

Rochester Institute of Technology

RIT Digital Institutional Repository

Theses

9-4-2013

Facebook and Relationships: A Study of How Social Media Use is Affecting Long-Term Relationships

Rianne C. Farrugia
rcf1044@rit.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.rit.edu/theses>



Part of the [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Media Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Farrugia, Rianne C., "Facebook and Relationships: A Study of How Social Media Use is Affecting Long-Term Relationships" (2013). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology. Accessed from

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the RIT Libraries. For more information, please contact repository@rit.edu.

The Rochester Institute of Technology

Department of Communication

College of Liberal Arts

Facebook and Relationships:

A Study of How Social Media Use is Affecting Long-Term Relationships

by

Rianne C. Farrugia

A Thesis submitted

in partial fulfillment of the Masters of Science degree

in Communication & Media Technologies

Degree Awarded:

September 4, 2013

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of

Rianne C. Farrugia presented on September 4, 2013.

Patrick Scanlon, Ph.D.
Chairman and Professor of Communication
Department of Communication

Tracy Worrell, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Thesis Advisor

John E. Edlund, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Thesis Advisor

Rudy Pugliese, Ph.D.
Professor of Communication
Director, Communication & Media
Technologies Graduate Degree Program
Department of Communication

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Introduction.....	5
Technology and Relationships	7
Social Penetration Theory	9
Orientation.....	9
Exploratory affective exchange.....	11
Affective exchange.....	13
Stable exchange.....	14
Surveillance.....	16
Jealousy.....	18
Jealousy and Social Penetration Theory.....	22
Method	23
Participants and Procedures	23
Measures.....	24
Relationship satisfaction scale.....	25
Interpersonal attraction scale.....	25
Partner surveillance scale	26
Individualized trust scale.....	26
Jealousy scale	27
Revised self-disclosure scale.....	27
Social intimacy scale	28
Results.....	28
Discussion.....	30
Limitations	33
Implications for Future Research	34
Conclusion	35
References.....	37
Appendix A.....	41

FACEBOOK AND RELATIONSHIPS:
A STUDY OF HOW SOCIAL MEDIA USE IS AFFECTING LONG-TERM
RELATIONSHIPS

Name: Rianne C. Farrugia
Department: Communication
College: Liberal Arts
Degree: Master of Science in Communication & Media Technologies
Term Degree Awarded: Fall Semester 2013 (2131)

Abstract

An online survey was conducted where 255 respondents provided information about their significant other. Respondents answered questions dealing with elements of relationship satisfaction, Facebook usage, surveillance, and jealousy. Results indicate a correlation between Facebook usage and relationship satisfaction. Individuals with varying levels of Facebook usage were shown to have a positive correlation with jealousy levels in their relationship, meaning as Facebook use increased, jealousy also increased. Altman and Taylor's theory of social penetration (1973) was used to describe the stages in a relationship from orientation into a relationship of stable exchange. This developmental theory illustrated the growth in relationship phases. Results found stage of relationship did not have a significant effect on the amount of surveillance within a relationship.

Keywords: social penetration theory, Facebook usage, relationship satisfaction, surveillance, jealousy

Facebook and Relationships:

A Study of How Social Media Use is Affecting Long-Term Relationships

Since the beginning of time, people have created ways to communicate, evolving from primitive language and markings to more recent technologies including telephones and computers. Prior to today's technology, people developed relationships face-to-face. Face-to-face interaction allows a person to respond in conversation by utilizing verbal and non-verbal clues they receive during the conversation. Today's systems of communication allow people to interact with each other in settings that are not face-to-face. The use of telephones and computers has paved the way for the most recent addition to communication—social media.

Online social networking sites (SNS) have tried to re-create face-to-face interactions on the web by allowing people to interact publically or privately. Many people use social media as a way to stay in contact, while others use the medium as a way to develop new connections. A benefit of social networking websites is that they allow people to develop or maintain relationships with individuals who may not be close to themselves geographically. When it comes to location, social networking websites allow families, couples, and friends to stay connected using a simple click of a button.

What happens when people who have developed an intimate relationship (either offline or online) try to maintain it online? How does the lack of face-to-face interaction affect their relationship? What psychological factors can develop due to the use of social networking sites? These questions raise concerns for individuals utilizing these websites. Marshall, Bejanyan, Di Castro, and Lee (2012) argued that Facebook claimed to keep people connected but the

challenges faced by romantic relationships were unknown. Could Facebook cause the demise of an intimate relationship?

To begin it is important to understand that each relationship goes through a set of steps, allowing the connection to flourish from an acquaintance to a close friend or even lover. Social penetration theory was first examined by Altman and Taylor (1973). Further examination showed that individuals worked their way through four stages of relationships equating to higher levels of intimacy and depth within said relationship. According to LaSalle (2004), the four stages are best defined as follows:

1. *Orientation* is a way for people to begin to develop a relationship by revealing basic information about themselves to others. Orientation can be awkward because there is not enough shared information to generate conversation.
2. *Exploratory affective exchange*, Altman and Taylor (1973) explain, is where people begin to gain a better understanding of the personality of the individual they are conversing with. The information has passed the basic phase and becomes more detailed.
3. *Affective exchange* is where the relationship becomes more intimate. The exchange of conversation includes more personal information and the pair conversing is comfortable with the exchange.
4. *Stable exchange*, the final stage, is where the relationship is the strongest. There is complete openness to talk about all aspects of life. People develop idioms which make the conversation much more personal and ambiguous.

Technology and Relationships

Computer mediated communication (CMC) allows individuals to have an interactive exchange of communication through technological devices. CMC is a way in which people are developing relationships online, often without the visual and oral cues that face-to-face communication would deliver (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008; Whitty, 2007). CMC isn't only social media or web based communication. CMC also includes texting, emailing, instant messaging, video conferencing, and social media platforms to name a few. Now that cell phones have Internet access, the smart phone provides users with the ability to communicate through many forms of media technology at the touch of a button. Whitty (2008) said that CMC might actually be a better way for people to communicate because individuals are more likely to be their true self online. The feeling produced by CMC can result in greater feelings of love and support, even if that person is not receiving face-to-face communication (Whitty, 2008).

Bargh and McKenna (2004) found that over a billion text messages were sent daily through mobile devices. Based on the results of the study, it can be suggested that the digital generation is utilizing the convenience of text messaging to communicate in a non-face-to-face environment. Other forms of technology are also being used to communicate regularly in a non-face-to-face environment, such as SNS.

SNS are websites where people join and create online communities to develop relationships online (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). Today, there are numerous SNS, but for this research, Facebook is the primary focus. After its establishment in 2004, Facebook's popularity separated it from competing sites. Facebook as a social network was the 4th most visited website in 2010 (Bowe, 2010) attracting over 800 million users to date (Elphinston & Noller, 2011;

Marshall et al., 2012). SNS users are connected in the way they develop relationships through the Internet, even though they may not have a face-to-face relationship with those connections offline (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). Social networking and SNS have become part of many daily routines (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011).

