

Trust in our spouse, the social media effect
“相信我们的配偶，社交媒体”影响。”

By

Khaled A S M S Alnhailan

Assistant professor

The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training – Basic Education
Collage – Social Studies Department, Kuwait

Email: k.alnhailan@gmail.com

Jawad A A Y Y B Alqallaf

Assistant professor

The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training – Basic Education
Collage – Social Studies Department, Kuwait

Email: dr.alqallaf@hotmail.com

Fatimah A A T M H Alnaser

Assistant professor

The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training – Basic Education
Collage – Social Studies Department, Kuwait

Email: dr.f.alnaser@hotmail.com

٢٠٢٣/٧/٩: تاريخ استلام البحث

٢٠٢٣/٧/٢٤: تاريخ قبول البحث

الملخص

منصات التواصل الاجتماعي أصبحت جزءاً من حياة الناس. تشير الدراسات إلى أن استخدام منصات التواصل الاجتماعي والإدمان عليها يمكن أن يؤثر سلباً على صحة الأفراد وحياتهم الاجتماعية والزوجية. يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة العلاقة بين استخدام منصات التواصل الاجتماعي والثقة بين الزوجين. من خلال اختبار فرضيتين رئيسيتين. الفرضية الأولى هي أن منصات التواصل الاجتماعي تؤثر على ثقة الزوجة في زوجها. والفرضية الثانية هي أن منصات التواصل الاجتماعي تؤثر على ثقة الزوج في زوجته. ويتم تطبيق نهج وصفي تحليلي على البيانات المجمعة. وتوصلت نتيجة التحليل إلى رفض كلاً الفرضيتين؛ حيث لم يظهر استخدام منصات التواصل الاجتماعي أي تأثير على ثقة الأفراد في شريك حياتهم. وبختصار البحث إلى أن هناك عوامل أخرى تعزز الثقة في الزوج أو الزوجة، كما يفسر ذلك نظرية التبادل الاجتماعي ونظرية الأهداف الديناميكية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يؤكد البحث أن أخراضاً استخدام منصات التواصل الاجتماعي قد تغيرت من الاتصال بالآخرين فقط إلى تطوير الذات والمهنة ومتابعة آخر الأخبار والأحداث والترفيه.

الكلمات الدالة: منصات التواصل الاجتماعي، الثقة في الزوج، الثقة في الزوجة ، إدمان منصات التواصل الاجتماعي.

Abstract

Social media platforms have become part of people's lives. Various studies argued that social media platform usage and addiction could hurt people's health and social life, including marriage. This paper examines the relationship between social media platforms usage and trust in spouses. Two main hypotheses are tested. The first hypothesis is that social media platforms impact the wife's trust in her husband. The second hypothesis is that social media platforms impact the husband's trust in his wife. The paper applies a descriptive-analytic approach to the data collected. The outcome of the analysis rejects both hypotheses, as social media usage showed no effect on one's trust in his or her spouse. The study concludes that other factors strengthen trust in a spouse, as explained by social exchange theory and dynamic goal theory. In addition, the paper argues that social media platform usage purposes have changed from connecting with others mainly to self and career development, being updated with the most recent news and events, and entertainment.

Keywords: social media platforms, trust in spouse, social media addiction

Introduction

Social media platforms have revolutionized how people communicate, interact, and maintain relationships in today's digital age. While social media can be a powerful tool for maintaining and strengthening social connections, excessive use can negatively affect the trust between spouses. A growing body of literature suggests that excessive use of social media can lead to mistrust, jealousy, and dissatisfaction in romantic relationships (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011). Some studies have found that social media addiction can negatively impact trust between spouses (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011), while others have suggested that social media use can have a positive impact on trust in relationships (Lin & Utz, 2015). However, there is a need for further research to understand the complex relationship between social media use and trust between spouses.

Therefore, this paper examines the relationship between excessive use and addiction to social media platform usage and trust between spouses. The paper adapts a descriptive-analytical approach to analyzing data collected from the Public Authority of Applied Education and Training (PAAET). Data aim to examine two main hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that social media platforms impact the wife's trust in her husband. The second hypothesis is that social media platforms impact the husband's trust in his wife. The study rejected both hypotheses. Several theories are applied to understand the relationship between trust in marriage and social media platform usage, including attachment theory, social exchange, cognitive dissonance theory, and dynamic goal theory.

The paper concludes that other factors are associated with trust in one's spouse, as explained by social exchange and dynamic goal theory. The paper adds that social media platforms have shifted from mainly connecting with others to other sections, such as staying updated on recent events, entertainment, self and career development. Finally, further research is needed to understand the factors within marriage that result in higher trust in one's spouse.

Literature review

Social media platforms are defined as "a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content." (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Social media platforms enable people to stay connected, updated, and engaged with friends, family, loved ones, and even brands and news, so well that some become addicted to them. Several studies found that excessive social media usage can decrease spouses' trust, jealousy, and relationship dissatisfaction (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011). Some studies suggest that social media addiction can negatively affect trust among spouses (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011). Nevertheless, before illustrating the literature on the correlation between social media addiction and trust in a marriage, the paper will define trust, marriage, social media platforms, and social media platforms' addiction, in addition to outlining their importance, starting with trust.

Trust is a fundamental concept that plays a crucial role in human interactions and relationships (Schilke, Reimann & Cook, 2021). Trust is known for having multiple definitions. For instance, Ueno et al. (2022) define trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other parties.". Mayer et al., (1995) define trust as "a multi-dimensional construct that involves cognitive and affective components, and it can be viewed as a process that develops over time through consistent behavior, honesty, and communication." Furthermore, Choi et al. (2020) defines trust as "a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another." In other words, trust can be argued to refer to the belief or confidence one has in another person, organization, or entity based on the expectation that they will act predictably and reliably. Therefore, trust is of importance socially, as stated by early scholars Luhmann (1988) and Coleman (1990), who argued that trust is essential for the smooth functioning of social, economic, and political systems, including marriage (Siegrist, 2021).

Marriage is a legally and socially recognized union between two individuals, typically involving intimate relationships and responsibilities (Pauli, 2022; Girgis et

al., 2011). The concept of marriage has been studied and analyzed in various fields, including sociology, psychology, anthropology, and law (Pauli, 2022; Girgis et al., 2011). Sociologists have examined the role of marriage in society, including how it has changed over time and how it differs across cultures (Pauli, 2022; Girgis et al., 2011). The importance of marriage is providing a stable and legal framework for childbearing and childrearing (Nabila et al., 2022; Lerman, 2002). The legal recognition of marriage promotes a sense of commitment and responsibility towards each other and their offspring, creating a stable environment for children to grow up in (Nabila et al., 2022; Lerman, 2002). Marriage also contributes to social cohesion and stability in society. It provides a recognized and respected relationship between individuals and their families, strengthening the bonds between families and communities (Nabila et al., 2022; Wilcox, 2010). This social recognition of marriage has been found to reduce the risk of social isolation and loneliness among married couples (Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Cacioppo et al., 2000). Marriage is also essential for economic stability, as it provides a means of pooling resources, sharing expenses, and providing mutual support (Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Dew, 2009). Married couples are more likely to own a home, have higher levels of savings, and enjoy greater financial security (Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Dew, 2009). Marriage positively impacts physical and mental health (Nabila et al., 2022; Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Waite & Gallagher, 2000). Married individuals have better health outcomes and longer life expectancy than their unmarried counterparts (Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Waite & Gallagher, 2000). This is due to the emotional support, social connection, and healthy behaviors associated with marriage (Nabila et al., 2022; Waite & Gallagher, 2000). Marriage positively impacts child development, providing children with better educational outcomes, mental health, and socialization skills (Nabila et al., 2022; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994). Children raised in married households are less likely to experience poverty, abuse, and neglect and are more likely to thrive in their social and academic environments (Nabila et al., 2022; Gonczarowski et al., 2019; Dew, 2009; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994). According to Gottman & Silver (2012), a successful marriage can be attributed to several factors, such as communication skills, emotional intelligence, shared values, and trust. Therefore, this study is driven to understand the impact of trust in marriage, which is one of the common reasons marriages fail.

