predictionscale	176	1.50	4.33	2.9612	.54735
Valid N (listwise)	176				

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Opennessscale	175	1.00	4.50	2.6514	.56907
Valid N (listwise)	175				

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Closednessscale	178	1.00	5.00	3.0281	.84199
Valid N (listwise)	178				

The reliability coefficient for each of the six individual scales and then the three paired scales was previously reported in the methods section. Only the individual novelty scale with a reliability coefficient of .710, the individual closedness scale with a reliability coefficient of .746 and the paired openness/closedness scale with a reliability coefficient of .765 can be considered reliable measurements by statistical requirements.

Independent sample t-tests were run to investigate whether males and females scored significantly different on each of the three paired scales (hypotheses one-three). The results of those t-tests were as follows:

Autonomy/Connection scale: $t(170)= -3.655$, $p> .05$
(male mean=2.97; female mean=2.85)

Novelty/Prediction scale: $t(170)= 3.655$, $p< .05$ *Significant
(male mean=2.77; female mean=2.53)

Openness/Closedness scale: $t(170)= .024$, $p> .05$
(male mean=2.78; female mean=2.78)

Another set of independent sample t-tests were run to investigate whether age had a significant effect on the scores for each of the three paired scales (hypotheses four-six). The researcher ran these t-tests with age broken down into two groups, 18-22 and 23-30. The results of those tests shown in the following tables:

Autonomy/Connection Scale (Table 1)

Group Statistics

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullAutonomy/ Connection	18-22	162	2.8901	.43756	.03438
	23-30	12	3.0583	.52477	.15149

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	.670	.414	-1.267	172	.207	-.16821	.13273	-.43020	.09378
Equal variances not assumed			-1.083	12.160	.300	-.16821	.15534	-.50617	.16975

$t(172) = -1.083, p > .05$

Novelty/Prediction Scale (Table 2)

Group Statistics

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullNovelty/ Connection	18-22	160	2.6181	.41069	.03247
	23-30	12	2.7750	.66350	.19153

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	4.593	.034	-1.215	170	.226	-.15688	.12916	-.41185	.09810
Equal variances not assumed			-.808	11.641	.436	-.15688	.19427	-.58160	.26785

t(170) = -1.215, p > .05

Openness/Closedness Scale (Table 3)

Group Statistics

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullOpenness/ closedness	18-22	160	2.7813	.57661	.04558
	23-30	12	2.7000	.81798	.23613

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	1.671	.198	.456	170	.649	.08125	.17814	-.27041	.43291
Equal variances not assumed			.338	11.834	.741	.08125	.24049	-.44355	.60605

t(170)= -.338, p >.05

The next set of hypotheses (seven, eight, and nine) deal with relationship status and its effect on each of the scales. Therefore, three independent sample t-tests were run comparing single respondents and respondents in a relationship to engaged and married respondents. In these tests, the independent variable (status) was coded so that 1=Single and In a Relationship respondents while 2=Engaged and Married respondents. The results of these t-tests are as follows:

Autonomy/Connection Scale (Table 4)

Group Statistics

	StatusRecoded	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullAutonomy	1.00	166	2.8849	.44061	.03420
	2.00	9	3.2111	.39193	.13064

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	.460	.499	-2.173	173	.031	-.32617	.15007	-.62237	-.02997
Equal variances not assumed			-2.415	9.132	.039	-.32617	.13505	-.63100	-.02135

$t(173) = -2.415, p < .05$
***Significant**

Novelty/Prediction Scale (Table 5)

Group Statistics

	StatusRecoded	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullNovelty	1.00	164	2.6213	.43480	.03395
	2.00	9	2.8000	.33912	.11304

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	2.260	.135	-1.211	171	.227	-.17866	.14749	-.46979	.11247
Equal variances not assumed			-1.514	9.505	.163	-.17866	.11803	-.44351	.08619

t(171) = -1.514, p >.05

Openness/Closedness Scale (Table 6)

Group Statistics

	StatusRecoded	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullOpenness	1.00	165	2.8018	.57874	.04505
	2.00	8	2.2000	.61875	.21876

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	.010	.921	2.864	171	.005	.60182	.21013	.18704	1.01660
Equal variances not assumed			2.694	7.606	.029	.60182	.22335	.08208	1.12156

t(171) = 2.694, p <05
***Significant**

Hypotheses ten through twelve still deal with relationship status and its effect on each of the scales; however, this time independent samples t-tests were run to look for a significant difference between those respondents who were single versus those in a relationship. These t-tests had similar results to those run for the previous three hypotheses. The results are listed below.

