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ABSTRACT

The inception of this research was informed by the numerous media reports of marital challenges and breakups that included issues related with mobile phone usage. A popular column by Phillip Kitoto in the Daily Nation newspaper has continually posted questions from aggrieved spouses and relationship partners seeking counsel on relationship matters. Conspicuously standing out are the many people who link their relationship problems to the mobile phone either questioning their spouses or partner’s mobile phone behavior that arouses suspicion regarding their fidelity, or claims that they discovered their spouse’s cheating from mobile phone text messages or suspicious phone calls. This study therefore examines the effect of mobile phone adoption on marriages.

The study explores the effect of mobile phone adoption on marriages in Kenya and seeks to find out whether the mobile phone has contributed to breakups and increased strife in marriages. It involves a survey conducted in Nairobi – Kenya’s Capital – involving a population of married individuals, professional counselors and religious leaders.
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CHAPTER 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Technological inventions have definitely played a key role in revolutionizing communication and social interactions. With the invention of mobile telephony, computer technology and internet, communication has been made easier by increased accessibility.

The innovation and adoption of the mobile phone greatly revolutionized communication that was previously restricted by space and time. Fixed telephone lines meant that people had to be at a specific place time to be able to offer and receive communication. In developing countries like Kenya, the fixed telephones were a preserve for a few affluent homes, public and private offices whereas the general public only got access to this service via public pay phones that were mounted at few spots in market places. This made it very difficult to offer and receive communication in real time due to the challenge of distance between communication participants.

Postal mails were the other available option as a means of communication. Though accessible to many, this means of communication was slow; it took days or even weeks to deliver a message. Telegraphs, which were treated as urgent and were delivered in a shorter period, only provided scanty information. They disallowed users to incorporate details and emotions in their messages since they were brief and only accommodated key words in a message. Communication through this means was therefore impersonal and sometimes unclear. The invention of the internet gave reprieve to users. The internet helped people beat distance as emails made it possible to deliver messages across the world in a click of a button. This was even made better by modern inventions of internet chat rooms that have enabled conversations between people that are miles apart across the globe.

The mobile phone could be termed as the best communication technology innovation of all times so far. The small hand held portable gadget has made mediated communication extremely easy
and accessible. It has made it possible to communicate in real time irrespective of distance or
time hence completely changing the aspects of time and space in communication. Individuals can
communicate with friends and family from whatever part of the world at any time of the day. It
has become extremely easy to keep in touch with people you care about. Even better, the modern
day mobile phone has incorporated multiple functions that were served exclusively by other
forms of technology in the past. One can call, send a text message, email, access social networks,
watch movies and music videos and access other forms of entertainment, execute business deals
and conduct money transfers – all on the mobile phone. The gadget therefore easily serves as the
telephone, the computer, the television, the movie theater, the social club, the bank, and so forth.
This, to say the least, has made life really easy.

The convenience the mobile phone has injected into everyday life could explain the rapid rate of
its adoption. The rate of mobile phone adoption globally and indeed in Kenya has reached what
Everett Rogers calls ‘critical mass’ in his Diffusion of Innovations Theory. He explains this as the
stage where continued adoption of the innovation is self-sustaining. The mobile phone today has
become part and parcel of majority’s lifestyle today. Mobile phone technology evidently bears
all the five intrinsic characteristics outlined by Everett Rogers, which influence an individual’s
decision to adopt an innovation. Rogers outlined these factors as: Relative advantage,
Compatibility, Complexity or simplicity, Triability and Observability. The mobile innovation has
definitely improved the previous generation of communication technology of fixed telephones, it
is easily compatible and has been assimilated into individual’s day-to-day life, it is simple to
use and is therefore a favored means of communication by both the educated and the less
educated. Peer influence on its adoption was high since it is a visible gadget and initially came
with a lot of prestige and recognition. Today however it is a common gadget and prestige would
only come with the type of phone and the latest improvements on the innovation.

However, adoption of any innovation comes with its own implications. Everett Rogers, in his
book Diffusion of Innovations indicates that there are both positive and negative outcomes of
adoption of a particular innovation (Rogers E, 2005). He lists the consequences as: desirable vs.
undesirable, direct vs. indirect, and anticipated vs. unanticipated. The mobile phone as a
 technological innovation definitely has its positive and negative consequences. Usually in most
cases of technological innovations, the negative outcomes tend to be overlooked due to biased
positive attitudes associated with the adoption of a new innovation (Rogers, 2005). This study sought to examine both the positive and negative effects of mobile phone adoption on marriages.

1.1 Background of the study:

The modern day technological innovations have definitely affected the way individuals live their lives. They have redefined social interactions as communication becomes more and more mediated. People no longer have to meet face to face to communicate either on social matters or even conduct business. Unfortunately, very close and personal relationships have not been spared. As the mobile phone makes accessibility more and easier, could it be playing the reverse role of making people antisocial? As it increasingly influences communication, could it be alienating individuals from their loved ones? In their Uncertainty Reduction Theory, CR Berger and Calabrese (1975) state that as a relationship grows, more disclosure takes place and therefore communication improves. The mobile phone seems to reverse this theory; as mobile phone mediated communication increases, deception increases as people can easily edit their self presentation in the absence of face-to-face communication (meaning less self disclosure) and as a result relationships increasingly crumble.