Trust is vital to a successful and lasting marriage (Siegrist, 2021). Trust forms the foundation of a healthy and happy marriage (Adamson & Hauck, 2019; Johnson et al., 2013). It fosters open communication, promotes stability, increases intimacy, and improves conflict resolution (Adamson & Hauck, 2019; Johnson et al., 2013; Reis et al., 2010). Trust creates a safe and supportive environment where both partners can express their feelings and needs (Reis et al., 2010). It allows partners to communicate openly and honestly without fear of judgment or retribution (Adamson & Hauck, 2019). When partners trust each other, they are more likely to feel secure, allowing them to build a deeper connection and intimacy (Johnson et al., 2013).

Moreover, trust provides stability and predictability in a marriage, as partners are less likely to worry about their spouse's actions or intentions (Reis et al., 2010). In addition, trust helps partners resolve conflicts more effectively. When partners trust each other, they are more likely to listen to each other's points of view and work together to find a mutually agreeable solution (Adamson & Hauck, 2019; Johnson et al., 2013). Trust is thus a critical factor in promoting marital satisfaction, longevity, and overall well-being (Reis et al., 2010), and mistrust neglect the latter.

Mistrust is a prevalent issue in marriages that can result from various factors. One of the most significant factors is infidelity, a leading cause of relationship mistrust (Whisman & Snyder, 2007). When one partner has cheated or been unfaithful, it can lead to feelings of betrayal and a breakdown of trust in the relationship. In addition, a lack of communication can also lead to mistrust, as partners may feel like they cannot express their thoughts or feelings freely (Van Der Voort, 2015). Whether in small lies or significant deceptions, dishonesty can also contribute to a lack of trust in marriages (Davidson et al., 2019). Control issues can also be a factor, as a partner who feels like the other is trying to control them may lose trust in the relationship (Peterson et al., 2014). Past experiences, such as betrayal in past relationships, can cause a person to have trust issues in marriage (Johnson et al., 2013). Insecurity is also linked to mistrust in relationships, as it can lead to feelings of inadequacy and suspicion (Gale et al., 2016), which can be sparked via social media platforms.

Social media platforms are digital communication channels that enable individuals and groups to interact, share, and create content in real-time (Ortiz-Ospina, & Roser, 2023). Some of the most widely used social media platform is Facebook. Facebook is a popular social networking site that allows users to connect with friends and family, share content, and join groups (Ortiz-Ospina, & Roser, 2023; Kross et al., 2013; Verduyn et al., 2015). Research has shown that Facebook use can positively and negatively affect individuals' well-being, depending on how the platform is used and how much time is spent (Kross et al., 2013; Verduyn et al., 2015). Regarding trust in marriages, a study by Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais (2009) found that the more time individuals spent on Facebook, the more likely they were to experience jealousy and suspicion in their romantic relationships (Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009).

Furthermore, Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith (2013) suggest that individuals who use Facebook to keep in touch with ex-partners or engage in flirtatious behavior are more likely to experience relationship conflict and lower levels of trust (Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013). Clayton et al. (2013) found that using Facebook can predict adverse relationship outcomes such as cheating, breakups, and divorce. However, this association is found to be mediated by conflicts that arise from Facebook usage and was moderated by the length of the relationship (Clayton et al. 2013). Specifically, the negative impact of Facebook use was more significant for

couples who had been together for less than three years and when conflicts surrounding Facebook use were present. These findings are consistent with an early national survey by Valenzuela et al. (2014), which showed that Facebook use was linked to higher divorce rates across different US states, even after controlling for other factors like income and income unemployment. In addition, social networking use was found to predict lower marital quality, marital dissatisfaction, and marital trouble (Valenzuela et al., 2014).

On the other hand, Lin & Utz (2015) suggest that Facebook use may positively impact trust in relationships. In doing so, Lin & Utz (2015) argue that individuals who were more satisfied with their romantic relationships were more likely to use Facebook to keep in touch with their partners and to display their relationship status publicly and, in some cases, affection. However, Clayton (2014) replicated her (2013) study with Twitter and found that higher usage was linked to adverse outcomes, with conflicts arising from Twitter use acting as a mediator.

Twitter is a widely used social media platform (Ortiz-Ospina & Roser, 2023). Twitter is a micro-blogging site that allows users to share short messages (tweets) with their followers (Ortiz-Ospina & Roser, 2023; Larsson and Moe, 2012; Jungherr et al., 2016). Larsson and Moe (2012); Jungherr et al. (2016) studies have found that Twitter can effectively disseminate information and promote social change, particularly in politics and activism. Regarding marriage, Twitter can be a valuable tool for couples to communicate and stay connected, leading to distractions, misunderstandings, and even jealousy (Kerkhof, Finkenauer, & Muusses, 2011). Additionally, Twitter has been linked to infidelity. Individuals may be exposed to temptations, such as reconnecting with old flames or engaging in flirtatious behavior with strangers, which can erode trust in a marriage (Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013). Duran, Kelly, and Rotaru (2018) Twitter use can contribute to lower levels of relationship satisfaction and intimacy in romantic relationships. In other words, excessive social media use can lead to a decrease in trust and an increase in jealousy, which can negatively impact relationship quality (Duran, Kelly, and Rotaru 2018). Yet, the impact of Twitter on trust in marriage ultimately depends on how it is used and how couples communicate and navigate potential challenges in their relationship. As such, establishing healthy boundaries around social media use and prioritizing open and honest communication can help maintain trust and strengthen the marital bond (Drouin, Vogel, Surbey, & Stills, 2019).

Instagram is another social media platform commonly used among various age groups (Ortiz-Ospina & Roser, 2023). Instagram is a visual-centric social media platform that allows users to share photos and videos (Ortiz-Ospina & Roser, 2023; Fardouly et al., 2019; Perloff, 2014). Instagram can positively and negatively affect individuals' self-esteem and body image, depending on the type of content viewed and shared (Fardouly et al., 2019; Perloff, 2014). Instagram can facilitate feelings of

connectedness and closeness between partners, particularly in long-distance relationships (Gibbs, Ellison & Lai, 2011). Couples can use Instagram to share their daily activities, exchange messages, and feel involved in each other's lives (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). This may enhance feelings of trust, especially when partners disclose more intimate information on the platform (Gibbs et al., 2011).

On the other hand, Instagram can also trigger feelings of jealousy, insecurity, and mistrust in a romantic relationship. Viewing images of attractive individuals, seeing partners liking or commenting on other people's posts, or discovering that they follow accounts that seem threatening or inappropriate, can lead to negative emotions and mistrust (Marshall, Bejanyan, Di Castro, & Lee, 2012; Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009). Moreover, when partners use Instagram to communicate with others in a flirtatious or secretive way or spend excessive time on the platform, this may lead to suspicions of infidelity or a breakdown of trust (Marshall et al., 2012; Muise et al., 2009). Ridgway and Clayton (2016) examined the relationship between posting selfies on Instagram and relationship outcomes. According to Ridgway and Clayton (2016), findings of posting selfies were related to Instagram-related conflicts, which in turn predicted adverse relationship outcomes, which is consistent with the findings of Marshall et al. (2012) and Muise et al. (2009). The effects of Instagram on trust in romantic relationships are complex and depend on how couples use the platform and the quality of their relationship. Partners must communicate openly about their feelings and expectations regarding Instagram, set clear boundaries, and develop strategies to minimize potential adverse effects on their relationship (Muise et al., 2009).