Users find value in SNS because they are mostly posting about their personal life and opinions. These posts can provide validation to individuals when they receive feedback from their online friends (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). Rau, Gao, and Ding in 2008 stated, “SNS expect to gratify social-emotional needs rather than informational needs, and they are connected in a person-to-person manner which is more direct and interpersonal” (p. 2757). The research establishing the importance of social-emotional feedback found that SNS have a significant impact on a person’s behavior in an online environment.

SNS can also be used to express romantic relationships. The most apparent illustration of romantic relationships can be found through the profile picture (Bowe, 2010; Mansson & Myers, 2011; Papp, Danielewicz, & Cayemberg, 2012; Utz & Beukeboom, 2011). In general, this means couples tend to display their relationships by depicting themselves and their partner in their default profile photo, or photo that is displayed on their main profile page. Moreno, Swanson, Royer, and Roberts (2011) stated that people judged newly acquainted friends by their uploaded and tagged pictures online. Tagging pictures is a Facebook function where the program uses facial recognition as a way to identify the individuals within the picture. Once a picture is tagged that image will show up on an individual’s profile page. Moreno et al. (2011) further claim the well-known phrase “a picture is worth a thousand words” applies directly to social media usage today. SNS encourage the uploading and sharing of photos, which provide more opportunities to

judge those images. In 2010, Bowe reported that there were over 300 million photos being uploaded daily, and in 2007, Clark, Lee, and Boyer (as cited in Mansson & Myers, 2011) found that more than half (57%) of users post pictures of themselves in a romantic situation. A picture showing a romantic situation was described as any way to put value on the relationship by displaying affection. This expression of affection and self-disclosure is a way users illustrate the value of their relationship (Mansson & Myers, 2011). Technology has altered the way relationships can be developed and maintained. An in-depth look of Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory will describe what is happening during each phase and how new technologies are being used.

Social Penetration Theory

Orientation. According to Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory, orientation is the first step a person would experience when they meet someone new. This phase allows individuals to make first judgments as to what the personality of the individual would be like based on things they can see and hear. Twenty years ago, this type of interaction would be more commonly found offline. Today, initial connections can be established in a computer-generated environment where individuals can look for a partner online. By integrating the use of SNS, new acquaintances may self-disclose information during preliminary interactions to help establish a relationship.

Self-disclosure is "an interaction between at least two individuals where at least one intends to deliberately divulge something personal to another" (Greene, Derlega, & Mathews, 2006, p. 411). Self-disclosure reinforces components of love such as trust, intimacy, and commitment, and is crucial for the development of a relationship (Park, Jin, & Jin, 2011).

Typically, more personal, offline self-disclosure is a reciprocal action where individuals are likely to disclose to those who are likely to disclose back to them.

Park, Jin, and Jin (2011) indicate that SNS allow users to interact by sharing photos, status updates, posts, and messages. The act of sharing information on Facebook is a form of self-disclosure. Reciprocation to this disclosure occurs when users respond to the content that was shared by commenting, liking, or sharing the material. Some users do not respond to self-disclosure in that way; rather, as a response, they will choose to disclose information about themselves. If the responder chooses to reveal information about themselves, Park, Jin, and Jin (2011) explain that a respondent's self-disclosure will trigger the original discloser to divulge once again. Self-disclosure on or offline provides individuals with an exchange of information that can be beneficial to a new relationship.

Courting a partner in an offline environment is the act of reaching out to an individual to express interest in getting to know them. Traditionally, relationships have to deal with components of love, trust, commitment, honesty, passion, and satisfaction; now relationships have to deal with much more (Marshall et al., 2012). As relationships have branched into online environments, the components of love are dealing with new influences on the way they affect the couple. Papp, Danielewicz, and Cayemberg (2012) concluded that the use of Facebook has altered the way people interact and develop relationships, finding "we can no longer disregard the potential connections between Facebook and intimate relationships, which serve as one of the most important contexts of individual growth and development" (p. 85).

Courting of a partner online can be done on Facebook by being proactive in the type of person you want to find. Facebook allows individuals to join groups that may interest them, and

in turn, the group provides profile pictures of those individuals who are also involved in the group. Seeing a profile picture online is comparable to seeing a person from across the room where then a person can decide if they are attracted to them. From the point of initial attraction, Facebook allows users to add the individual as a friend, inbox message them, or ‘poke’ them with just a few clicks.

This stage of meeting or getting to know someone online allows for generations of people to develop relationships in a unique way, due to the nature of the technology. Tokunaga (2011) said that “early or intermediate stages of a new relationships (are used) to obtain more information about others” (p. 706). Tokunaga is illustrating how the level of self-disclosure can help progress a relationship to the next stage in both an online and offline environment. For those individuals who are using online-based networks to display information, they are allowing others to identify with them (Gershon, 2011). Identifying factors such as groups and interests can allow the start of a relationship. Depending on how much a person or their partner reveals, Marshall et al. (2012) argue the insecurity of individuals can play as a direct factor in relationship stability.

Exploratory affective exchange. The second relationship stage in Altman and Taylor’s theory is exploratory affective exchange. This is where the “newness” of the relationship wears off and the pair becomes more comfortable with each other. It is at this stage where individual personalities are revealed. The conversational exchange is more comfortable than in the orientation phase, but individuals are still cautious not to offend the other person (LaSalle, 2004). Once personal character is revealed, people begin to display more personality in a relationship. During this time, an individual’s behavior may begin to cause anxiety within the relationship as a person’s idiosyncratic nature becomes apparent. Due to the tension that can develop, Altman and

Taylor (1973) say many relationships will not go beyond the exploratory affective exchange phase. Those characteristics that would hinder an offline relationship would likewise impede a relationship developing online.

Individuals who are looking to develop a relationship may begin to get curious about their love interest's behavior online. Someone's behavior online may unknowingly hurt his or her potential offline relationship. In the beginning of a relationship, SNS are a great way to interact with another person online, by getting to know that individual person better, or to maintain and enhance a long distance relationship (Tokunaga, 2011).

Offline public display of affection, or PDA, is much different than PDA that can be found online. Offline PDA are such things as holding hands, or exchanging hugs; while online, displayed affection is called a public display of commitment (Bowe, 2010; Utz & Beukeboom, 2011). Public displays of commitment mean displaying such things as "liking" pictures or status updates, posting pictures, or sharing inside jokes on a future partner's wall. This feature allows the users to "like" the public display of commitment that their friends have uploaded. Liking a picture on Facebook is an interactive way to virtually indicate approval. Liking uploaded content is as simple as clicking the thumbs up button at the bottom of the picture. Furthermore, uploading photos of a significant other is a demonstration of commitment to others online.

Facebook "pokes" are even considered PDA (Bowe, 2010; Marshall et al., 2012; Tosun, 2012). Facebook pokes are a private way to flirt online, or let a user know that you have been looking at their webpage. Users will receive a notification that they have been "poked" and who sent the poke. As a user, it was found that looking at a partner's page and seeing that they, too, are reciprocating the PDA postings can be satisfying (Marshall et al., 2012; Utz & Beukeboom,

2011). Bowe (2010) suggests in his study that couples found it important to reciprocate actions of posting about their relationship online. Nonetheless, of the two sexes, women are more likely to express their affections online (Mansson & Myers, 2011; Marshall et al., 2009). Participants felt it would not only inform others that they were in a relationship, but also deter others from getting unintentionally involved. Online actions such as these can serve as an advertisement of the relationship to others while providing security to a couple.