Marriage relationships are drawing a lot of attention in society today due to their fragile nature in today’s modern society. Divorce rates have increased over the years due to various forces of modernization including: cultural, social, economic and technological changes among others.

Society is really puzzled over the reasons for increased failed marriages here in Kenya. Media reports of domestic violence, murder of spouses and even suicide in marriage have increased over the past few years thus painting a bleak picture of the state of the marriage institution in Kenya. Modernization has been blamed for increased marital challenges. Modern means of communication like the use of the mobile phone and other technological devices have been seen as contributing factors to strained marriages. In an opinion poll commissioned by the Sunday Nation, results revealed that many married couples had made it a full time pre-occupation to spy on each other. 47.3 percent of the respondents acknowledged they secretly read their spouse’s text messages regularly (Waweru G, 2007). Such marriages have been put to test by the spouse’s tendency to scroll through the partner’s messages. With the coming of the mobile phone, marital
problems have increased with many spouses treating each other with suspicion and the mobile phone serving as tool for exposing cheating spouses. This kind of “detective interactions” by spouses is aggravated by the mobile technology itself where ‘spy phones’ are now available in the market. This has made it possible for spouses to access mobile phone conversations and text messages from their partner’s phones, in their own phones.

Marriage is an interpersonal relationship that results from interpersonal communication between human male and female species (with an exception of gay and lesbian relationships). Face-to-face communication is crucial in such a relationship since it creates a closer bond between participants hence the development of a close relationship. The adoption of technological media of communication limits the face-to-face interactions of participants in a communication process. This reduction or total elimination of direct contact definitely affects the relationship shared by the participants of such communication. In Social Penetration Theory of interpersonal communication, participants in an interpersonal relationship are compared to a multi-layered onion. As people get to interact and communicate, the layers are slowly shed off, the core person is revealed and relationships move from being superficial to personal (Irwin Altman and Dalmas Tylor, 1973). The hindrance of this kind of interaction where face-to-face interaction has been replaced by mediated communication limits bonding in marriages.

In addition to occupying the place of face-to-face communication, the mobile phone could cripple communication between married partners. The mobile phone is known to be addictive where individuals get too attached to their phones thus finding themselves operating these gadgets almost always at every available opportunity. In a report by CNN’s Jack Cafferty published on the internet on 3rd of January 2011, he stated that, ‘...most of us spend our days walking around with our noses buried in our cell phones, BlackBerrys, iPhones, etc. And while we’re doing that, we’re tuning out the people who are actually in the same room as us. We seem to have long ago crossed the line as to where doing this stuff is appropriate - people take calls while they’re out to dinner, text or check e-mail while on a date, you name it.’ This is a clear indication of the society’s addiction to mobile phones.

The addiction could be attributed to the increased functions of mobile phones that go beyond calling and text messaging. Social and entertainment networks such as facebook, twitter, you-
tube, myspace, etc can now be accessed through mobile phones. These networks provide an alternative to face-to-face interactions, and individuals can interact with a wide network of friends without having to meet them at all. These new communication habits have not only affected communication between married couples negatively but have also created increased opportunities for infidelity with individuals spending more time flirting on the internet, and with the emergence of internet dating.

Many internet blogs by married individuals portray an institution that is increasingly becoming devoid of trust and proper communication. New sites that are exclusively dedicated to cheating in marriages, for example – cheaters.com, are developed every other day in the internet. Solicited and unsolicited information on ‘how to catch a cheating spouse’ is availed for free on these sites. Interestingly some of the spouses that suspect their partners of cheating attribute their suspicion to the way these partners interact with their mobile phones.

In view of all these developments, the mobile phone emerges as a very interesting gadget that though small, seems to affect lives significantly around the globe. It therefore became the subject of this research study.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Mobile phone usage in Kenya has evolved tremendously over the past few years. Kenyans are now able to carry out multiple every day transactions through their mobile phones. This gadget has become an important tool in Kenyans’ lives with transactions ranging from calling, text messaging, internet access and mobile money transfer (the biggest ever in the world, moving billions of shillings a year) all happening on phone. Mobile phone operators in Kenya have taken this further by developing systems that enable Kenyans to access other crucial basic needs. For example, the M-health that is being rolled out by Safaricom Ltd in corroboration with the ministry of health is aimed at making it possible for Kenyans to consult medical doctors on phone from whichever part of the country. In addition, Kenyans can now pay utility bills, pay for goods in supermarkets and shopping malls via M-pesa. These gains have been extended to
schools where mobile phone companies have developed software for school fees payment. Parents can now pay school fees via phone in the comfort of their living room.

This revolutionized use of the mobile phone has made the gadget a basic need for Kenyans rather than the luxury it was only two decades ago. For this reason, almost every Kenyan household has a mobile phone. In the urban areas, it would be safe to say that at least every Kenyan owns a mobile phone. In an article posted on a Kenyan ICT site on 7th June 2011, *All about Africa especially Kenya*, the Kenyan mobile penetration was reported to be at 63%. Mobile phone subscription rose from "22.3 million recorded in the previous quarter by CCK (Communications Commission of Kenya) to 24.96 million subscribers in the second quarter of 2010 – 11." According to the report this is the highest growth that has been reported in four years. The report concludes that on average, each Kenyan adult owns a mobile phone. It would therefore be safe to conclude, for purposes of this research, that most married couples in Kenya have a mobile phone or two between them.