Autonomy/Connection (Table 7)

Group Statistics

	Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullAutonomy	Single	95	2.8158	.43767	.04490
	In a relationship	71	2.9775	.43035	.05107

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.001	.973	-2.372	164	.019	-.16168	.06817	-.29629	-.02707
Equal variances not assumed			-2.377	152.286	.019	-.16168	.06801	-.29603	-.02732

t(164) = -2.377, p <.05
***Significant**

Novelty/Prediction (Table 8)

Group Statistics

	Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullNovelty	Single	95	2.6021	.45593	.04678
	In a relationship	69	2.6478	.40570	.04884

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.420	.235	-.664	162	.508	-.04572	.06889	-.18176	.09032
Equal variances not assumed			-.676	155.386	.500	-.04572	.06763	-.17931	.08787

t(162) = -.676, p > .05

Openness/Closedness Scale (Table 9)

Group Statistics

	Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FullOpenness	Single	94	2.9638	.53277	.05495
	In a relationship	71	2.5873	.57070	.06773

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	.274	.601	4.359	163	.000	.37651	.08638	.20594	.54708
Equal variances not assumed			4.317	145.148	.000	.37651	.08722	.20413	.54889

t(163)= 4.317, p <.05
***Significant**

Hypotheses thirteen through fifteen are the final three hypotheses dealing with relationship status and its effect on each of the scales. Three more independent sample t-tests were run to gain an analysis of whether there was a significant difference in scoring on the scales between those respondents in a relationship and those who were married. The results of these three t-tests came back showing that there was no significant difference in scoring on any of the three paired scales. The autonomy connection scale resulted in $t(72)= -.620$, $p > .05$. The novelty/prediction scale reported $t(70)= -1.511$, $p > .05$. Finally, the openness/closedness scale resulted in $t(72)= 1.062$, $p > .05$.

The next set of tests run were to test hypothesis sixteen which predicted that there would be a strong negative correlation between each of the three pairs of scales (autonomy vs. connection, novelty vs. predictability, openness vs. closedness). The following tables show the results of the correlations run.

Autonony vs. Connection (Table 10)

		Autonomy scale	Connection scale
Autonomyscale	Pearson Correlation	1	-.190(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.011
	N	177	177
Connectionscale	Pearson Correlation	-.190(*)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	
	N	177	178

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Novelty vs. Prediction (Table 11)

		Novelty scale	Prediction scale
Noveltyscale	Pearson Correlation	1	-.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.922
	N	177	175
Predictionscale	Pearson Correlation	-.007	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.922	
	N	175	176

Openness vs. Closedness (Table 12)

		Openness scale	Closedness scale
Opennessscale	Pearson Correlation	1	-.518(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	175	175
Closednessscale	Pearson Correlation	-.518(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	175	178

**** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The final three hypotheses (seventeen, eighteen, nineteen) required linear regression tests to be run. Hypotheses seventeen states that sex will be a good predictor of all three paired scales; therefore, a linear regression test was run for each of the three paired scales. The first test revealed that $B(174)= 1.995$, $p < .05$ for the autonomy/connection scale with a correlation of .15. The second test revealed that $B(172)= 3.729$, $p < .05$ for the novelty/predictability scale with a correlation of .274. The third test revealed $B(172)= -.373$, $p > .05$ for the openness/closedness scale with a correlation of .029.

Hypothesis eighteen states that age will not be a good predictor of all three paired scales. Three more linear regression tests were run. Each of these tests showed that there

was no significant correlation between age and the scale it was tested on. Finally, hypothesis nineteen states that status will be a good predictor of all three paired scales. Three last linear regression tests were run. The first resulted in $B(174)= 3.224$, $p < .05$ for the autonomy/connection scale with a correlation of .238. The second resulted in no significant correlation between status and the novelty/prediction scale. The third test resulted in $B(172)= -5.309$, $p < .05$ for the openness /closedness scale with a correlation of .376.