Affective exchange. The third stage of social penetration theory is affective exchange. During this stage of the relationship, both parties are quite comfortable with each other, and conversation could carry itself. An individual's true self is apparent as more personal information is revealed in conversation (LaSalle, 2004; Tosun, 2012). There is clear connection based on the casual nature of the relationship and the awkward pauses decrease. The use of personal expressions and idiomatic vocabulary is established. During affective exchange, people start to develop more intimate feelings toward each other (LaSalle, 2004).

During affective exchange, individuals who are getting closer can declare that they are in a relationship (Bowe 2010; Marshall et al., 2012). Facebook relationship settings allow users to share their relationship status or keep it private. On Facebook, users can choose from categories such as "in a relationship," "it's complicated," and "single," to name a few. Nowadays, declaring publically online that you are in a relationship is an illustration to friends and family of the commitment you have made (Bowe, 2010). Instead of having people hear about the relationship change through word of mouth, many people use the website as a way to declare to their online friends that they have made a commitment to be in a relationship. Bowe (2010) explains that attaching significance to the relationship allows the user to display their true self.

Rogers (1951) defined the true self as a person's characteristics that actually exist (as cited in Tosun, 2012). The true self exemplifies authentic aspects of a person's life allowing people to understand who they really are (Tosun, 2012). At this stage in relationships, where the flow of communication between individuals is comfortable, the true self should be apparent. However, the offline true self can be viewed differently from the online true self (Tosun, 2012).

The "individual's tendency to express one's 'real' aspects of the self through Internet communication" is the best way to establish the online true self (Bargh et al., 2002, as cited in Tosun, 2012, p. 1511). Facebook as a medium allows users to serve as their own gatekeepers of information, but for affective exchange to be successful users must accurately represent themselves online. Online representations of the true self are important as they can transfer into an intimate relationship during stable exchange (Gershon, 2011).

Stable exchange. The last step in this relationship progress model is stable exchange, where partners engage in the most honest and comfortable conversation with each other. Few people reach this final phase. Individuals may experience negative feelings toward the others as a result of the brutal honesty that occurs in this phase (LaSalle, 2004). Relationship threats and intimacy issues are struggles felt during this phase. Facebook users don't always consider how a public forum could truly affect their personal relationships (LaSalle, 2004).

Intimacy is a huge portion of a relationship. Intimacy is not always defined in sexual terms, but it can also be defined by the quality of relationship interaction (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). Intimacy is the "feeling of closeness developed from personal disclosures resulted from interpersonal contact" (Park, Jin, & Jin, 2011, p.1975). According to Rau, Gao, and Ding (2008) verbal intimacy is an essential part of a relationship. They found that people in online

relationships are able to adapt to the need of verbal exchange in online terms. Park, Jin, and Jin (2011) wrote that intimacy has become increasingly crucial for relationships in an online environment. “The more intimate a relationship, the more interactions are needed, and the more likely people are to adopt and expand their media use to support the exchanges” (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008, p. 2761). Women, in particular, found online intimacy as an ego booster when a member of the opposite sex had higher desires publically displayed online (Marshall et al., 2012).

It’s not uncommon to hear Facebook or other SNS blamed for the failure or break down of a relationship. Gershon (2011) reported that students in her study claimed that Facebook caused their breakup. Unfortunately, for those intertwined with social networks, they may learn the real problems social networking can cause between friends and romantic partners (Tokunaga, 2011). One factor which may play a role in a relationship’s demise is using SNS for surveillance. Marshall et al. (2012) report that modern day online surveillance is easier and takes less effort than traditional offline surveillance. For an individual who has insecurities, they may find their partner’s online actions to be a flaw, which could be a diminishing satisfaction factor (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). Surveillance of Facebook pages may cause higher anxiety, mistrust, and jealousy, which will threaten the romantic relationship’s existence (Marshall et al., 2012). Utilizing Altman and Taylor’s (1973) social penetration theory, there is an understanding as to how relationships develop through the four stages. With relationships being developed and maintained in an online environment, it is important to explore what concerns SNS can cause. Modern couples using SNS may experience surveillance and feelings of jealousy based on social

media use.

Surveillance

Online couple surveillance is more common now that SNS are more popular. The use of media has changed the way people interact and has made people nosier (Darvell et al., 2011). Could it be the ease of access to information via this phenomenon of partner monitoring, or just an internal trust issue that increases surveillance? Surveillance is an important factor of SNS because users are utilizing information online to monitor their partners. Surveillance directly corresponds with trust issues within couples (Darvell et al., 2011; Helsper & Whitty, 2010; Tonkunaga, 2011).

Tonkunaga (2011) reported that partner monitoring is the second most commonly reported act of Facebook. Surveillance is an unintended advantage to online websites because the act is anonymous (Elphinston & Noller, 2011; Marshall et al., 2012). Recent studies have found that 60% of college students use the social network Facebook as a way to check up on their significant other (Bowe, 2010; Marshall et al., 2012; Tokunaga, 2011). Elphinston and Noller (2011) state couples are likely to use SNS as a way to check up on their partner. Utz and Beukeboom (2011) said that monitoring a partner through Facebook is “almost” the socially acceptable way to check up on your partner.

The use of surveillance as a tool to monitor a partner can have negative effects on the relationship, especially when it is incorporated into daily routines (Elphinston & Noller, 2011; Tokunaga, 2011). Elphinston and Noller’s (2011) study proposed “...young people’s levels of Facebook intrusion can impact their romantic relationships negatively” (p. 634). Additionally, use of Facebook can prove to be difficult in maintaining a functional relationship (Elphinston &

Noller, 2011). Personal self-disclosure can create a vicious cycle of jealousy because a partner is constantly checking up on their spouse (Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009). Finally, the negative feelings and surveillance of a partner online will diminish functionality between the couple, and final results could end with the romantic partner having intentions of ending the relationship (Tosun, 2012).

Furthermore, Facebook monitoring doesn't limit individuals to their current partner. Getting information about a former lover is tempting for most people (Bowe, 2010; Darvell et al., 2011). Most profoundly, Tonkunaga (2011) found that people would rather monitor a former lover or their current partner, rather than develop a new relationship in the online environment.

Having a socially acceptable way to check up on a significant other can reflect the jealous feelings one may experience. Darvell et al. (2011) suggest that partner monitoring is appealing due to the ease of accessing information. Of course, a person's privacy settings have a lot to do with this (Tokunaga, 2011). Privacy settings are internal settings within Facebook which allow users to limit the amount of information they display publicly. Many people don't know or realize that they have the ability to set boundaries, or limit what people can see online. However, Tokunaga (2011) concluded that if an observer was to uncover enough information about someone they were observing they were more likely to do it again. Darvell et al. (2011) found in their study that the more time spent on Facebook or SNS the more time a partner's behavior would be monitored. In turn, Elphinston and Noller (2011) concluded that this ease of information into the online world of Facebook in daily life directly caused more issues than good.