Though the mobile phone undoubtedly presents a lot of benefits to its users, it is presenting its own share of challenges as highlighted in the background information for this research. Most families especially in urban areas where a lot of daily transactions are performed on mobile phones are facing serious problems that come with the use of this device. Last year, members of the Kenyan parliament passed a law requiring all phone SIM cards to be registered due to various threats their misuse posed to the society. Among the threats highlighted were terrorism, extortion of money and ruined marriages. Contributing to the motion, Mr. Wambungu – a Member of Parliament, said, "I urge the government to move very fast and support this motion, so that everybody who buys a SIM card is registered … marriages have been ruined because of this thing (referring to the mobile phone).” (the Kenya National Assembly official Record – Hansard, 2nd July 2008).

This study therefore focuses on the problem; *Mobile phone adoption and marriages - a study of families in Nairobi city, Kenya*. Research questions that arise from this problem include:

- How has the adoption of the mobile phone as a communication device affected marriage relationships in Kenya?
• Is there any correlation between increased mobile phone usage and severed marriage relationships?
• Do married couples consider the mobile phone a beneficial or a destructive addition to their marriage?
• Has the mobile phone made cheating easier?
• Does the mobile phone contribute to the absence of trust in marriages?
• What are some of the ways in which mobile phones ruin marriages?

1.3 Objectives of the study:

i. Determine the extent to which the mobile phone has been integrated in the day-to-day lives of married couples.
ii. Establish the marital challenges that arise from adoption and usage of the mobile phone by married couples.
iii. Determine the extent to which the mobile phone is responsible for ruined marriages in Nairobi city.

1.4 Justification for the research:

The findings of this study would be of interest to a number of constituencies. Firstly, psychologists since they have interest in behavior change. They would draw from the findings of this research to explain behavior change in this technological age. They would also use the findings to come up with corrective approaches to antisocial behavior that ail the family unit, in their role as counselors and clinical therapists.

Secondly, sociologists since their main interest are social behavior. They would draw from the findings of this research to come up with solutions to specific social problems like infidelity and divorce. The findings would also help them to understand the changing social trends in the family unit in the wake of increased technological adoptions.
Thirdly, individuals in society, who are keen on building a healthy marriage relationship, would draw from the findings of this research to ensure moderated use of the mobile phone in order to safeguard their marriages.

Fourthly, academia and researchers would be interested in this study. The findings of this research would form a foundation for in-depth studies with respect to interpersonal communication vis-à-vis technological adoptions.
CHAPTER 2

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The literature in this chapter highlights the views of experts on the effect of mobile phones on relationships. It also explores the feelings and views of individuals based on narratives relating to personal experiences as well as published findings of related topics. The literature was generated mainly from newspaper articles, magazines and internet sources.

2.2 Effects of technological adoption on relationships

There is no question that technological innovations, like the introduction of accessible and reliable mail service via internet, invention of the mobile phone have changed the nature of people’s connection to others in the social world. Electronic mail has made possible connections among people without physical proximity and the telephone has facilitated communication among distant people, making rapid connections possible across long distances. The internet has created an electronic mail system, merging the speed and flexibility of the telephone on the written character of the mail (Tyler R. 2002).

This communication revolution however has changed the nature of interpersonal and group processes. The revolution has had positive social consequences in people’s everyday lives, because it increases the frequency of interpersonal communications among people. On the other hand, the communication revolution resulting from technological innovations may have led to weaker social ties; people have less reason to leave their homes and actually interact face to face with other people (Tyler R. 2002).

Communication and the way that individuals interact with each other is a huge dynamic of sociology. The cell phone is changing the way in which all of this interaction occurs, which makes it sociologically relevant. With the creation and accessibility of cell phones, more and more individuals own their own cell phone and using them every day to communicate within their social network. Cell phones also make individuals available anywhere, and anytime, which changes the way that individuals are choosing to interact in social settings with other individuals.
The marriage institution, being a social institution, has not been spared the consequences of technological adoptions and more specifically for the purpose of this study, the mobile phone adoption. The mobile phone is the most dominant technological adoption in homes. Some of the effects of these adoptions on relationships include:

2.2.1. The Change of Space and Time
The 18th Century phone was located at a fixed location, usually in a home or office, and one had to be in that particular location where the phone was in order to be able to receive and answer incoming phone calls. With the development of technologies, telephone communication has changed tremendously.

With the development of mobile phones, individuals are able to remain in close and instantaneous contact with members of their social network regardless of where they are in the world. Cell phones have allowed individuals to surpass time and space and have any conversation that they choose wherever they choose (Corbett A. 2009).

The mobile phone has created new trend - what Fortunati (2008) calls ‘present absences.’ This is explained as the concept of how an individual’s presence in a social setting changes regardless of their physical presence; they are only half-present. After a ring or buzz of their mobile phone, they are drawn away somewhere else, away from their present situation and/or conversation. Individuals interrupt an ongoing conversation to answer the ringing of their cell phone. This has its repercussions. In answering the ringing cell phone, the individual who is presently being conversed with feels a sense of being left alone, which can cause social anxiety, as well as resentment/annoyance towards the individual who answered the phone call (Humphreys 2009).