While Instagram is considered a lifestyle social medial platform, LinkedIn is a professional social medial platform (Ortiz-Ospina, & Roser, 2023). LinkedIn is a professional networking site that allows users to connect with colleagues and peers, share their work experience and skills, and search for job opportunities (Kluemper et al., 2015; Buil et al., 2018). LinkedIn can be an effective tool for job search and career development (Kluemper et al., 2015; Buil et al., 2018). Regarding trust in marriage and the impact of LinkedIn, limited empirical research directly investigates the relationship between LinkedIn use and trust in marriage. Furthermore, YouTube is a video-sharing site that allows users to upload, view, and share videos of people's health and well-being. Studies by Shensa et al. (2019) and Primack et al. (2014) have shown that YouTube can positively and negatively affect individuals' mental health, depending on the type of content viewed and shared. Like LinkedIn, no empirical studies examine the relationship between trust in marriage and the use of YouTube or the addiction to them in relation to trust in spouses.

Social media addiction can be defined empirically as “a behavioral addiction that involves excessive and compulsive use of social media platforms despite negative consequences” (Andreassen et al., 2017). In other words, social media addiction is a

behavioral addiction characterized by excessive use of social media platforms, which leads to negative consequences in different areas of a person's life, such as work, relationships, and mental health (Andreassen et al., 2017). It involves an uncontrollable urge to use social media, even when it interferes with daily activities and obligations (Andreassen et al., 2017). Social media addiction symptoms include manifested mood, cognition, physical and emotional reactions, and interpersonal and psychological problems (Hou et al., 2019). Social media addiction can significantly impact people's social lives, such as feelings of isolation and loneliness, as individuals may spend more time interacting with their screens than others (Tandoc, Ferrucci, & Duffy, 2015).

Several theories explain the mistrust in marriage, where social media addiction could play a role. Additionally, social media use may reduce our ability to communicate and connect with others, leading to decreased social skills (Rosen, Carrier, & Cheever, 2013). Moreover, social media addiction has been linked to increased anxiety and depression, as individuals may feel pressure to maintain a perfect online persona or compare themselves to others (Kross et al., 2013). Excessive use of social media can also negatively impact personal relationships, as partners may feel neglected or ignored due to their significant other's constant screen time (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016), which can break the trust in one's marriage.

Mistrust in marriage has been explored through various theoretical perspectives. Attachment theory proposes that early childhood experiences with caregivers shape one's relationship expectations and behaviors. Those with insecure attachment styles may struggle with trust and intimacy in adulthood (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Social exchange theory posits that individuals make rational decisions based on the costs and benefits of a relationship and that a perceived lack of trustworthiness or unmet needs can lead to mistrust and potential relationship dissolution (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Cognitive dissonance theory suggests that individuals experience discomfort when their beliefs or attitudes are inconsistent with their behaviors (Harmon-Jones, & Mills, 2019). Those who have violated their partner's trust may experience cognitive dissonance and attempt to rationalize their behavior (Harmon-Jones, & Mills, 2019; Festinger, 1957). Finally, jealousy theory suggests that jealousy is a natural and adaptive response to perceived threats to a relationship and that mistrust can arise (Sharpsteen & Kirkpatrick, 1997). A more recent theory is the dynamic goal theory, which suggests that individuals have multiple goals in marriage, which can be classified into three main categories, 1) personal growth, 2) companionship, and 3) instrumental (Li & Fung, 2011). It can be argued that young married individuals focus on personal growth, middle-aged focus more on instrumental, and older couples seek companionship goals (Li & Fung, 2011). The following sections illustrate the methodological approach of the study prior to discussing the outcomes concerning the theories outlined and the literature.

Methodology

The study implements a descriptive-analytical approach, a research approach or method that involves both descriptive and analytical techniques (Kumar, 2019). Descriptive research involves collecting and presenting data that describes or summarizes a particular phenomenon without attempting to draw inferences or conclusions (Kumar, 2019).

Sample

The data collection method is a questionnaire distributed and shared electronically. The study sample consists of students and faculty members of the Public Authority for Applied Education and Training, in addition to their relatives and friends. The total number of respondents is 483, divided by 140 males and 343 females.

Data collection methods

After reviewing the literature on the relationship between trust in marriage and social media platforms addiction, the theoretical framework is withdrawn from the approach used in previous studies, which are questionnaires.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire is used as a tool for the study to study the relationship between trust in marriage and social media platforms addiction. The questionnaire contains two main parts; the first part includes the participants' demographic information. The second part includes the measures of trust in marriage and social media platform addiction.

Table 1: Measuring trust in marriage.

#	Statement – Trust in marriage	Score
1	Trust in marriage – Husband	5
2	My expectations from my wife	5
3	Trust in marriage – Wife	5
4	My expectations from my husband	5

Table 2: Measuring social media platforms addiction.

#	Statement – Social media addiction	Score
1	The Impact of social media platforms on my mental and physical health	5
2	The impact of social media platforms on my social relationships	5
3	The impact of social media platforms on my professional or academic life	6
4	addiction to social media platforms	6
5	Escape from reality	6

Validity of the method:

Validity is “the inclusion of the questionnaire for all the elements that must be included in the analysis on the one hand, and the clarity of its paragraphs and

vocabulary on the other hand so that it is understandable to everyone who uses it" (Al-Assaf, 1433 AH, p. 310). To ensure the validity of the methodological approach, the following procedures are followed.

First, after drafting the questionnaire, it was presented to several specialized faculty members for their feedback. The faculty members' feedback included their opinion on the clarity of the phrases, the extent of their suitability for what they were developed for, and the extent to which the phrases are appropriate for their measurement purpose. The faculty members' comments were considered, and a percentage approved the statement agreed upon by the faculty members of more than (85%) or more.

Second, after ensuring the apparent validity of the questionnaire, the researcher ensured the internal consistency's validity by applying the questionnaire to an exploratory sample of (30) individuals outside the study sample and having the same characteristics as the study sample. Each question of each measurement, and the total sample answers for all the questions of the measurement to which the question belongs, using the SPSS software, table (3) outlines the outcome.

Table 3: The validity of the consistency between each question of measuring trust in marriage

Statement number	Correlation coefficient	Statement number	Correlation coefficient
1	.691**	17	.811**
2	.712**	18	.808**
3	.711**	19	.574**
4	.457**	20	.730**
5	.735**		
6	.727**		
7	.820**		
8	.728**		
9	.742**		
10	.701**		
11	.548**		
12	.738**		
13	.748**		
14	.730**		
15	.704**		
16	.725**		

**Significant at .001

*Significant at .05

It is clear from Table (3) that the correlation coefficients between the questions measuring trust in marriage and the total score of measuring trust in marriage "confidence" were all positive and statistically significant with medium and high values. In other words, measuring trust in marriage has a very high degree of

validity. Therefore, the result shows the validity of the questions and its validity in measuring trust in marriage.

Validity of the consistency between each question of measuring social media addiction

Statement number	Correlation coefficient	Statement number	Correlation coefficient
1	.818**	10	.772**
2	.821**	11	.786**
3	.768**	17	.842**
4	.794**	18	.874**
5	.895**	19	.733**
6	.860**	20	.849**
7	.842**	21	.611**
8	.906**	22	.640**
9	.932**	23	.533**
10	.920**	24	.641**
11	.838**	25	.656**
12	.832**	26	.893**
13	.919**	27	.844**
14	.914**	28	.787**

**Significant at .001

*Significant at .05

Table (4) shows the correlation coefficients between the questions measuring social media addiction which are all positive and statistically significant with medium and high values and, therefore, a very high degree of validity.