Couples are using SNS as a tool to gather information about possible threats to their relationship (Marshall et al., 2012). The observer may respond to relationship threats by posting on their partner's Facebook, creating status updates, and questioning online behavior (Tokunaga, 2011). Relationship threats are anything that has a negative effect on the relationship. Negative partner behavior, conflicts, and disagreements may negatively impact a relationship (Feeney & Lemay, 2012). Status updates are a place where the user can post anything he/she is thinking or feeling. Under the update, their friends are able to like, share, and comment on their thoughts. SNS provide a platform for individuals to monitor their relationship in an online environment. This act of surveillance can directly lead to jealousy (Darvell et al., 2011).

Jealousy

Jealousy is a provoked emotion, triggered by an event involving a friend or significant other. A jealous lover can emotionally alter their characteristics very quickly based on their emotional responses. Higher passion and love can result in greater jealousy (Marshall et al., 2012). However, not all researchers approach jealousy in that way. Relationship factors and character traits can contribute to feelings of jealousy. Feelings of jealousy can be connected to low levels of trust and self-esteem (Muisse et al., 2009). According to Utz and Beukeboom (2011), there are three types of jealousy: reactive, anxious, and possessive. Reactive jealousy is an emotional reaction based off of a partner's infidelity. Anxious jealousy is the fear that your partner may be unfaithful. The third type of jealousy is possessive, which is monitoring partner behavior as well as trying to control their other heterosexual relationships (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011). Utz and Beukeboom said "reactive jealousy occurs as a reaction to a real threat to the relationship, whereas anxious and possessive jealousy can also occur in the absence of a real

threat” (p. 513). Marshall et al. (2012) argued that jealousy, although usually thought of as a negative trait, could reinforce closeness to a loved one.

Jealousy is a cyclical design working directly with the feedback loop (Marshall et al., 2012). In simple terms, when a message is sent, the message’s receiver then replies with feedback creating a constant looping motion. “Facebook increases exposure to information about one’s partner that may arouse jealousy and jealousy in turn, may increase the time spent on Facebook in search of relationship-relevant information” (Marshall et al., 2012, p. 2). When it comes to Facebook, the access to their partner’s information may lead to a higher degree of jealousy based on the information one is exposed to (Muisse et al., 2009).

As a result from habitual use of SNS, it is not surprising that individuals may begin to resent or have feelings of loathing towards their partner. Romantic jealousy can create negative thoughts about a partner and the relationship as a whole (Elphinston & Noller, 2011). Negative thoughts cause anxiety in the relationship. Couples tend to trust their partners less, and in turn, are less satisfied with their relationship (Elphinston & Noller, 2011; Marshall et al., 2012). Furthermore, those individuals who have negative feelings of self-worth tend to believe they are unworthy of love to begin with (Marshall et al., 2012). Maintaining a satisfying relationship can be more difficult if the individual had a negative past experience on a social networking site (Elphinston & Noller, 2011).

From jealousy that stems from online presence to the offline problems it causes, Facebook has changed the way relationships are approached. SNS have become part of the way we conduct our daily lives (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011); and with that, it has taken control of our relationships as well. Details of past relationships are no longer tucked away from the world

when Facebook has encrypted it into a quick stop for personal history. Usage of SNS may have an impact on a couple in a relationship. This online activity may create new feelings of jealousy causing disagreements offline.

Facebook may result in negative effects on a relationship (Gershon, 2011). Marshall et al. (2011) established that inappropriate Facebook activity did, in fact, put a negative strain onto relationships. People began to check their partner's online activity on a daily basis because of the jealousy they felt (Elphinston & Noller, 2011). When individuals felt instability in their relationship, online activity caused the expected jealous responses (Marshall et al., 2011).

Utz and Beukeboom (2011) described a scenario in which an observer saw a picture on Facebook of their partner with his arm around a member of the opposite sex. He explained that because the picture was available for so many eyes to see online, it was a public self-threat to a relationship. When other people could see the pictures online, it was anticipated there could be a jealous reaction (Marshall et al., 2011). These types of pictures, as innocent as they may be, can create an emotional jealous disturbance that may make the person feel they were completely betrayed by their partner (Helsper & Whitty, 2010; Whitty, 2008). Women reported more of these types of cyber infidelity than men did (Helsper & Whitty, 2010).

SNS allow users to experience relationship jealousy. Feelings of jealousy may cause Facebook users to express their emotions online, which may result in arguing. Arguing online may not only make the observed look bad, but it will illustrate the observer's insecurities as well (Papp, Danielewicz, & Cayemberg, 2012). Marshall et al. (2011) concluded their report stating that individuals who avoided the SNS were less likely to experience those negative views than others using social networking sites.

These forms of jealousy and relationship distrust of a partner can develop from fear of betrayal (Marshall et al., 2009). Elphinston and Noller (2011) found that Facebook as an environment can promote jealous feelings associated with negative outcomes on the relationship, directly causing addictive behaviors like surveillance. This form of attachment anxiety has strong links to romantic jealousy within couples (Elphinston & Noller, 2011; Tokunaga, 2011). In cases where the individual has low self-esteem, they experience the most trouble with SNS and jealousy (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011).

Relationship distrust can come from jealousy and knowledge of a partner's previous infidelity (Darvell et al., 2011). There is fear associated with the lack of commitment from a partner, and that, in itself, can be cause for concern. When it came to a heterosexual relationship, men, whom online had a plentiful group of friends, were less likely to commit to a relationship. These less committed men then may cause their female counterparts to lose trust within the relationship. Connected to this lack of trust is a lowering of the women's self-esteem within said relationship (Marshall et al., 2012). Due to the chronic access of information, people who have experienced some form of infidelity in the past are more likely to have interpersonal jealousy based on that experience (Tokunaga, 2011). If there is low trust in a relationship, there is a high chance for jealous behavior, especially if a person was to see their partner being affectionate with a potential partner online. Therefore, partner monitoring is reasonably unavoidable (Darvell et al., 2011; Marshall et al., 2009; Utz & Beukeboom, 2009). However, this fear and distrust in a relationship can be lessened as more trust is gained according to a study conducted by Darvell et al. (2011).

Jealousy and Social Penetration Theory

Jealousy pertains to the social penetration theory because as people get to know each other better, they are more likely to disclose more information about one another that may cause jealous feelings. When it comes to relationships, social media gives couples the chance to find out information or history about one another. With technology and the ease of partner monitoring online one might begin to see a rise in jealousy between couples.

The constant flow and access to information, which was previously discussed as one of the factors that will contribute to partner surveillance, additionally, will increase the amount of relationship jealousy (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011; Marshall et al., 2009). Facebook as an entity allows couples to gain more insight to each other's previous relationships, which can directly cause issues (Muisse et al., 2009). When it comes to making a relationship official, even though it's an online environment, Facebook is the most public place a couple will symbolize their commitment (Bowe, 2010). Even things such as socio-economic factors or level of intimacy can directly affect the couple and online behavior (Rau, Gao, & Ding, 2008). The amount of time spent on Facebook directly related to the jealousy felt between couples. Couples were scared their partner was developing a relationship with another person online, making their own behaviors more jealous (Marshall et al., 2012).