2.2.2 Broken Trust
This study considered a Daily Nation newspaper’s column published every Monday in its lifestyle segment. This column consists of questions about relationships, by readers addressed to a counselor named Philip Kitoto. The counselor’s answers to the questions are published alongside the questions in the same column. This study concentrated on the questions for purposes of exploring and seeking to understand the experiences of the readers in relation to
mobile phone use and relationships. The study considered the questions posted on this column over a period of three months (March – June 2011). About 96% (approx) of the questions asked are about troubled relationships. Among those, a good number of them related to mobile phone usage. Such questions involved confessions of individuals rummaging through their partner’s phones and discovering text messages that indicated or alluded to cheating. Others were concerned about their spouse’s phone habits that involved being overprotective of their phones, receiving calls or simply refusing to answer calls from their relationship partners. The aggrieved partners in their questions indicated their suspicions towards their spouses arising from such mobile phone habits. The study in this case found out that the mobile phone was a major cause for mistrust in relationships.

The mobile phone appears to be a tool that facilitates cheating. Spouses can organize for dates, send love messages and receive them from their secret lovers via mobile phone in the comfort of their living room next to their legitimate spouses. In an online publication, ‘How the cell phone is breaking marriages in Kenya’ (Weru G. 7th January, 2007), Mrs. Tabitha Murungu, a counselor with the Hearts of Gold, said, “the coming of the mobile phone has seen an upsurge in (counseling) clients. They are married and their problems are related to the mobile phone.” In the article, the writer expresses the ease with which spouses can cheat using mobile phones. He says, ‘a woman seated opposite her husband on the dinner table could be busy texting, “darling, I’m really missing you...” to some fellow across town.’ (Weru G, 2007)

In the article, Mrs. Murungu says that spouses’ phone use habits raise suspicion in their partners hence the development of mistrust. She however says the mobile phone is not all destructive. According to her, the gadget ‘is doing a great job of exposing cheating spouses.’ This she says provides an opportunity to salvage the marriage. In her own words, “before you treat a sickness, u need to know it exists and it is eating at your insides. That is what the mobile phone is doing.” This presents a paradoxical role played by the mobile phone in a relationship context where it serves as diagnostic tool for the same problem it has created. Seemingly to contradict this theory, in the same article, Mrs. Wanijiku Gikang’a – a psychology lecturer at United States International University (USIU) and a marriage counselor – advises spouses to keep off their partners’ phones. According to her, ‘what you do not know will not hurt you.’ She says the mobile phone has turned into a too l for domestic spy work which is causing unnecessary pain. Whichever way we
look at it, the two counselors seem to be in agreement that the mobile phone to a certain extent contributes to pain and strife in marriages.

The act of spouses rummaging through their partners' phones could be explained by the Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Berger CR and Calabrese, 1975). The two proponents of this theory who drew from the work of Heider (1952) postulated that uncertainty is unpleasant and therefore is motivational; that people communicate to reduce uncertainty. They stated that the urge to reduce uncertainty leads to information-seeking behavior. One would therefore imagine that one spouse must have portrayed that caused uncertainty in their partner regarding the relationship thus resulting to this information seeking behavior of rummaging through text messages and listening into phone calls. This is done in the bid to reduce uncertainties regarding the relationship. The Uncertainty Reduction Theory states that people seek information about each other in order to predict their partner's behavior.

In his Attribution Theory of interpersonal communication, Fritz Heider (1952), says that we all face the task of trying to figure out personality from behavior. We see a person act and immediately draw conclusions that go beyond mere sensory information. This theory states that we cannot help judging others in day-day-life. Listening to people talk or observing them fills us with sensory data, some of it contradictory. We then make personality judgments to explain their behavior. Married couples are not immune to this communication practice. An individual is bound to try and explain his or her spouse's behavior. They seek to answer questions like: why does he/she move out of the house to answer a call? Why does his phone have a secret password? The effort to explain such behavior results in personality judgment that could inevitably arouse suspicion and reduce trust in relationships.

In the Daily Nation article, 'How the cell phone is breaking marriages in Kenya.' a Kenyan Catholic priest says that the mobile phone is causing serious problems in marriage. He says, "it is true the mobile phone is breaking marriages. And this is more of a problem of rapid social transformation where values such as trust and responsibility to each other have been discarded."

The priest seems to allude to the fact that the mobile phone, though causing breakups is not solely responsible for marital problems relating to it. Rapid changes in society have led to loss of certain social values and the mobile phone is just a tool for propagating already acquired societal trends and behavior. Agreeing with this, Mrs. Murungu (counselor), says that society is dealing
with ‘a deep rooted culture of infidelity’ seemingly suggesting that we cannot blame it all on technology.

In another online publication, '10 ways a cell phone can ruin your relationship’ the cell phone is described as a possible ‘ticking time bomb ready to blow up any relationship from inside out.’ (Vercillo K, 2008) It is associated with the thriving of secret affairs in relationships.