Reliability

The reliability test refers to conducting the same questionnaire with a different sample will give almost the same results. The reliability test was conducted via a Cronbach Alpha coefficient.

Table 5: Cronbach's Alpha coefficient

Measures	Number of questions	Chronbach Alpha
Trust in marriage	20	.883
Social Media Addiction	28	.860
TOTAL	48	.881

Table (5) reflects the reliability coefficients using Cronbach's Alpha method. The table above indicates a high-reliability coefficient using Cronbach's alpha method on all questions measuring trust in marriage and social media platforms addiction with a total score of 0.881, which indicates the questionnaire's validity to achieve the study's objectives and answers its questions.

Scores scale

The study monitored the scores using the five-point Likert scale, as each statement has five levels which are: 1) strongly disagree, 2) disagree, 3) neutral, 4) agree, and 5) strongly agree.

Analysis methods:

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) uses several appropriate statistical methods. After coding and entering the data into the computer, the answer was given: (strongly agree = 5), (agree = 4), (neutral = 3), (disagree = 2), (strongly disagree = 1), and then the Mean of the responses of the participants was calculated. To determine the length of the five-scale (lower and upper limits) used in the measurement, the range ($5-1 = 4$) was calculated, then divided by the number of scores of the scale to obtain the correct score length ($4/5 = 0.80$), after which these were added as shown in table (6).

Table 6: Degree of approval and extent of approval of the five-point Likert scale.

Value	Average		Response
	From	to	
1	1	1.80	Strongly disagree
2	1.81	2.60	Disagree
3	2.61	3.40	Neutral
4	3.41	4.20	Agree
5	4.21	5.00	Strongly agree

To serve the purposes of the study and analyze the data collected through the study tool on the field side, several statistical methods were used to find out the attitudes of the members of the study community about the questions raised, using appropriate statistical treatment methods using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

The analysis

Once the reliability and validity of the study are conducted, the demographic characteristics of the participants are outlined with Frequencies and Percentages. Then, the Mean and Standard deviation are measured. After, Pearson correlation coefficient and Cronbach's Alpha are measured.

Demographic characteristics of the participants

The frequencies and percentages of the participants of the study are calculated according to the following variables:

Age

Table 7: Age distribution of the study population according to the age variable

Age	Repetition	Percentage
Less than 18	17	3.5
19 – 25	274	56.7
26 – 35	77	15.9
36 – 45	83	17.2

More than 46	32	6.6
Total	483	100

It is clear from Table 7 that 56.7% of the participants' age ranges from 19 to 25 years, 17.2% of the participants ranged from 36 to 45 years old, and 15.9% of the total study population age between 26 to 35 years of age, and 6.6% are over 46 years old.

Academic level

Table 8: Academic level distribution

Education Level	Repetition	Percentage
High-School or equivalent	108	22.4
Diploma or equivalent	42	8.7
Bachelor or equivalent	291	60.2
Masters or equivalent	22	4.6
Ph.D. or equivalent	16	3.3
TOTAL	4	.8

Table 8 shows 60.2% of participants hold a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, 22.4% hold a high school diploma or its equivalent, 8.7% are holders of a diploma or its equivalent, and 4.6% are holders of a master's degree or its equivalent. Only 3.3% are Ph.D. or equivalent holders.

Residential Governance

Table 9: Residential governance distribution

Residential Goveranance	Repetition	Percentage
Al Asima	120	24.8
Al Ahmadi	101	20.9
Al Farwaniya	79	16.4
Hawally	65	13.5
Mubarak Al Kabir	46	9.5
Al Jahra	72	14.9
TOTAL	483	100

Table 9 above shows 24.8% of the study sample are residents of Al Asima, while 20.9% are residents of Al-Ahmadi Governorate, and 16.4% are residents of Farwaniya Governorate. Al Jahra residents formed 14.9% of the total study sample. 13.5% of the total participants are residents of Hawalli Governorate, and 9.5% are Mubarak Al-Kabeer Governorate residents.

Income per month

Table 10: Income per month distribution

Income	Repitition	Percentage
Less than 1000 KWD	335	69.4
1001 – 2000 KWD	84	17.4
More than 2000 KWD	64	13.3
TOTAL	483	100

KWD is Kuwaiti Dinars.

From Table 10 above, 69.4% of participants have a monthly income of 1000 Kuwaiti dinars (KWD) or less. 17.4% of participants have a monthly income between 1001 to 2000 KWD. While participants who earned more than 2000KWD per month formed 13.3% of the total study sample.

Gender

Table 11: Gender distribution of the study population according to the gender variable

Gender	Repetition	Percentage
Male	140	29.0
Female	343	71.0
TOTAL	483	100

It is clear from Table 11 that 71% of the total members of the study sample are females, and 29% are males.

Males Occupations

Table 12: Males Occupations distribution

Occupation	Repetition	Percentage
Student – Public university or College	38	27.1
Employees in the public sector	69	49.3
Employees in the private sector	25	17.9
Unemployed	2	1.4
Retired	6	4.3
Total	140	100

Table 12 illustrates the occupations of the male participants of the study. 49.3% of the total males are employed in the government sector, and 27.1% are students at a public university, college, or equivalent. While 17.9% are employed in the private sector, and 4.3% of the total males in this study are retired.

Males marital status

Table 13: Male marital status distribution

Marital status	Repetition	Percentage
Single	63	45.0
Married	74	52.9
Divorced	3	2.1
TOTAL	140	100

52.9% of the total males in this study are married, 45% are single, and 2.1% are divorced, as shown in Table 13.

Females' occupation

Table 14: Females occupation distribution

Occupation	Repetition	Percentage
Student – Public University or College	263	76.7
Student – Private University or College	9	2.6
Employee in the Public sector	48	14.0

Employees in the Private sector	10	2.9
Unemployed	7	2.0
Retired	6	1.7
TOTAL	343	100

Table 14 shows 76.7% of females in this study are students at a public university, college, or equivalent, and 14% are employed in the public sector. While 2.9% of the female participants are employed in the private sector, and 2.6% are students in a private university, college, or equivalent. On the other hand, 2.0% are unemployed, and 1.7% are retired.

Females' marital status

Table 15: Females marital status distribution

Marital status	Repetition	Percentage
Single	238	49.3
Married	77	15.9
Divorced	23	4.8
Widow	5	1.0
TOTAL	343	100.0

It is clear from Table 15 that 49.3% of the female participants are single, 15.9% are married, and 4.8% are separated. While only 1.0% of the female participants are widowed.

Measuring trust in marriage – The husband

Table 16: Mean (M) and Standard Deviations (S.D.) – Trust in marriage – Husband

#	Statement	M	S.D.	Rank	Agreeability
1	I find my wife trustworthy, and I don't mind her participating in activities others find threatening to our marriage	3.57	1.187	4	agree
2	When I do not know the response of my wife – I feel confident, safe, and relaxed telling her personal matter, even the one im does not provide of	2.89	1.267	5	Neutral
3	Though time may change and the future is uncertain, I know my wife will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support	4.35	.898	1	Strongly agree
4	I am certain my wife won't be something that I dislike or will embarrass me	4.43	.760	1	Strongly agree
5	I have found that my wife is usually dependable, especially when it comes to things that are important to me	4.31	.859	1	Strongly agree
	TOTAL	3.91	0.99		Agree

Table 16 shows the dimension of trust in marital relations of the husband, which came larger, as the general average is 3.91. The degree of agreement (I agree), with a 0.99 standard deviation, which is a low value indicating the homogeneity of the opinions of the study sample about the extent of trust the husband has in his wife.