Today, with social networking sites allowing individuals to meet in online environments, one must wonder how satisfying the relationship can be when Facebook is used. As each stage of relationship passes, individuals share more information about themselves. During each stage, people should act differently based on the amount of self-disclosure in the relationships. Darvell et al. (2011) concluded that people interact in a different way online, therefore:

RQ1 - What is the difference between the stages of relationship when looking at varying levels of Facebook usage within the relationship and relationship satisfaction?

Tokunaga (2011), Marshall et al. (2012), and Bowe (2010) all found that college students admitted to checking up on their significant other. As the stage of relationship increases, couples should be secure in their relationship based on levels of self-disclosure. Will the use of surveillance change as couples become more intimate in their relationship? Based on previous discussions, couples may use the web as a way to gather information about their spouse, hence:

RQ2 - Is there a difference between couples in the different stages of relationship and their use of Facebook for surveillance and does the progression of relationship stages have a negative effect on surveillance?

Finally, since Elphinston and Noller (2011) found that Facebook as a network can produce jealous feelings:

RQ3 - What is the reported difference in levels of jealousy for individuals with varying levels of Facebook usage within their relationships?

and

RQ4 - Is there a difference in the level of jealousy felt between couples in various stages of the relationship when both parties utilize Facebook on a regular basis?

Method

Participants and Procedure

An online-based survey was conducted during the summer of 2013, where all participants agreed to their involvement in the survey by accepting the terms of the informed consent. The informed consent page, which was approved by the Institutional Review Board, notified the participants that the online survey was going to be confidential and anonymous. Participants

were free to end their participation at any time. The removal of incomplete or nonresponsive surveys left a total of 255 respondents.

Participants in the online survey were generated from convenience and snowball sampling. The convenience sample was generated from individuals who were either enrolled in the Rochester Institute of Technology's graduate programs or were Facebook friends with the researcher. The snowball sample came from Facebook users sharing the link to their friends allowing the survey to reach a larger population. There were 181 female respondents, 71 male respondents, and three respondents who neglected to answer.

The majority of the respondents were Caucasian (90.1%); there were 5.1% Hispanic responders, and 4.3% responders chose other for their race; 0.4 % responders selected African Americans, and there were no Asian respondents. There were more women (71.8%) respondents than men (28.2%). The youngest age group ranging from the ages of 18-24 had 16.6% of the total; the largest population of respondents ranged in age from 25-32 (36.8%). Respondents between the ages of 33-40 had 24.3% of the total, and 8.2% were in the last group of age 50+.

Measures

The survey used scales examining relationship satisfaction (Hendrick, 1988), interpersonal attraction (McCroskey & McCain, 1974), partner surveillance, individualized trust (Wheless & Grotz, 1977), jealousy (Utz & Beukeboom, 2011), revised self-disclosure (Wheless, Nesser, & McCroskey, 1986), and social intimacy (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). The scales were arranged in this order to best facilitate participant responses, while masking the true intent of the survey. Demographic information was also collected. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Relationship satisfaction scale. Hendrick's (1988) relationship satisfaction scale ($\alpha = .86$) was used to ascertain how satisfied individuals were in their current relationship. Hendrick's scale was altered for this research by providing new Likert scale response options to more accurately reflect whether individuals were feeling satisfaction within their relationship. There was concern that the wording of original response options differed too significantly from the rest of the survey format. New responses measured from 1 (*highly unsatisfied*) to 5 (*highly satisfied*), 1 (*worst*) to 5 (*best*), and finally 1 (*not very much*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

The relationship satisfaction scale concentrated on how partners felt about their relationship with a significant other. The first section asked questions such as "How well does your partner meet your needs?" The second section asked "How good is your relationship compared to most?" The last section asked questions such as "How many problems are there in your relationship?" (See Appendix A for a full list of items).

Interpersonal attraction scale. The interpersonal attraction scale consisted of 15 items measuring personal desirability. Taken from the 1974 survey constructed by McCroskey and McCain, this survey was designed in three parts: social attraction ($\alpha = .84$), physical attraction ($\alpha = .86$), and task attraction ($\alpha = .81$). McCroskey and McCain's response sets were all Likert scales which were not altered (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*).

The interpersonal attraction scale was used to measure how desirable another person is to a subject. The first social attraction section made inquiries such as "It would be difficult to meet and talk with him (her)". The second section concerned types of physical attraction asking questions such as "I find him (her) very attractive physically." The final section testing task

attraction referred to statements such as “I have confidence in his (her) ability to get the job done.”

Partner surveillance scale. A partner surveillance scale was used to gain insight into an individual’s surveillance of their partner on the social networking site Facebook. As this scale was created by the researcher through revising previous surveillance measures, internal consistency was examined utilizing Chronbach’s alpha. The 15-item scale was found to have fair reliability ($\alpha = .79$). Further examination found that two items dealing specifically with trust, “I trust my significant other” and “I trust my significant other’s online activity,” were not found to be highly reliable with the other scale items. When those two items were removed the reliability improved ($\alpha = .84$). The surveillance scale also utilized a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The partner surveillance scale examined how individuals were using Facebook as a way to keep tabs on their significant other. Claims such as “I check my significant other’s Facebook profile” were used to determine surveillance.

Individualized trust scale. The individualized trust scale created by Wheelless and Grotz (1977, $\alpha = .92$) was originally designed as a 7-point semantic-differential scale. In order to have a consistent rating scale and maintain continuity throughout the questionnaire the scale was reduced to a 5-point semantic-differential scale.

The trust scale examined a respondent’s immediate feeling of trust. The words being reviewed were single word terms and their opposite. Examples of the individualized trust scale are as follows: trustworthy/untrustworthy, faithful/unfaithful, and considerate/ inconsiderate. Participants were asked to record their immediate reaction to the pair of words provided while thinking about a significant other.

Jealousy scale. Utz and Beukeboom's (2011) two-part jealousy scale was used to measure participants' levels of jealousy within their relationships ($\alpha = .84$). Their questionnaire looked at both offline behaviors ($\alpha = .81$) and online jealousy ($\alpha = .86$) dealing directly with SNS. The first questions had a Likert scale measuring 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). The second set of questions had a scale ranging from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 5 (*very likely*).

The jealousy scale examined how jealous a participant could be offline or online. The first part focused on offline activities, while the second part looked into online activities. The first section asked respondents "How often do you look through your partner's drawers, handbags, or pockets" and "How often do you secretly read the SMS messages on your partner's mobile phone." The scale measuring social networking site jealousy used declarations such as "check your partner's profile on the regular basis" and "monitor your partner's activities on social networking sites."