2.2.3 Impersonal Communication

Another effect of mobile phone adoption is promotion of impersonal relationships. ‘The little gadget, according to experts has already revolutionized the way we interact with each other – for the worse.’ (Sunday Nation, 12th June 2011,Lifestyle Magazine, pg.4). In an article published on this Sunday Nation feature segment, ‘Are Cell Phones Switching off Relationships’(Wesangula D, 2011), the mobile phone is seen to have replaced close personal interactions where people engaged in face-to-face conversations. Through the mobile phone, individuals can interact with friends without the hustle of making house calls. Although this development has made social interactions easier, sociologists say it is not necessarily positive. One sociologist, George Ouko said in the daily nation article that ‘people have abandoned the etiquette of traditional living for the convenience of a text (message) or a conversation with a faceless person at the other end of the line.’ This, according to this sociologist, affects individuals’ emotional growth so that the emotional growth ‘is at the risk of being stunted.’ The cell phone has become a ‘trusted companion, the other silent ever present but demanding significant partner.’ (Sunday Nation, lifestyle magazine, pg 4.)

The mobile phone has changed the way spouses interact at home. Instead of the lengthy conversations that characterized the family living room in the past, discussing all manner of topics, spouses now seem to limit face-to-face conversations to exchanging formal niceties and they turn to their little gadgets (mobile phones) for companionship. Spouses therefore seem to be more emotionally attached to their cell phones than their partners. This negative effect on emotional growth as described Ouko would definitely affect the way a spouse interacts with his or her marriage partner. The level of bonding and intimacy would consequently be negatively affected. Such developments would only put a marriage relationship at the risk of disintegration and ultimate failure.
In his theory, *Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation* (FIRO), William Schutz (1958) identified the need for love and affection as one of the needs that cause people to seek interpersonal relationships. This he describes as the need to be close and or to have a positive attachment to others. Love and affection is definitely one of the important components of a marriage relationship. As communication in marriage becomes more and more mediated because of the increased use of the mobile phone, there is a question whether the closeness that meets and fulfils this need is at risk. Does this therefore mean that marriage relationships could be at risk?

The prominence the mobile phone has been given in today’s society leads to strife not only in romantic relationships but in other close associations as well (Dr. Mbataaru Wanjiru - Anthropologist). Children are not left out in this alienation created by mobile phones. Parents today buy their children mobile phones. Such children are known to withdraw into their own world where they spend more time interacting with their mobile phones rather than family members. (Sunday Nation)

Cell phones are also used by certain individuals deliberately to put off any intended conversation by people around them. This indicates a society that is continually becoming impersonal and antisocial. In a UK survey carried out by a British cell phone firm, Carphone Warehouse, in 2008, twenty-one percent (21%) of the respondents said they use their cell phones to deter people from approaching them. 55% of the women under twenty five (25) years of age said they use their mobile phone to deter unwanted advances from men. Using the mobile phone this way – to hinder interpersonal face-to-face communication- would definitely affect the development of social skills in the people who apply this antisocial tactic. This study, among other things, sought to establish whether this is rightly so among Kenyans, especially married couples. Do they use their mobile phones to keep off conversations with their spouses?

Although the mobile phone is seen as an important scientific innovation that has revolutionized communication and socialization, some sociologists see it as a bad excuse for doing away with personal contact in communication. ‘No matter how evolved we think we are, nothing can replace human contact during communication. The theory of (technological) evolution is just an excuse’ (Dr. Mbataaru - Anthropologist). This expert says that confining ourselves to non-verbal and non-personal forms of contact ‘is detrimental to the social development of a person.’
In Kenya, the case could be worse for long distant relationships. Spouses or family members find it easier to just call or text rather than physically visit their relations. With the rural urban migration, family bread winners (mostly fathers, husbands) work and live in urban areas whereas their families continue to live in their rural homes. Such marriages could be at risk of total failure. With the advent of mobile money transfers, such men find it easier to send money via mobile phone for family support rather than travel upcountry to see their families. This saves on travel expenses. Although such individuals may continue to communicate as much as they can via mobile phones, they are at a risk of total alienation hence failed marriages.

However, Ms. Loise Noo, a psychologist, disagrees on this matter. She says that man can adapt to any situation and therefore the mobile phone is not to blame for severed relationship. She says, ‘if you choose to ignore your immediate relations, or cut yourself off from everybody else, you will do so regardless of whether you have a phone or not’ (Sunday Nation Lifestyle magazine, June 2011). She seems to attribute disintegration of relationships to individuals’ choices rather than technological innovations like mobile phones.

The mobile phone has been blamed for breakdown of communication in relationships where individuals do not only use the phone as a tool for communication but they use them as a ‘substitute for real heart-to-heart talk’ that they need to have with their partners. (Vercillo K, 2008). Partners in a relationship or spouses are said to avoid problems or confrontations in a relationship by moving the bulk of their conversations to text messaging. Texting creates ‘a false sense of connection’ that keeps people in touch while avoiding responsibilities that come with real heart-to-heart conversations. They keep people in touch without having to talk at all. This definitely cripples certain aspects of a healthy relationship.

Even where spouses or relationship partners seek to have a real face-to-face conversation, mobile phones come along as major distracters. They bring about the “you are not paying attention to me” kind of conversation (Vercillo K, 2008). This is where a person purports to listen to his or her partner’s conversation while busy browsing through his or her phone, texting, playing games etc. As a result there is discontent among spouses that might result in arguments. This definitely creates disharmony in a relationship. Other partners prefer ‘hanging out with their mobile phones rather than their spouses. Individuals in this case seek to fulfill their social and
emotional needs through constant interaction with their mobile phones. They can build and develop relationships, have a ‘feel- good’ moment, entertain themselves, all via mobile phone. This alienates their partners who would otherwise provide for such social and emotional needs.