The standard deviation values range between 0.76 - 1.267, and all items had low values. These values explain the homogeneity of the opinions of the study sample about these statements, apart from statements 1 and 2, which have high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample about these statements.

The 4th statement came in the first (I am certain my wife won't be something that I dislike or will embarrass me), with a Mean of 4.43, a Standard Deviation of 0.76, and an agreeability of (I strongly agree). The 2nd statement (I When I do not know the response of my wife – I feel confident, safe, and relaxed telling her matter, even the one' im not provide of) reflected a Mean of 2.89 and a Standard Deviation of 1.267, and a degree of agreement (neutral).

Measuring my expectations from my wife (intentions - considering my happiness)

Table No. (17) Arithmetic means and standard deviations for the items of my expectations from my husband (good faith - considering my happiness)

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	I can rely on my wife to react in a positive way when I expose my weakness to her.	4.51	.745	γ	Strongly agree
2	When I share my problems with my wife, I know she will respond in a loving way, even before I say anything.	4.19	1.002	γ	Agree
3	I am confident my wife won't cheat on me even if she knows she won't get caught.	4.70	.697	ι	Strongly agree
4	Sometimes I avoid my wife because I can't predict how she would react, which could create a conflict	3.35	1.164	ο	Neutral
5	When my wife gives me unlikely excuses, I'm confident she's telling the truth.	3.76	1.108	ξ	Agree
TOTAL		4.10	0.94	Agree	

It appears from Table 17 that the dimension of the husband's expectations from his wife (intentions - considering my happiness) came to a high degree, as the Mean average is 4.10 and the degree of agreeability (I agree), with a Standard Deviation of 0.94, which is a low value indicating homogeneity of opinions. The values of the Standard Deviations range of all the statements between 1.164 and 0.697. This explains the divergence of the opinions of the study sample towards the statement, except for the 1st and 3rd, which have low values. This explains the homogeneity of the study sample's opinions about these statements.

The 3rd statement came in the first (I am confident my wife won't cheat on me even if she knows she won't get caught.), with a Mean of 4.7, a Standard Deviation of 0.69, and a degree of agreeability of (strongly agree). On the other hand, the 4th statement came in the last (Sometimes I avoid my wife because I can't predict how

she would react, which could create a conflict) with a Mean of 3.35, a Standard Deviation of 1.164, and a (neutral) agreeability level.

Trust in marriage - The wife

Table 18: Mean and Standard Deviations for Trust in Marriage – The wife

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	I find my husband trustworthy, and I don't mind her participating in activities others find threatening to our marriage	3.52	.968	4	agree
2	When I do not know the response of my husband – I feel confident, safe, and relaxed telling her personal matter, even the one I do not provide of	2.99	1.198	5	Neutral
3	Though time may change and the future is uncertain, I know my husband will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support	3.94	.951	1	Agree
4	I am certain my husband won't be something that I dislike or will embarrass me	3.56	1.070	3	Agree
5	I have found that my husband is usually dependable, especially when it comes to things that are important to me	3.91	.976	2	Agree
TOTAL		3.58	1.03		Agree

Table 18 illustrates trust in marriage from the wife's perspective. The results show a large Mean equal to 3.58 and a level of agreeability at (I agree), with a Standard Deviation of 1.03, which is a high value indicating the divergence of the opinions of the study sample. The standard deviation values range between 1.198 and 0.951, and all statements had low values. This explains the homogeneity of the opinions of the study sample regarding the statements, except for statements 2 and 4, which have high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample about these statements.

The 3rd statement came in the first (Though time may change and future is uncertain, I know my husband will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support), with a Mean of 3.94, a Standard Deviation of 0.951, and a level of agreeability at (I agree). On the other hand, the 2nd statement (When I do not know the response of my husband – I feel confident, safe, and relaxed telling her personal matter even the one I do not provide of) came in the last with a Mean of 2.99, and a Standard Deviation of 1.198, and a (neutral) level of agreeability.

Measuring my expectations from my husband (intentions - considering my happiness)

Table 19: The arithmetic means and standard deviations for the items of my expectations from my husband (intentions - considering my happiness)

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	I can rely on my wife to react in a positive way when I expose my weakness to her.	3.97	1.063	1	Agree
2	When I share my problems with my wife, I know she will respond in a loving way, even before I say anything.	3.79	1.092	2	Agree
3	I am confident my wife won't cheat on me even if she knows she won't get caught.	3.32	1.094	3	Neutral
4	Sometimes I avoid my wife because I can't predict how she would react, which could create a conflict	3.43	1.141	4	Agree
5	When my wife gives me unlikely excuses, I'm confident she's telling the truth.	2.94	1.185	5	Neutral
TOTAL		3.49	1.12		Agree

Table 19 above reflects the dimensions of (my expectations from my husband (good faith - considering my happiness)) which came to a large degree, with a Mean of 3.49 and a level of agreeability at (I agree), with a Standard Deviation of 1.12, which is a high value that indicates a divergence of opinions among the study sample. The values of the Standard Deviations range between 1.185 and 1.063, and all the statements had high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample regarding the statements.

The 1st came in first (I can rely on my wife to react in a positive way when I expose my weakness to her.), with a Mean of 3.97, a Standard Deviation of 1.063, and a level of agreeability (I agree). While the 5th statement (When my wife gives me unlikely excuses, I'm confident she's telling the truth.) with a Mean of 2.94, a Standard Deviation of 1.185, and a degree of agreement at (neutral).

Measuring social media addiction

The impact of social media platforms on my mental and physical health.

Table 20: The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items of the impact of social media platforms on my professional or academic life

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	Sometimes the use of social media platforms overwhelms taking care of myself	3.13	1.181	2	Neutral
2	Social media platforms affected my sleep times	3.77	1.142	1	Agree
3	I suffer from health problems (neck pains, back pains, eyes pains, etc.) due to the use of social media platforms	3.19	1.263	3	Neutral

4	It happened that I forgot to eat because of my preoccupation with social media platforms	2.60	1.249	ξ	Disagree
5	I went through a psychological problems, such as depression, because of social media platforms	2.46	1.191	ο	Disagree
TOTAL		٢,٠٣	١,٢١	Neutral	

Table 20 shows the impact of social media platforms on my psychological and physical health, which came at a medium level, as the average Mean equals 3.03 and the level of agreeability at (neutral), with a Standard Deviation of 1.21. These high values indicate the divergence of opinions among the study sample. The values of the Standard Deviations range between 1.263 and 1.142. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample among the questions.

The 2nd question came in the first order: (Social media platforms affected my sleep times), with a mean of 3.77, a Standard Deviation of 1.142, and a degree of agreement at (I agree). The 5th question came in the last order: (I went through a psychological problem such as depression because of social media platforms) with a Mean of 2.46, a Standard Deviation of 1.191, and a degree of agreeability at (I do not agree).

Measuring the impact of social media platforms on my social relationships.

Table 21: The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the paragraphs on the impact of social media platforms on my social relationships.

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	It so happened that I neglected my friends because of my preoccupation with social media platforms	2.58	1.227	٢	Disagree
2	It happened that I neglected my family / husband / wife / mother / father because of my preoccupation with social media platforms	2.49	1.250	٣	Disagree
3	Using social media platforms caused me problems with those who are close and dear to me	2.67	1.230	١	Neutral
4	I prefer spending my time on social media platforms than my friends	2.42	1.134	ξ	Disagree
5	People criticize me for the time I spend on social media platforms	2.42	1.132	ο	Disagree
TOTAL		٢,٥٢	١,١٩	Disagree	

It is clear from the above table 21 that the impact of social media platforms on my social relations is weak, with a 2.52 Mean and a level of agreeability at (I do not agree), and a Standard Deviation of 1.19, which reflects a high value indicating the divergence of the opinions of the study sample. The Standard Deviation values range

between 1.25 and 1.132, and all statements had high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample regarding the questions.