Revised self-disclosure scale. The revised self-disclosure scale measured the amount of personal information that individuals reveal about themselves to other people (Wheeless, Nesser, & McCroskey, 1986). The self-disclosure scale was 31 items divided into five sections. Only the first three sections were used for this survey. The 16 questions from those three sections were used for this survey within the following categories: intended disclosure ($\alpha = .85$), amount of disclosure ($\alpha = .88$), and positive/negative disclosure ($\alpha = .91$). The Likert scales ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Self-disclosure is being used to measure depth of relationship; the depth of relationship depends on the amount of self-disclosure (Altman and Taylor, 1973). The self-disclosure scale is a close approximation of depth of relationship wherein

as self-disclosure increases intimacy also increases (the progression through stages of relationships).

The first section about intended disclosure had items such as “When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.” The second section inquired about the amount of self-disclosure by utilizing statements such as “I usually talk about myself for long periods of time.” The positive-negative section looked at the type of disclosure a person was sharing with items such as “I usually disclose positive things about myself,” and “I often reveal more undesirable things about myself than desirable things.”

Social intimacy scale. Miller and Lefcourt (1982) designed the social intimacy scale ($\alpha = .95$). The original 10-point scale allowed users to circle the number that best represented their feelings. For this survey, the 10-point scale was converted into two separate Likert scales that ranged from 1 (*very rarely*) to 5 (*almost always*) and 1 (*not very much*) to 5 (*a great deal*). This allowed participants to complete the survey in the same manner as the previous examinations.

The social intimacy scale is a reflection of how a respondent’s personality fits with their significant other that is in their life (or was in their life). “How often do you show him/her affection?” and “how often do you feel close to him/her?” are both examples of the first section of Likert scale responses, while “how satisfying is your relationship with him/her?” and “how important is your relationship with him/her in your life?” represented the second set of Likert items.

Results

Four questions drove this research: (a) What is the difference between the stages of relationship when looking at varying levels of Facebook usage within the relationship and

relationship satisfaction?, (b) Is there a difference between couples in the different stages of relationship and their use of Facebook for surveillance and does the progression of relationship stages have a negative influence on surveillance?, (c) What is the reported difference in levels of jealousy for individuals with varying levels of Facebook usage within their relationships?, and (d) is there a difference in the level of jealousy felt between couples in various stages of the relationship when both parties utilize Facebook on a regular basis?

The first research question looked at the difference between stages (depth) of relationship, which was measured by self-disclosure ($M = 3.36$), and relationship satisfaction ($M = 4.01$) when the social networking site Facebook was being used. A multiple regression was conducted and found that there was a relationship between Facebook usage ($M = 3.42$) and relationship satisfaction within the various stages of relationship. The significant regression was found, $F(2, 210) = 10.854$, $p < .001$ with $R^2 = .094$. Predictors of stages of relationship found that relationship satisfaction was a positive factor ($\beta = .230$) as well as Facebook usage ($\beta = .152$). The findings illustrate 9.4% of the time the stage of relationship can be explained by looking at factors of relationship satisfaction and the amount of Facebook use.

The second research question focused on if there were a difference between the stages of relationship and their use of Facebook for partner surveillance ($M = 3.42$). A multiple regression analysis was conducted comparing the relationship between stage of relationship and partner surveillance when Facebook usage was a factor. A significant regression was found, $F(2, 213) = 5.604$, $p < .004$, with $R^2 = .050$. Stage of relationship predictors found a Facebook usage was a negative factor ($\beta = -.002$), while partner surveillance was a positive factor ($\beta = .152$). This

regression found intimacy within a relationship can be predicted by Facebook usage and partner surveillance 5% of the time.

The third question in the study asked if there was a difference in levels of jealousy ($M = 1.8$) felt in a relationship when there were varying levels of Facebook activity. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted and found that there was significant value between jealousy and Facebook use, $F(24, 213) = 6.371, \rho < .001$. The analysis discovered as Facebook usage increased, jealousy also increased.

The final question of research focused on the level of jealousy between couples that are in various stages of relationship that use Facebook regularly. A multiple regression was used to predict if jealousy would be affected by the amount of self-disclosure paired with Facebook usage. A significant regression was found, $F(2, 208) = 55.837, \rho < .001$, with $R^2 = .349$. Predictors of jealousy found that self-disclosure was a negative factor ($\beta = -.088$) while Facebook usage was a positive predictor ($\beta = .603$). Self-disclosure did have an effect on jealousy when Facebook was the moderating factor 35% of the time.

Discussion

The goal of this research was to reveal information about Facebook and the effects it has on relationships. Utilizing early studies allows a comparison of the results of this study to earlier findings. The finding falls both in conjunction and in difference with earlier studies. Viewing previous results helps provide insight into the findings. When results fall in conjunction with previous research, it provides consistency with past findings. When results are different, it allows researchers to gain new insight as to how predictors of the research may have changed and may

alter outcomes in results. This research focused on questions measuring factors such as stage of relationship, relationship satisfaction, surveillance, and jealousy.

The first research question examined the stage of relationship (self-disclosure as the measure), when looking at varying levels of Facebook usage and relationship satisfaction. The study concluded that there was a connection between stage of relationship and relationship satisfaction when Facebook was being used. The regression analysis between stage of relationship and relationship satisfaction did not support Marshalls et al.'s (2012) claim that Facebook would make couples less satisfied within their relationship. Rao, Gao, and Ding (2008) also found that partner's online activities would diminish relationship satisfaction support the findings. Finding different results from Marshall et al. (2012) and Rao, Gao, and Ding (2008) may illustrate how couples are changing the way they utilize Facebook and possibly suggest that they are embracing the site's use into their relationship.

The correlation found between relationships on Facebook and satisfaction establishes the relationship between the factors. Relationships that are being developed through Facebook may be able to maintain the relationship process as the relationship matures. If there is an increase in relationship, Facebook usage could be seen as a benefit to the relationship.

The second research question focused on couples in different stages of relationship and partner surveillance to determine if stage of relationship had a negative correlation with surveillance. The results from this study found that as self-disclosure increases (stage of relationship) surveillance also increases, however as stage of relationship progresses, Facebook usage decreases. Therefore, as self-disclosure increases, surveillance may increase because couples are getting closer with their significant other. This did not support the findings of

Tokunaga (2011), and Elphinston and Noller (2011) where they stated that couples were more likely to use surveillance when there was an increased exposure to SNS.

As a relationship matures, couples invest more time into the relationship. As the relationship becomes more important, it is not surprising that individuals would check their partner's social media accounts to ensure and protect their relationship stability. The regression analysis illustrates that as a relationship matures, Facebook usage decreases. This means as couples get more intimate, they spend less time online. However, results suggest that when they are online, they are likely to check their partner's online activities. The use of Facebook indicated how society is changing by utilizing new technologies to monitor relationships, with the goal to protect it.

The third research question focused on the level of jealousy felt between couples who used Facebook regularly and if their stage of relationship was a factor in those findings. This study concluded that stage of relationship was in fact not a significant predictor of jealousy, but the usage of Facebook was a significant predictor of jealousy. This upheld Marshall et al.'s (2011) claim that partners were scared their significant other was developing a relationship online, which caused their behaviors and reactions to be more jealous.