2.2.4 Intrusion of Privacy

The study done by a UK phone company mentioned on page 10 of this report, mainly aimed at showing just how intrusive the mobile phone has become. The study mostly majored on the role of cell phones in romantic relationships of users. Shockingly, the study revealed that ‘only one (1) in ten (10) Britons switch off their mobile phones before having sex.’ (DN 12th July 2011)

This would definitely mean that the mobile phone has been allowed to intrude even the most private aspects of life. Sexual intimacy is important in a marriage relationship and is meant to be privately shared by couples. Sadly the mobile phone seems to have been allowed to violate this privacy.

In the Daily Nation article, ‘Are Cell Phones Switching off Relationships?’ some of the Kenyans interviewed indicated that they seldom switch off their mobile phones at home. Some actually indicated that their mobile phones only go off when there is a major power failure at home and they therefore run out of battery charge. This would only mean that the family is never accorded absolute privacy. Conversations and other family activities are constantly distracted by mobile ring tones and sometimes conversations come to an abrupt end as participants answer their mobile phones therefore engaging in a different conversation all together.

2.2.5 Irritation and annoyance

Mobile phones can also be a source of irritation and annoyance in a relationship. Like other little habits individuals engage in and we get irritated, phone habits can be a major irritation. For example, annoying ring tones, constant nags from irritating text message ring tone, irritating sounds of phone alarms in the morning etc could drive a partner away. The way one’s partner speaks on phone, the irritating tone of voice and other phone mannerisms can all annoy hence straining relationships. (Vercillo K, 2008)
2.2.6 Financial Stress

With so many daily transactions happening on phone, the mobile phone comes as an addition to family expenditure. Individuals’ calling habits can lead to accumulation of high telephone bills thus straining the family budget. This could lead to relationship strife especially in a marriage situation where finances are centralized.

New models of mobile phones are created every other day and users find themselves digging deeper into their pockets in order to acquire a more modern and sleek phone with added features. If partners in a marriage have not acquired self financial discipline. they could end up overstretcing the family budget thus causing strife. Such expenditures could wreck havoc in an otherwise harmonious relationship.

2.2.7 Addiction

Mobile phones and other forms of technology could be just as addictive as alcohol and drugs and could also wreck havoc with personal and work relationships (John O’Neil, director of addiction services at the Menninger Clinic in Houston, Texas). O’Neil uses the term ‘technology overload’ to refer to this form of addiction.

Individuals could suffer from too much mobile phone addiction that loved ones find it difficult to interact with them and they therefore begin to separate themselves from the addicted person and his problems. O’Neil says that technology addicts share the same components as people who become addicted to alcohol and drugs in that they cannot put their phones and other gadgets down and cannot stop the use of it even when there are some consequences. He says technology overload can have consequences on relationships. (Krannjec S, Reany P, 2008).

Psychologists agree with this and have classified technology addiction as an impulse disorder that can be as socially damaging as alcoholism, gambling and drug addiction. O’Neil says that warning signs that someone may be sliding into an unhealthy relationship with technology include using text messages, email and voice mail when face-to-face interaction would be more appropriate, or limiting time with friends and family to tend to emails, return phone calls or to surf the internet. The inability to leave home without a cell phone, to relax without constantly checking email or to stop using the internet are also worrying signs.
Addiction can result from too much dependency on the mobile phone due to low self esteem. Individuals with low self esteem typically do not communicate as much with others, and are more prone to expect a negative response from those whom they do contact. Such individuals will actually use their cell phone more to try and establish social networks, and build relationships without having all of the pressures of a face-to-face encounter with an individual, as well as to try and reach out to other individuals (Reid and Reid 2007). Research shows that individuals who have low self-esteem seek out more frequent use of the cell phone to seek to establish new relationships and try and gain an element of control in their social relationships. This makes it easier for individuals with lower self-esteem to form and maintain social relationships (Corbett A. 2009).

2.3 Is technology to blame?

The mobile phone could be a contributing factor to broken relationships and marriages, but is it entirely to blame for this? Technology, though advantageous, has its stresses on relationships. It is seen to have taken the place of face-to-face communication that existed before the advent of cell phones and social media sites (Varanasi S, 2010). Although social networking keeps friends and family in touch as well as builds networks, it on the other hand takes quality time from families. Experts say that people flock to media sites to cope in times of boredom and stresses. This however only causes their relationships with their partners/spouses to deteriorate further because they run away from real issues or challenges facing them. They therefore miss the opportunity to nurture their relationship. Relationship experts say that doors of communication must be left open at all times however difficult even in times of stresses. However when an individual turns to his phone and logs onto a social site to seek solace, this closes doors to any possible communication and conflict resolution with their spouses.

Some opinion makers in the internet argue that society should not blame it all on technology. They are of the opinion that every individual has a duty to control his mind and make appropriate choices even in times of distress. This individual therefore is to blame for actions he or she takes not the technology available to him or her.