Discussion

When each of the scales were tested individually (six total) only two met the requirement of a .7 or higher reliability coefficient. This means that only the novelty scale with a reliability coefficient of .710 and the closedness scale with a reliability coefficient of .746 can be considered a reliable measurement tool. The autonomy scale had a .635 reliability coefficient therefore, it did not meet reliability requirements; however, it was the closest out of the rest. When the scales were tested with their pairs (3 total), the openness/closedness scale was reliable with a reliability coefficient of .765. Both the autonomy/connection scale and the novelty/prediction scale did not meet reliability requirements because their coefficients were less than .7.

One reason that these scales did not have good reliability could be that there were only four to five questions for each individual scale and still only ten questions per scale when paired together. Another reason could be that the nature of this study reflects the conflicting desires of individuals within relationships. Even though questions from the paired scales were recoded so that answers were scored to represent one measure, the

individuals who do have conflicting desires within relationships would have an almost equal combination of high and low scores. This could easily make the scale appear to be unreliable, all the while indicating these conflictions are present.

Hypothesis one which states men will want more autonomy than women was rejected. This is because the independent samples t-test did not result in a statistically significant difference between the scoring of male and females on the autonomy scale. The men did have a higher mean score on this scale; however, the t-test showed that this was not a statistically significant difference. This would mean that the woman slightly desired more connection than men, but not enough to be significant. These results could mean that both males and females value their independence and also desire a closeness with their partner.

Hypothesis two states that women will want more prediction than men. This hypothesis was confirmed. The t-test run on the paired novelty/prediction scale that showed a significant difference with males averaging a higher score of novelty than females. One can then deduce that males place a greater importance on having novelty within a relationship than their female counterpart. One can also deduce from this that females prefer less novelty and more predictability/stability within their relationships.

Hypothesis three stating that men will want less openness than females was rejected due to the t-test which showed no significant difference between male and female scoring. Again, males did have a lower mean with 2.618 and females with 2.675 but, this difference is not enough to be significant according to the test. This could mean that openness and closedness are equally important to both sexes.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth hypotheses brought into question a new independent variable of age. The fourth stated that respondents aged 18-22 will want more autonomy than respondents aged 23-30. The hypothesis was rejected because no statistically significant evidence was found of a difference in scoring. This means age did not play much of a factor in how a person felt regarding his/her desire for autonomy and/or connection within a relationship. The fifth hypothesis tested whether age would affect the responses on the novelty/prediction scale and it was also rejected because no statistically significant difference in scoring was found. The sixth hypothesis which tested age against the openness/closedness scale was rejected due to the same reason. This can lead one to conclude that age does not prove to be an influencing factor on a person's feelings toward the three main dialectical tensions.

Hypotheses seven through fifteen begin to explore the possibility of an effect of relationship status on each of the three dialectical tensions. Independent samples t-test revealed significant results regarding several of these hypotheses. Hypothesis seven states that single respondents and respondents in a relationship will desire more connection than engaged and married respondents. The t-test in Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference in scoring between these two sets of people. Hypothesis seven is confirmed because participants engaged and married scored higher on this scale than those in a relationship or single. This shows that married and engaged respondents place a higher value on their independence within a relationship than those who are either not in a relationship or are not yet engaged or married.

Hypothesis eight states that engaged and married respondents will want more novelty than those who are single or in a relationship. This hypothesis, as evidenced by

the t-test in Table 5, was not confirmed. Although married and engaged participants did have a higher mean score, the test showed this was not a statistically significant difference. Thus, we can conclude novelty/prediction does not vary much due to status.

Hypothesis nine states that single respondents and respondents in a relationship want more openness than engaged and married respondents. The t-test in Table 6 shows that this hypothesis is accepted. There is a statistically significant difference in scoring. Single respondents and respondents in a relationship had a higher mean score on this scale meaning that they place a higher value and have a greater desire to be open with their partners than those who are married and engaged.

Hypothesis ten compares single participants to participants in a relationship (excluding engaged and married participants). The hypothesis states that single respondents will want more autonomy than those in a relationship. This hypothesis is rejected. According to the t-test results in Table 7, single participants scored lower than those in a relationship and the test results show that this was statistically significant. These findings indicate that single respondents are less concerned with their independence within a relationship than those participants who are in a relationship.