Couples who are on Facebook are likely to become more jealous when there is more information exposed to the public. Facebook usage correlates with jealousy because couples are trying to balance their current relationship in an online environment. All forms of relationships come together on Facebook where the common meeting area can create the feelings of jealousy. The ability to share and have access to information may make it difficult for couples who are

trying to progress through the stages of relationship to move forward with the threat of jealousy approaching.

The final research question examined the reported difference in levels of jealousy for individuals with fluctuating amounts of Facebook usage. This investigation illustrated that people with altering levels of Facebook usage did have varying levels of jealousy. Therefore, as Facebook usage increased, the levels of jealousy felt also increased. This finding supported the claims by Marshall et al. (2011) that jealousy was a response to Facebook activity. It also supported Muise et al.'s (2009) finding that Facebook access provides information about their partner's life. This access will positively cause a higher degree of jealousy within couples. Finally, Elphinston and Noller (2011) found that Facebook as an environment promotes jealous feelings, which also result in negative consequences on the relationship.

Jealousy can be directly caused by Facebook usage. As a relationship moves forward, one partner's chronic use of Facebook may hinder their relationship because of the jealousy it may cause. Increasing Facebook usage provides individuals with an increased access to information, which may directly cause jealousy in their relationship. If increased use of Facebook causes more jealous feelings if a couple is experiencing jealous feelings, reducing Facebook usage should decrease the levels of jealousy felt.

Limitations

There were a variety of limitations experienced throughout this process. The survey design was very long and was not broken up into different pages so the length was not as intimidating to participants. Additionally, the sample population was a convenience sample, so many people did not have the opportunity to participate just based on the form of distribution.

The convenience sample allowed for snowballing to occur, but the pitfall to this distribution method is the survey only reached a certain population of individuals. Consequently, the distribution method produced limited representation of minorities in the responses. The survey respondents were close in age to the researcher based on the distribution method.

The survey was focused directly at Facebook users. By only accepting Facebook users' responses, non-Facebook responses were not considered. This meant there was no data to compare the two groups. Furthermore, the survey only focused on one partner in the relationship; if both partners were studied, results may have indicated different data.

Using self-disclosure as a measurement of stage of relationship may not have been the best way to measure the variable. Even though Altman and Taylor (1973) said stage of relationship was a result of self-disclosure one variable may not have been enough. Stage of relationship may not actually be found in self-reported response studies. Using measurements of trust, attraction, and satisfaction may display a more accurate representation of elements that are factors in a relationship.

Implications for Future Research

Based on the results of this study, there are implications for future research. Further studies should look at the effect Facebook usage has on the relationship in the long-term. Are couples breaking up because of jealousy? Or are they being forced to be more honest, and tell their significant other the truth? Does the technology of smart phones and social media actually force couples to be more honest since anyone can document someone's whereabouts all the time?

Secondly, another opportunity for future research would be to focus on social media as a cause for the demise of healthy and trusting relationships. Are younger generations experiencing increased levels of distrust resulting in the termination of their relationship? Are couples that disclose more information about their personal relationship on Facebook more likely to fail because they are looking for satisfaction in the wrong place? How happy can a couple be if they are constantly looking for satisfaction from their social network online? And are couples ending relationships because of information discovered online?

Finally, an examination that concentrates on those individuals who are in the beginning stages of developing a relationship would be useful for future research. Are people using social media as a screening process in the dating world? Can people really go on a blind date anymore? With access to so many social networks a lot of the mystery is gone. Many people meet online first, so this researcher wonders what the implications are to this change in behavior. What does screening of potential partners do to the success of a relationship?

It is also important to note this research was not consistent with findings. The first research question showed no correlation between Facebook use and relationship satisfaction. However, previous studies found that relationship satisfaction was diminished as Facebook use increased (Marshall et al., 2012; Rao, Gao, & Ding, 2008). This contradiction of findings proves further research on Facebook and its effects are important to explore.

Conclusion

Based on the information discovered in this research, it is fair to say that SNS such as Facebook are changing the way couples are developing their relationships. Facebook does serve as an aid for those individuals traveling through the stages of Altman and Taylor's social

penetration theory (1973). Stage of relationship did correlate with an increase in partner surveillance even though as the relationship matured Facebook use did not increase. However, when Facebook use increased there was an increased chance for jealousy within the relationship. Increased levels of jealousy within a relationship may hinder the progression of the relationship through social penetration theory (Altman, Taylor; 1973).

Using communication technologies, such as Facebook, provide the platform for individuals who may struggle in a face-to-face setting. Developing a relationship in a non-face-to-face environment allows people to still experience the progression of a relationship in a different way. By observing how social media affects levels of self-disclosure, it is apparent that the more a person shares, the more others will share, enhancing the relationship cycle. In summary, it is important to realize how Facebook has partially modernized the way people communicate and form relationships.

References

- Bargh, J. A., & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2004). The Internet and Social Life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 573-90.
- Bowe, G. (2010). Reading romance: The impact Facebook rituals can have on a romantic relationship. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, 1(2), 61-77.
- Coyne, S. M., Stockdale, L., Busby, D., Iverson, B., & Grant, D. M. (2011). "I luv u :)!": A descriptive study of the media use of individuals in romantic relationships. *Family Relations*, 60(2), 150-162.
- Darvell, J., Walsh S. P., White, K. M. (2011) Facebook Tells Me So: Applying the Theory of Planned Behavior to Understand Partner-Monitoring Behavior on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 14(12), 717-722.
- 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.
- Feeney, B. C., & Lemay, E. P. J. (2012). Surviving relationship threats: the role of emotional capital. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(8), 1004-1017.
- Gershon, I. (2011). Un-friend my heart: Facebook, promiscuity, and heartbreak in a neoliberal age. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 84(4), 865-894.
- Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, A. (2006). Self-disclosure in Personal Relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 409–427). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Guadagno, R. E., & Sagarin, B. J. (2010) Sex Differences in Jealousy: An Evolutionary Perspective on Online Infidelity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(10), 2636-2655.
- 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.
- Hendrick, S.S. (1988). A Generic Measure of Relationship Satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 50* (1), 93-98
- LaSalle, J. (2004). Social Penetration Theory. In R. West & L. Turner (Eds.), *Introducing Communication Theory Analysis and Application* (2nd ed., pp. 171-188). New York, NY McGraw-Hill.
- Mansson, D. H., & Myers, S. A. (2011). An Initial Examination of College Students' Expressions of Affection Through Facebook. *Southern Communication Journal, 76*(2), 155-168.
- 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. *Social Psychology, 20*(1).
- McCroskey, J.C. & McCain T.A. (1974). The measurment of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs, 41*, 261-266.
- Miller, R.S. & Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). The assessment of social Intimacy. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46*, 5, 514-518.
- Moreno, M. A., Swanson, M. J., Royer, H, & Roberts, L. J. (2011). Sexpectations: Male college students' views about displayed sexual references on females' social networking web