The 3rd question came in the first order: (Using social media platforms caused problems with those close and dear to me), with a 2.67 Mean, a 1.23 Standard Deviation, and a (neutral) level of agreeability. The 5th question: (People criticize me for the time I spend on social media platforms) with a Mean of 2.42, a Standard Deviation of 1.132, and a degree of agreement (I do not agree).

Measuring the impact of social media platforms on my professional or academic life.

Table 22: The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items of the impact of social media platforms on my professional or academic life.

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	My preoccupation with social media platforms negatively affected my studies and my work	2.81	1.240	γ	Neutral
2	Because of spending a lot of time on social media platforms, I neglected some activities at school or work	2.72	1.189	ο	Neutral
3	Due to social media platforms, I cannot complete my work on time	2.78	1.210	ς	Neutral
4	My productivity declined due to social media platforms	2.75	1.190	ξ	Neutral
5	The more you work, the more you feel the need to enter social media platforms	2.95	1.236	ι	Neutral
6	The use of social media platforms has caused me problems in my life (personal, professional, or academic).	2.54	1.188	τ	Disagree
	TOTAL	2,76	1,21		Neutral

Table 22 shows the statistical measures of measuring the impact of social media platforms on one's professional or academic life, which came to a moderate degree, with a 2.76 Mean and the degree of agreement at (neutral), and a Standard Deviation of 1.21. The measures reported high values that indicate the divergence of opinions among the study sample. The values of the Standard Deviations range between 1.24 and 1.188, and all the questions had high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample. The first order came with question No. (5): (The more you work, the more you feel the need to enter social media platforms), with a Mean of 2.95, a Standard Deviation of 1.236, and a degree of agreement of (neutral). On the other hand, the last order came with question No. (6): (The use of social media platforms has caused me problems in my life (personal, professional, or academic) with a Mean of 2.54, a Standard Deviation of 1.188, and a degree of agreement of (I do not agree)).

Measuring social media platforms' addiction

Table 23: The arithmetic means and standard deviations of addiction items on social media platforms

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	I do not prioritize my hobbies and leisure time because of social media platforms	2.58	1.181	7	Disagree
2	Sometimes I spend more time than I intended on social media platforms	3.71	1.109	1	Agree
3	In the event of an internet outage, I am thinking hard about how I can access social media platforms	3.24	1.272	2	Neutral
4	I can't explain how I spend so much time on social media without noticing the time	3.65	1.110	3	Agree
5	Whenever I want to get off social media platforms - I tell myself - soon	3.47	1.209	4	Agree
6	I think my life would be boring without social media platforms	3.05	1.254	5	Neutral
TOTAL		3.28	1.19		Neutral

Table 23 outlines the dimensions of social media platforms addiction measures which came to a medium degree, with a 3.28 Mean and a degree of agreement (neutral). The Standard Deviation is 1.19, which is a high value that indicates the divergence of the opinions among the study sample. The values of the Standard Deviations range between 1.272 and 1.109, and all the questions had high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample. The 2nd question came in the first place: (Sometimes I spend more time than I intended on social media platforms), with an average mean of 3.71, a Standard Deviation of 1.109, and a degree of agreement (I agree). While the 1st question came in last: (I do not prioritize my hobbies and leisure times because of social media platforms) with a Mean of 2.58, a Standard Deviation of 1.181, and a degree of agreement (I do not agree).

Measuring escaping reality

Table 24: The arithmetic means and standard deviations of escaping reality items

#	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Agreeability
1	Whenever I get bored with my problems, I turn to social media platforms	3.61	1.164	2	Agree
2	I prefer browsing social media platforms to overcome the negative things in my life	3.41	1.225	3	Agree
3	I use social media platforms to escape from my personal problems	3.10	1.264	4	Neutral
4	When I browse social media platforms, I forget my problems	3.16	1.206	5	Neutral
5	I use social media platforms when feeling lonely	3.81	1.084	1	Agree
TOTAL		3.42	1.19		Agree

The above table (24) shows the Mean, Standard Deviation, and agreeability of the escaping reality measures. The table reported a 3.42 average Mean and a degree of agreement (I agree), with a Standard Deviation of 1.19. these figures suggest a high value indicating the divergence of the opinions of the study sample. The Standard Deviations range between 1.264 and 1.084, and all items had high values. This explains the divergence of opinions of the study sample.

The 5th question came in the first order: (I use social media platforms when feeling lonely), with a Mean of 3.81, a Standard Deviation of 1.084, and a degree of agreement (I agree). The 3rd question came in the last order: (I use social media platforms to escape from my personal problems) with a Mean of 3.1, a Standard Deviation of 1.264, and an agreement degree at (neutral).

The hypothesis

This paper outlines the relationship between social media platforms (social media addiction) and trust between spouses. To do so, the following study hypotheses were verified:

The first hypothesis: Social media platforms have an impact on the wife's trust in her husband.

A multiple regression test is applied to verify the validity of this hypothesis table 27 outlines the outcome:

Table 25: The impact of social media platforms addiction on the wife's trust in her husband

Independent variables	Regression coefficients	T-Test	Significance
Fixed value	18.097	3.665	.000
Trust in marriage – wife	-.023	-.095	.925
My Expectations from My Husband (Good Intentions - Considering My Happiness)	-.036	-.116	.908
Correlation coefficient = 0.030	Determination coefficient = - 0.027		
F = 0.032	P value = 0.969		

Table 25 shows the correlation coefficient at 0.030, which indicates the correlation is statistically insignificant between addiction to social media platforms and the wife's trust in her husband. The value of F is 0.032, which is also an insignificant value at a level of significance equal to 0.969, which is greater than 0.05, which indicates that there is no statistically significant effect of social media platforms on the wife's trust in her husband.

The second hypothesis: Social media platforms have an impact on the husband's trust in his wife.

To verify the validity of this hypothesis, the impact of social media addiction on the husband's trust in his wife was studied, a multiple regression test was conducted, and Table 26 below outlines the results.

Table 26: The impact of social media platforms addiction on the husband's trust in his wife

Independent variables	Regression coefficients	T-Test	Significance
Fixed value	19.093	4.773	.000
Trust in marriage – husband	-.367	-1.263	.210
My Expectations from My Wife (Good Intentions - Considering My Happiness)	.376	1.373	.174
Correlation coefficient = 0.165	Determination coefficient = -0.001		
F = 1.037	P value = 0.360		

Table 26 finds that the correlation coefficient is 0.165, which indicates an insignificant relationship between addiction to social media platforms and the husband's trust in his wife. The value of F is 1.037, a non-statistically significant value at a level of significance equal to 0.360, which is greater than (0.05), which indicates that there is no statistically significant effect of social media platforms on the husband's trust in his wife.

Discussion

This study outlines the effect of social media platform usage on trust in spouses. In doing so, the paper divided the impact of social media into four main categories to understand better how social media platforms affect their life. Three of the measurements (The impact of social media platforms on my mental and physical health., Measuring the impact of social media platforms on my social relationships. Measuring the impact of social media platforms on my professional or academic life., Measuring social media platforms' addiction) all reported (neutral) levels of agreement, apart from (Measuring escaping reality), which reported an (agree) toward it. In effect, the participants' sample is relatively heavy users of social media platforms but does not fall within the addiction definition. On the other hand, trust between both spouses came in at (agree), which is relatively high. In addition, the measuring expectation of both spouses came in at (agree) as well. Finally, the paper found that social media usage does not impact trust and expectations between spouses.