Hypothesis eleven states that single respondents will want less novelty than those in a relationship. This hypothesis was not confirmed. The mean scores were so close that there was no statistical significance. This leads one to concede that status does not affect how much a person desires novelty or predictability in a relationship. Hypothesis twelve states that single respondents will want more openness scale than those in a relationship. The t-test in Table 9 shows that single respondents did score higher on the openness/closedness scale and that this result was statistically significant. This confirms

hypothesis twelve and allows one to conclude that single respondents feel that they would be more open disclosing information than those respondents who are actually in a relationship. This could be due to the fact that those respondents who are single are not being faced with information disclosure situations so they believe that they would be more open than they truly would be if in the relationship. It also could mean that once one is in a relationship he/she's desire to disclose information lessens.

Hypotheses thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen tested people in a relationship against people who are married and their scoring on each of the three paired scales. All of these hypotheses were rejected because no statistically significant evidence was found of an effect. This could be due to the fact that both groups are of people who are currently with a romantic partner in some way. This allows us to ponder the possibility that the depth of the relationship has little or no effect on the existence of dialectical tensions. Instead, it is more likely that those in a relationship experience the tensions differently or even to a greater level than those not in a relationship.

Hypothesis sixteen states that there will be a negative correlation between each of the three pairs of scales. This hypothesis was confirmed by testing and shown in Tables 10-12. The autonomy scale and the connection scale had a statistically significant negative correlation of -.190. The novelty and the prediction scale had a negative correlation of -.007 and the openness and the closedness scale had a statistically significant negative correlation of -.518. What this allows one to understand is that these dialectical tensions do exist. Each pairing had a negative correlation with its dialectic opposition and these pairings do present themselves to people in and not in relationships, as evidenced by the study.

The final three hypotheses (seventeen-nineteen) were tested by linear regression to see whether or not the independent variables of sex, age, and status were good predictors of each of the three paired scales. Hypothesis seventeen says that sex will be a good predictor of the scales. Sex was found to be a good predictor for the autonomy/connection scale and the openness/closedness scale, but not a statistically significant predictor of the novelty/prediction scale. This means that the hypothesis was not confirmed. Sex was, however, found to be an influential variable on two of these three dialectical tensions which tells the researcher that it should be considered in this study and other studies regarding dialectics.

Hypothesis eighteen states that age will not be a good predictor of all three paired scales. This hypothesis was confirmed by linear regression tests. None of the three scales showed age as a good predictor, therefore the researcher can conclude that a person's age will not necessarily cause any difference in desires of a person within a relationship in the area of dialectical tensions. Finally, hypothesis nineteen states that status will be a good predictor of all three scales. The results of a linear regression test for this hypothesis show that it is rejected because only two of the three scales show a statistically significant correlation. Status is shown to be a good predictor of the autonomy/connection scale and the openness/closedness scale, but not the novelty/prediction scale. These results are the same as those for hypothesis seventeen. This can show us that novelty/prediction may not be as important or prevalent of a dialectical tension as the other two pairings. It also shows us that both sex and status are good predictors and influential on the autonomy/connection and openness/closedness dialectics.

The most significant conclusions one can draw from this study are that the dialectical tensions do exist within relationships. Every pair of dialects was shown to have a negative correlation meaning that the tensions are, in fact, opposing. The results stated that the mean score on the survey was a 2.64. This is telling because it is so close to a neutral response. This means that answers on both ends of the scale were chosen a near equal amount. Participants agreed and disagreed to questions regarding each of the paired tensions, allowing one to conclude that each pair of tensions is present in relationships.

Another significant result that a conclusion can be drawn from is that both sex and status play a role in a person's experience with the dialectical tensions. Males tend to want more autonomy in a relationship while females are more concerned with connection. When looking at the openness/closedness scale it was found that females are more concerned with being open in the relationship than males. Status also played a large role.

People who were single and in a relationship valued connection significantly more than those who were engaged or married. They also valued openness significantly more than those engaged and married. When comparing single participants to those in a relationship the same results were found. Thus, one can conclude that the less serious the relationship of comparison the less the person in that relationship will be concerned with their independence. Since no significant results were found concerning sex, status, or age and the novelty/prediction scale the researcher can conclude that this dialectical tension is not as prevalent within the relationship and perhaps not as important to individuals.