On the other hand, individual postings on the internet depicting people’s personal experiences of mobile phone usage reveal both the good and the ‘evil’ side of mobile phones. In one particular
case this study looked at. the question, ‘do you think cell phones better your relationships or ruin them?’ was posted on a website – experienceproject.com. This question attracted divergent views from bloggers. A huge percentage of respondents were of the opinion that cell phones ruin relationships citing misunderstandings resulting from unclear text messages and loss of the emotional aspect of communication that can be realized through face-to-face interaction. A speaker’s actual tone of voice and their body language were cited as important components of communication that are lost when people communicate via mobile phone. Some in this category of respondents found the cell phone intrusive and nagging, where friends and relatives expect you to be available to answer their calls at all times irrespective of where you are. This according to them denies them ‘time alone.’

On the other hand, another category of respondents the best innovation ever as far as communication is concerned. They said it helps people in a relationship to beat the challenge of distance and can stay in touch at all times. Those in long distant relationships said talking on phone for long hours with their partners helped them to feel closer to them and are able to bond more this way. Those who have very busy schedules at work termed the cell phone as a convenient and good way to stay in touch with their partners through text messaging while still going about their busy schedule.

So do mobile phones help to build or ruin relationships? This study sought to establish that, among other effects of mobile phone usage in the Kenyan context.
CHAPTER 3

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Site selection:

Being the capital city of Kenya, Nairobi is a cosmopolitan city with almost every Kenyan ethnic community represented in its population. It is therefore unlikely that behavioral trends are highly influenced by any single community’s tradition or culture.

As a modern city dwelling with highly dynamic lifestyles, Nairobi city epitomizes the fast-paced adoption of mobile phone usage in every-day-life in Kenya. The city also happens to have the highest rate of marriage break ups in the country. It also reports more cases of infidelity than any other place in Kenya.

Nairobi is host to a cross section of people in its population ranging from the very poor to the very rich, the highly educated to the semiliterate and illiterates. This could be attributed to the rural-urban migration where the very poor have found their way into the city in search for a better life but have unfortunately ended up forming the lower stratum of the society’s economic ladder due to lack of employment. Consequently this group remains largely uneducated since education remains unaffordable to many low income earners.

The city population in many ways represents the whole Kenyan society due to its social, economic, cultural and intellectual diversity. It provides for the variables that this research put into consideration.

3.2 Research Design:

This research took an explorative approach with an aim of establishing the extent to which mobile phones have affected marriage relationships. This approach was considered sufficient for this particular study since the researcher intended to explore the behavioral characteristics of married mobile phone users, establish whether their behavior is linked to mobile phone usage and to what extent these behaviors have affected their marriages.
More in-depth study could be done given that little scientific study has been done in respect to mobile phone usage and its effects on relationships. Most researchers have concentrated on the effect of the internet usage. Most literature available on mobile phone usage and relationships is not based on scientific research; they contain individuals' perspectives of the matter.

3.3 Population:

The population of interest in this study comprised of married individuals within Nairobi who had an acceptable level of knowledge to be able to participate in this research.

3.4 Sampling:

Non-probability sampling was used where participants in the personal interviews were handpicked on the basis of knowledge possession and their adequacy in meeting the parameters of the selected variables. There were three participants in the personal interviews including: one professional counselor, one religious leader and a third participant who was both a professional counselor and religious leader. The choice of the third participant was advised by the need to balance between professional counseling and religious views. Being a psychologist and a pastor, the third participant provided for this need. These categories of people were considered because they are all concerned with society's behavior patterns and because of their every day involvement in handling marital issues.

Respondents for the questionnaires were selected at two levels; first a group of married individuals, both male and female, were selected putting into consideration their professions and perceived levels of income. This was done to ensure the sample of respondents represented a cross-section of socioeconomic constituents with varied levels of education. This group included managers, sales people, accountants, business people, health nurses, drivers, and hair dressers. Secondly, questionnaires were distributed through this selected group so that they issued them to their married peers and their subordinates randomly.
3.5 Data collection:

The study used primary and secondary data. Primary data was generated through personal interviews and Questionnaires. The personal interviews were unstructured so that respondents were not too limited in their responses. This is because the study was explorative and also involved a sensitive topic - marriage relationships – and respondents needed to be relaxed and at liberty to structure their answers the way they felt comfortable. However an interview schedule (in form of a questionnaire) was prepared in advance and was used as a guide to the interview. This ensured that relevance was maintained throughout the interview. In each case the interviewer completed the interview schedule as the interview progressed.

The purpose of the interview was explained to the respondent prior to the interview meeting and just before the commencement of the interview. This was done to facilitate provision of relevant information by interviewees and to clear all doubt thus establishing trust between the interviewer and the respondent.

All interviews were recorded for purposes of ease of collecting information and to ensure accuracy of the same. The audio recordings also helped during data editing since parts of information that could have been missed by the interviewer or written in an unclear manner in the schedules could be retrieved from the audios.

Questionnaires were administered mainly through the “drop and pick later” method. Other questionnaires were mailed electronically to target online respondents who were encouraged to fill them and mail them back via the internet. This will made it possible to reach a wider population within Nairobi.

Secondary data was generated mainly from newspaper and magazine articles plus internet publications and blogs. The content analysis focused on articles reporting on personal experiences by different individuals as well as relevant surveys carried out on the topic before or other related fields.
3.6 Data Analysis

This being an explorative study the data analysis involves summarization of data using statistical averages, percentages and frequency. The results were presented using tables, graphs and pie charts. This was done for all objectives and sections of questionnaires other than those providing qualitative data.