Literature suggests, as argued by Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais (2009); Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith (2013), spending a longer time on social media platforms, sparks jealousy and suspicion in their romantic relationships and, therefore, relationship conflict and lower levels of trust, which is inconsistent with this study findings.

However, this study's findings are in line with Lin & Utz (2015); Drouin, Vogel, Surbey, & Stills (2019); Gibbs et al. (2011), who argued that the usage of social media should not necessarily lead to mistrust but could lead to greater bond and trust between spouses. Several possible explanations are presented, explaining the findings of this study. First, other factors maintain trust between spouses, as social exchange theory suggests. Those partners who make rational decisions based on the cost and benefits of these decisions on their relationship are more likely to have greater levels of trust that would outweigh other factors that would affect their trusting relationship.

Furthermore, social media platforms can outline a person's behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes. Those in a healthy relationship who share it on social media platforms, including beliefs and attitudes, can fall within cognitive dissonance theory as their beliefs or attitudes are consistent with their behaviors and, in effect, tend to have higher trust (Harmon-Jones, & Mills, 2019). Furthermore, the literature argues that the impact of social media on trust between spouse's dependent on how the spouse uses social media platforms, which dynamic goal theory can explain (Li & Fung, 2011). For instance, young and newly married couples seek personal growth (Li & Fung, 2011). Therefore, they are more likely to use social media for personal growth rather than cheating on their partner or seeking companionship as newlyweds (Li & Fung, 2011). According to dynamic goal theory, middle-aged individuals seek instrumental guidance (Li & Fung, 2011); in effect, those in healthy relationships are utilizing social media platforms to get instrumental guidance in reaching their goals. On the other hand, seniors are likely to use social media platforms to stay connected with loved ones and find companionship.

It is clear from the literature that the relationship between trust in a spouse and usage of social media platforms highly depends on how one uses it and the type of relationship he or she is in. Those in a toxic and problematic relationship tend to escape into social media to avoid their problems, which can result in deeper problems such as mistrust.

It is worth noting that much of the literature focuses on Facebook, where one's social status is defined and mainly designed to connect with others. Yet, there has been a significant drop in the use of Facebook as a social media platform lately in Kuwait, which is the focus of this study. More users are using other platforms which does not focus on one's social status but promote content. People today tend to attend to social medial platforms as a form of entertainment and stay connected with the latest news, updates, and trends and not only connecting with friends and family. Furthermore, people are starting to treat their social media presence as their public image and behave in manners that would not jeopardize their relationships at home or even their careers.

Conclusion

Marriage is an essential institution with various personal and societal benefits. Marriage provides companionship, emotional support, and intimacy between two committed individuals. Marriage is the foundation for starting a family and raising children, providing a stable environment for children to grow up in. Marriage represents a significant commitment between two people to share their lives and support each other through the ups and downs of life, which can provide a sense of stability and security in a relationship. One of the most important elements in a successful marriage is trust. Various factors can influence one's trust, defined as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party." (Ueno et al., 2022) in their spouse, such as social media platforms.

Social media platforms are defined as "a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content." (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). Various studies suggest that excessive social media use can negatively impact trust in spousal relationships (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011). These studies have found that spouses who spend too much time or are addicted to social media platforms may experience decreased trust, jealousy, and overall dissatisfaction with their relationship (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010; Clayton, Nagurney, & Smith, 2013; Elphinston & Noller, 2011).

Yet, there are some inconsistencies in the literature as other studies suggest social media platforms could strengthen trust in one marriage, as argued by Lin & Utz (2015) suggest that Facebook, which is a social media platform usage, can have a positive influence on trust within romantic relationships. Lin & Utz (2015) argue that individuals who were more satisfied with their relationships were more likely to use Facebook to stay in touch with their partners and publicly display their relationship status and affection. The literature concludes by arguing that social media platforms' impact on trust within marriage depends heavily on how spouses use social media platforms and whether other factors contribute to and push spouses to misuse social media platforms that could spark mistrust between two spouses.

This paper aims to illustrate the effect of medial social platform usage and addiction on spouses' trust and mistrust in their partners. The paper uses attachment, social exchange, cognitive dissonance, and dynamic goal theories to understand the trust dynamics between spouses and how social media platforms could meddle between them.

The study adopts a descriptive analytic approach, examining two main hypotheses. The first hypothesis suggests that social media platforms have an impact on the wife's trust in her husband. The second suggests that social media platforms have an

impact on the husband's trust in his wife. Both hypotheses are rejected as the data show no impact of social media platform use on spouses' trust in one another. The results of this study are consistent with previous research conducted by Lin & Utz (2015), Drouin, Vogel, Surbey, & Stills (2019), and Gibbs et al. (2011). These studies argue that using social media does not necessarily lead to mistrust.

The paper argues that other factors in a marriage can substantially nourish one's trust in their partner, as suggested by social exchange theory and dynamic goal theory. Furthermore, the spouses' behaviors vary according to their age. Therefore, their use and purpose in social media platforms can depend on their age and stage in the relationship, as explained by the dynamic goal theory. It can be argued that young and middle-aged couples are on social media for career, personal development, and entertainment, in addition to being updated and staying connected with friends and family, which are most study participants. The findings of this study can contribute to the Ministry of Communication of Kuwait's efforts in reaching young couples through recruiting, education, and awareness programs, in addition to all other entities. Further research is needed to identify the factors within marriages that can lead to higher levels of trust.

Reference List

- Adamson, S. J., & Hauck, J. N. (2019). The importance of trust in romantic relationships: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 18(2), 88-108.
- Andreassen, C. S., Pallesen, S., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). The relationship between addictive use of social media and video games and symptoms of psychiatric disorders: A large-scale cross-sectional study. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 6(3), 190-198.
- Bielinowicz, A. (2021). The Young Generation on Family and Marriage in Social Media. In *Forum Teologiczne* (No. 22, pp. 95-109). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego w Olsztynie.
- Buil, I., Catalán, S., & Martínez, E. (2018). The impact of social media on consumers' attitudes toward brands. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 240-248.
- Burke, M., & Kraut, R. (2016). The relationship between Facebook use and well-being depends on communication type and tie strength. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 21(4), 265-281.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkley, L. C., Ernst, J. M., Burleson, M., Berntson, G. G., Nourian, B., ... & Spiegel, D. (2000). Loneliness within a nomological net: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34(1), 20-27.
- Choi, E. W., Özer, Ö., & Zheng, Y. (2020). Network trust and trust behaviors among executives in supply chain interactions. *Management Science*, 66(12), 5823-5849.
- Clayton, R. B., Nagurney, A., & Smith, J. R. (2013). Cheating, breakup, and Divorce: Is Facebook Use to Blame? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(10), 717-720.
- Clayton, R. B. (2014). The third wheel: The impact of Twitter use on relationship infidelity and divorce. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 17(7), 425-430.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2010). *The marriage-go-round: The state of marriage and the family in America today*. Vintage.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Harvard University Press.
- Davidson, T. M., Ross, S. M., & Esposito-Smythers, C. (2019). Lying behavior in romantic relationships: Links to attachment and relations with psychological and relational adjustment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(4), 1078-1095.

Dew, J. (2009). Two sides of the same coin? The differing roles of assets and consumer debt in marriage. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 30(1), 20-31.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628.

Doss, B. D., Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2004). Why do couples seek marital therapy? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35(6), 608-614. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.6.608

Drouin, M., Vogel, K. N., Surbey, A., & Stills, J. R. (2019). Let's talk about sexting, baby: Computer-mediated sexual behaviors in committed relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(1), 63-73.

Duran, R. L., Kelly, L., & Rotaru, T. (2018). The impact of social media use on romantic relationships: A study with young adults. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 17(3), 253-266.

Edelman, L. B. (2001). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(3), 597–626.