- sites. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 24(2), 85-89.
- 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), 441-445.
- Papp, L. M., Danielewicz, J., & Cayemberg, C. (2012). "Are we Facebook official?" implications of dating partners' Facebook use and profiles for intimate relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(2), 85-90.
- Park, N., Jin, B., & Jin, S. A. (2011). Effects of self-disclosure on relational intimacy in Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(5), 1974-1983.
- Rau P.P., Gao Q., and Ding Y., 2008. Relationship between the level of intimacy and lurking in online social network services. *Computer Human Behavior*, 24(6) 2757-2770.
- Taylor, D. A. (1968) The Development of Interpersonal Relationships: Social Penetration Processes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 75, 79-90.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2011). Social networking site or social surveillance site? Understanding the use of interpersonal electronic surveillance in romantic relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 705-713.
- Tosun, L. P. (2012). Motives for Facebook use and expressing "true self" on the internet. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 20(4), 1510-1517.
- Utz, S., & Beukeboom, C. J. 2011). The Role of Social Network Sites in Romantic Relationships: Effects on Jealousy and Relationship Happiness. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 16(4), 511-527.
- Wheless, L. R., Nesser, K., & McCroskey, J. C. (1986). The relationships of self-disclosure and

disclosiveness to high and low communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports*, 3, 129-134.

Wheless, L.R. & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, 3, 250-257.

Whitty, M. T. (2008). Liberating or debilitating? an examination of romantic relationships, sexual relationships and friendships on the net. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5), 1837-1850.

Whitty, M. T., and McLaughlin, D. (2007). Online recreation: The relationship between loneliness, Internet self-efficiency and the use of the Internet for entertainment purposes. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(3), 1435-1446.

Appendix A
Survey

1. Do you have a Facebook Account?
 - Yes
 - No (User Survey Complete, Thank you)

2. Do you check your Facebook account daily?
 - Yes
 - No

3. In a typical week, how many hours do you spend on Facebook?
 - 0-2
 - 3-5
 - 6-9
 - 10+

4. Do you currently have your relationship status listed on your Facebook page?
 - Yes
 - No

5. What is your relationship status?
 - Married
 - In a relationship
 - It's complicated
 - Single
 - Not Listed
 - Other

****Please think of your significant other as you complete this survey.**

Relationship Satisfaction Scale

Instructions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability using the Likert scale rating system ranging from High Satisfaction to Low Satisfaction.

Relationship Satisfaction Questionnaire	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Average	Unsatisfied	Highly Unsatisfied
How well does your partner meet your needs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Best	Better than most	Average	Worse than most	Worst
How good is your relationship compared to most?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	A Great Deal		A Little		Not Very Much
How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much do you love your partner?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many problems are there in your relationship?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Interpersonal Attraction Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as they apply to your relationship. Use the following scale to write one number before each statement to indicate your feelings.

Social Attraction	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I think he (she) could be a friend of mine.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be difficult to meet and talk with him (her).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
He (she) just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like to have a friendly chat with him (her).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Physical Attraction					
I think he (she) is quite handsome (pretty).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
He (she) is very sexy looking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find him (her) very attractive physically.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't like the way he (she) looks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
He (she) is somewhat ugly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Task Attraction					
He (she) is a typical goof-off when assigned to do a job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have confidence in his (her) ability to get the job done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I wanted to get things done, I could probably depend on him (her).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I couldn't get anything accomplished with him (her).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
He (she) would be a poor problem solver.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Note: Items 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15 are reverse coded. Items should be randomly arranged and dimension labels removed before administration.

Partner Surveillance Scale

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability using the Likert scale rating system ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Surveillance Questionnaire	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I trust my significant other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I trust my significant other's online activity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I check my significant other's Facebook Profile.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I check my significant other's Facebook Profile to see his/her activity online.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I check my significant other's Facebook Profile to see the activity on his/her friends' pages.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I know that my significant other may have ex-lovers on his/her Facebook page.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It bothers me that my significant other has ex-lovers on his/her Facebook page.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like when my significant other posts on my page about me/us.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like when my significant other posts on his/her page about me/us.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to post pictures that have my significant other in them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like when my significant other posts pictures of us.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I know people who check their significant other's Facebook profile.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like seeing other people post status updates about their relationship on Facebook.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like seeing pictures of friends who are in a relationship on Facebook.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think couples should demonstrate their happiness online.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Individualized Trust Scale

Instructions: On the scales that follow, please indicate your reaction to the sets in conjunction to your relationship with your significant other. Place an “X” in the space between the colons that represents your immediate “feelings” about this person. Check in the direction of the end of the scale that seems to be most characteristic of this person. Mark only one “X” for each scale and please complete all scales.

Trustworthy	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Untrustworthy
Distrustful of this person	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Trustful of this person
Confidential	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Divulging
Exploitive	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Benevolent
Safe	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Dangerous
Deceptive	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Candid
Not deceitful	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Deceitful
Tricky	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Straightforward
Respectful	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Disrespectful
Inconsiderate	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Considerate
Honest	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Dishonest
Unreliable	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Reliable
Faithful	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Unfaithful
Insincere	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Sincere
Careful	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	Careless

Note. Score 1-7, with 7 indicating most positive (high trust), for each item before summing.

Jealousy Scale

Instructions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability using the Likert scale rating system ranging from Always to Never.

Jealousy Questionnaire (Part 1)	Always				Never
How often do you look through your partner's drawers, handbags, or pockets?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you secretly read the SMS messages on your partner's mobile phone?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you secretly read your partner's email?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability thinking how likely you are to engage in the behavior listed.

Jealousy Questionnaire (Part 2)	Very Likely				Very Unlikely
	1	2	3	4	5
Check your partner's Facebook profile on a regular basis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Look at your partner's profile page if you are suspicious of his or her activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Monitor your partner's activities on Social Networking Sites.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Add your partner's friends as friends to keep tabs on your partner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Revised Self-Disclosure Scale

Instructions: Please mark the following statements to reflect how you communicate with (specific target person). Indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with this person by marking whether you (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) are undecided, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree. Record the number of your response in the space provided. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

Intended Disclosure	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I reveal my feelings about myself, I consciously intend to do so.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I self-disclose, I am consciously aware of what I am revealing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount					
Amount	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I do not often talk about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My statements of my feeling are usually brief.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I usually talk about myself for fairly long periods of time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often talk about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often discuss my feelings about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Positive-Negative					
Positive-Negative	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I usually disclose positive things about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more negative than positive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I normally reveal "bad" feelings about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I normally "express" my good feelings about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often reveal more undesirable things about myself than desirable things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Miller Social Intimacy Scale

Instructions: Please answer the following questions about your relationship to the best of your ability using the Likert scale rating system and the specified ranges below.

	Almost Always		Some of the time		Very Rarely
When you have leisure time how often do you choose to spend it with him/her alone?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you show him/her affection?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you confide very personal information to him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often are you able to understand him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you feel close to him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	A Great Deal		A Little		Not Very Much
How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How close do you feel to him/her most of the time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is it to you to listen to his/her very personal disclosures?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How satisfying is your relationship with him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How affectionate do you feel towards him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is it to you that he/she understands your feeling?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with him/her?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is it to you that he/she be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is it to you that he/she shows you affection?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is your relationship with him/her in your life?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