Although these are significant conclusions that can be drawn, there were a few limitations with the study to be discussed. First, the reliability coefficient for all of scales

except the openness/closedness was too low to be considered statistically reliable. In a study, one would always want the scale of measurement to be considered reliable. However, there are a few proposed reasons why the scales did not meet these standards. It could be due to the length of the survey. Each scale was only ten questions long. Perhaps if more questions had been used, the scale would have be a more significantly strong measure of the dialectical tension. Another way to look at these reliability issues is that each scale was testing for the existence of opposing tensions, therefore the scale was supposed to receive answers on both ends of the spectrum. This could throw off a reliability reading which may be looking for answers to be more similar. Thus, the reliability measurements could be an indicator that these tensions do exist.

A second limitation was the diversity of the sample that was surveyed. Since the sample was only college students, there was a lack of diversity regarding the age variable. This could be a large reason why age was not found to be a good predictor of the scales. Another limitation was a lack of married respondents. Since the sample of participants was coming from a college atmosphere, only a limited number of married people were included. It would be interesting to have a greater number of married and engaged participants in order to test them against those who are in less committed relationships and those who are single.

A third limitation of the study was the study itself. While it is reasonable to test participants in a quantitative measure such as a survey, the nature of dialetics is more qualitative. Asking questions in survey format about a relationship will only give a researcher a limited idea of what truly occurs. Had the study been qualitative the researcher would have seen firsthand what occurs within relationships and perhaps had a

better understanding of the dialetics within that relationship. All in all, the survey did reveal that the tensions are present in relationships, that they are opposing tensions, and that sex and relationship status are influential factors regarding these tensions. One is thus led to discuss the possibilities for future research in this area.

In order to continue this study, the next logical step would be a qualitative study. The researcher could take couples relatively new to relationships and observe behavior over a two month time span and then take couples who are engaged and married and do the same. It would be interesting to see which of the dialectical tensions play the largest role in the different types of relationships. It would also be interesting to compare these qualitative results to the results of this quantitative study.

If one wanted to continue using quantitative measures it would be advisable to have a larger sample which included more engaged and married participants. Also, this study did not reveal that age played any significant role in the tensions. The next study should seek to include a greater variety of age and a greater number of participants who are married or engaged. More demographic variables could be added as well, such as length of time one has been in a relationship, nationality, and relationship status of parents. The more demographic variables one adds to the study the more can be tested to be an influential factor. These are just a few ways that one could continue the study.

As previously stated, the biggest conclusions that can be drawn from this study are that these three dialectical tensions do exist within relationships and they are opposing tensions. Sex and relationship status do play a role in influencing the way people feel about these tensions and which are most commonly found to be prevalent

within relationships. By looking at these results, one can feel certain that these tensions are out there and by studying their presence one can learn a great deal about them.

References

Anderson, R. & Ross, V. (2002). *Questions of communication* 3rd ed. (J. Bartlett, Ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Baxter, L. A. (1990). Dialectical contradictions in relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 7*(1), 69-88.

Baxter, L. A. (2004). A tale of two voices: Relational dialectics theory. *The Journal of Family Communication. 3*(4), 181-192.

Baxter, L. A. & Ebert, L. A. (1999). Perceptions of dialectical contradictions in turning points of development in heterosexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 16*(5), 547-569.

Baxter, L. A., Mazanec, M., Nicholson, J., Pittman, G., Smith, K. & West, L. (1997). Everyday loyalties and betrayals in personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 14*(5), 655-678.

Baxter, L.A., West, L. (2003). Couple's perceptions of their similarities and differences: A dialectical perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 20*(4), 491-514.

Ebert, L. A. (2000). Conflict and dialectics: Perceptions of dialectical contradictions in marital conflict. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 17*(4-5), 638-659.

Montgomery, B. M. & Baxter, L. A. (1998). *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Planalp, S. (February 2003). The unacknowledged role of emotion in theories of close relationships: How do theories feel? *Communication Theory. 13*(1), 78.

Scott, S. (2002). Introduction: The idea fierce. *Fierce conversations.* Penguin Group.

Stewart, J. (2006). *Bridges not walls* (9 Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing.

Trenholm, S. & Jensen, A. (2000). *Interpersonal communication* (D. Cavanaugh, Ed.). California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Wood, J. T. (1997). *Communication theories in Action* California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.