Elphinston, R. A., & Noller, P. (2011). Time to face it! Facebook intrusion and the implications for romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(11), 631-635.

Fardouly, J., Diedrichs, P. C., Vartanian, L. R., & Halliwell, E. (2019). Social comparisons on social media: the impact of Facebook on young women's body image concerns and mood. *Body Image*, 28, 43-52.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford University Press.

Fineman, M. A. (1995). The neoliberal assault on the family. *Feminist legal studies*, 3(1), 7-36.

Gale, J., Wink, P., & Graham, J. (2016). Understanding the association between relationship insecurity and communication within romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33(7), 929-948.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations* (pp. 213–237). Basil Blackwell.

Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 1–19.

Gibbs, J. L., Ellison, N. B., & Lai, C. H. (2011). First comes love, then comes Google: An investigation of uncertainty reduction strategies and self-disclosure in online dating. *Communication Research*, 38(1), 70-100.

Girgis, S., George, R. P., & Anderson, R. T. (2011). What is marriage? *Harv. JL & Pub. Pol'y*, 34, 245.

Gonczarowski, Y. A., Nisan, N., Ostrovsky, R., & Rosenbaum, W. (2019). A stable marriage requires communication. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 118, 626-647.

Gottman, J. M., & Silver, N. (2012). What makes marriage work: How to build trust and avoid betrayal. Simon and Schuster.

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (Eds.). (2019). Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in psychology. American Psychological Association.

Helsper, E. J., & Whitty, M. T. (2010). Netiquette within married couples: Agreement about acceptable online behavior and surveillance between partners. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 916-926.

Hou, Y., Xiong, D., Jiang, T., Song, L., & Wang, Q. (2019). Social media addiction: Its impact, mediation, and intervention. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of psychosocial research on cyberspace*, 13(1).

Huang, C. C., Campbell, L., & Campos, B. (2018). How do we fall back in love? A review of love recovery through mindfulness and compassion interventions. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 44(1), 93-103.

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.

Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(1), 3-34. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.118.1.3

Kerkhof, P., Finkenauer, C., & Muusses, L. D. (2011). Relational consequences of compulsive Internet use: A longitudinal study among newlyweds. *Human Communication Research*, 37(2), 147-173.

Kluemper, D. H., Rosen, P. A., & Mossholder, K. W. (2015). Social networking websites, personality ratings, and the organizational context: More than meets the eye? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 405-424.

Kirschner, P. A., & Karpinski, A. C. (2010). Facebook and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1237-1245.

Kumar, R. (2019). Research methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners. Sage Publications.

Kramer, R. M. (2009). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 569–598.

Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D. S., Lin, N., ... & Ybarra, O. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. *PLoS One*, 8(8), e69841.

Larsson, A. O., & Moe, H. (2012)

Lerman, R. I. (2002). The impact of marriage and divorce on children. *Future of Children*, 12(1), 116-138.

Li, T., & Fung, H. H. (2011). The dynamic goal theory of marital satisfaction. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(3), 246-254.

Lin, L. Y., & Utz, S. (2015). The emotional responses of browsing Facebook: Happiness, envy, and the role of tie strength. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 29-38.

Lin, L. Y., Sidani, J. E., Shensa, A., Radovic, A., Miller, E., Colditz, J. B., ... & Primack, B. A. (2018). Association between social media use and depression among US young adults. *Depression and Anxiety*, 35(9), 784-791.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1969). *The elementary structures of kinship*. Beacon Press.

Mark, K. P., Janssen, E., & Milhausen, R. R. (2011). Infidelity in heterosexual couples: demographic, interpersonal, and personality-related predictors of extradyadic sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40(5), 971-982. doi:10.1007/s10508-011-9771-z

Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, K., Di Castro, G., & Lee, R. A. (2012). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook-related jealousy and surveillance in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 19(1), 1-22.

McDaniel, B. T., Drouin, M., & Cravens, J. D. (2017). Do you have anything to hide? Infidelity-related behaviors on social media sites and marital satisfaction. *Computers in human behavior*, 66, 88-95.

McDaniel, B. T., & Coyne, S. M. (2016). “Technoference”: The interference of technology in couple relationships and implications for women’s personal and relational well-being. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 5(1), 85-98.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Harvard University Press.

McKay, K. M., Doss, B. D., & Simpson, L. E. (2016). Treatment of low sexual desire in couples: A conceptual overview and couple-based treatment approach. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 47, 50-67.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change. Guilford Press.

Muise, A., Christofides, E., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More information than you ever wanted: Does Facebook bring out the green-eyed monster of jealousy? *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 12(4), 441-444.

Nabila, R., Roswiyani, R., & Satyadi, H. (2022, April). A literature review of factors influencing early marriage decisions in Indonesia. In 3rd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2021) (pp. 1392-1402). Atlantis Press.

Ortiz-Ospina, E., & Roser, M. (2023). The rise of social media. Our world is in data.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, C. A., Caughlin, J. P., & Huston, T. L. (1999). The tripartite nature of marital communication: Implications for marital stability and satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(4), 873-893. doi:10.2307/354016

Johnson, S. M., Makinen, J. A., & Millikin, J. W. (2013). Attachment injuries in couple relationships: A new perspective on impasses in couples therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 39(3), 276-283.

Jungherr, A., Jürgens, P., & Schoen, H. (2016). Why the pirate party won the German Election of 2009 or the Trouble with Predictions: a response to Tumasjan, A., Sprenger, T. O., Sander, P. G., & Welpe, I. M. (2011). *Social Science Computer Review*, 30(2), 229-236.

Pauli, J. (2022). Futuring together: Inside and outside of marriage in Namibia. In *African Futures* (pp. 331-337). Brill.

Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2014). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35(5), 204-210.

Peterson, Z. D., Janssen, E., & Heiman, J. R. (2014). The association between sexual aggression and HIV risk behavior in heterosexual men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(2), 245-263.

Ueno, T., Sawa, Y., Kim, Y., Urakami, J., Oura, H., & Seaborn, K. (2022, April). Trust in human-ai interaction: Scoping out models, measures, and methods. In CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts (pp. 1-7).

Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., & Holmes, J. G. (2010). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness. *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*, 201-225.

Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 948-958.

Schilke, O., Reimann, M., & Cook, K. S. (2021). Trust in social relations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47, 239-259.

Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of big five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(2), 173-212. doi:10.1177/0022022106297299

Sela, Y., Zach, L., & Braun-Lewensohn, O. (2018). Social media addiction and job performance among employees and entrepreneurs. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 21(9), 581-586.

Sharpsteen, D. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1997). Romantic jealousy and adult romantic attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(3), 627-640.

Siegrist, M. (2021). Trust and risk perception: A critical review of the literature. *Risk analysis*, 41(3), 480-490.

Tandoc, E. C., Ferrucci, P., & Duffy, M. (2015). Facebook use, envy, and depression among college students: Is Facebooking depressing? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 43, 139-146.

Valenzuela, S., Halpern, D., & Katz, J. E. (2014). Social network sites, marriage well-being, and divorce: Survey and state-level evidence from the United States. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 36, 94-101.

Van Der Voort, J. R. (2015). The relationship between communication patterns and satisfaction with romantic relationships: An exploration of the construct of communication patterns and their impact on relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32(7), 912-927.

Waite, L. J., & Gallagher, M. (2000). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. New York: Broadway Books.

Whisman, M. A., & Snyder, D. K. (2007). Sexual infidelity in a national survey of American women: Differences in prevalence and correlates as a function of method of assessment. *Journal of Family*

Wilcox, W. B. (2010). Why marriage matters: Thirty conclusions from the social sciences. New York: Institute for American Values.

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5), 1816-1836.