Further analysis was done considering the demographic factors where cross tabulation was applied to establish the relationship between these factors and other certain key variables.

Data classification was done according to both attributes and class – intervals because the study sought to gather both descriptive and numerical data.

Tabulation of data was done electronically using the SPSS program for analysis for ease of handling data and to save on time.

The qualitative data the personal interviews was considered collectively with related information grouped together and assigned titles/subheadings that represented the attributes of the data. The data was then presented in a report form.
CHAPTER 4

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The data was collected using questionnaires and through personal interviews. 84 questionnaires were dispatched. Out of the 84 questionnaires, 53 (63.1%) responses were received, edited and validated. Out of the 53 questionnaires that were received 4 (4.2% of the total number of questionnaires dispatched) were completed by individuals who were not married. These are people who had indicated they were married, during the issuing of the questionnaires but indicated their marital status as single in the questionnaire. The credibility of the 4 respondents became questionable since they had been dishonest and this cast doubt on the authenticity of the information they had supplied in the questionnaire. In addition, the study was focusing on a population of married individuals therefore, if they were indeed single, they were ineligible for the study. For this reason the 4 responses were discarded and were not included in the analysis. 49 (58.3% of the total number of questionnaires dispatched) responses therefore, were analyzed.

The personal interviews involved three respondents. All the three respondents availed themselves and cooperated with the interviewer, supplying information with ease. The data from the interviews was edited, filling in missing or unclear information and rectifying erroneously entered information in the completed interview schedules using the audio recordings of the interviews. This data was compiled as one report as presented in 4.2 (Report on personal interviews).

This chapter presents the data analysis techniques, results and interpretation.

4.2 Presentation of findings from Personal Interviews

4.2.1 Respondents’ profile

The three respondents in the interviews included a pastor (Rev. Geoffrey Mwithi, Deliverance Church, Zimmerman), a professional psychological counselor (Mrs. Elecah Mbithi, Counselor
4.2.2 Findings from personal interviews

The following subsection constitutes the findings from the interviews conducted with the three respondents. The information from the three interviews has been integrated and recorded under different subheadings following the issues arising in the course of the interviews.

4.2.2.1 Demand for marital counseling

All the three persons interviewed in this study agreed in their view that the demand for marital counseling was on the increase. The demand however, according to Mrs. Elecah Mbithi portrays a changing trend where both men and women are seeking counseling as opposed to earlier trends where only women sought marital counseling. Reports at Amani Counseling Centre indicate that equal number of men to women sought counseling from the institution in the month of July 2011. Mrs. Mbithi however said that most often, there are more women than men seeking counseling. Pastor Geoffrey Mwithi described the increased demand for marital counseling as a 'cry' resulting from issues cutting across all age brackets. Mrs. Mbithi however, observed that the demand for counseling may not necessarily mean that there are more problems in marriages although that, she adds, cannot be ruled out but increased awareness of counseling help and support could be the major contributing factor.

4.2.2.3 Reasons for increased demand for marital counseling?

Pastor Irene Jacca and Pastor Mwithi attributed the increased demand for counseling to increased challenges facing married couples and society as a whole today. Pst. Mwithi sees today's lifestyle as the major cause of marital problems. He said life, especially in Nairobi, is too fast where people are too busy looking for money, in search for higher education, etc, and a result families are neglected and couples are not available for each other. In his words, "the fast life is creating a disconnect in families causing relationships to grow cold." In his opinion, the family is dropping down the priority list as personal goals supersede corporate family goals. In
addition he lamented that people in society have discarded values leading to many problems in families.

Mrs. Mbithi on the other hand attributed the rise in demand for counseling to *increased awareness* where people now know there is professional help. She said this awareness is evident even in the corporate sector where employers are today referring their employees for counseling. She said, “Employers are also realizing that issues that come from home are finding their way into the workplace.” According to her, employees who were previously productive in their workplace are becoming unproductive due to pressure originating from family problems. She expressed pleasure towards the fact that employers are now more sensitive and instead of firing such employees they are now referring them for professional counseling.

In addition, Mrs. Mbithi pointed out the issue of *collapsed social support systems* as another contributing factor to this increased demand for (professional) counseling. She said there are fewer social support systems in today’s Kenyan society as opposed to earlier days where community and the extended family provided great support to nuclear families. According to her, there is ‘increased individualism’ and she expressed the fear that the Kenyan society is losing a very important component. She said, “I am afraid we are losing what the west writes about Africa – that we are communal.”

According to Mrs. Mbithi, couples are also coming to the realization that pastors and religious leaders and family members may have goodwill but are not qualified to offer proper counseling. Such couples seek for professional counseling. She said family members and religious leaders can sometimes become part of the problem since they are in the same community and may not be objective in their role as mediators in marital issues.

Mrs. Mbithi also sighted *confidence* as a reason for increased demand for marital counseling, a view that Pst. Jacca agrees with. Pastor Jacca said that people are more open to counseling and are willing to ‘take the risk of sharing issues in their life and seeking help’ as opposed to yester years when marital issues were supposed to be kept between the couple. She said that people are more confident and more accommodating to counseling. Pst. Jacca noted that many people seek marital counseling because they are driven by the ‘desire to save their marriages.’ She however
brought up a very interesting view to this matter; that some people seek counseling simply to "put their spouses in their place – just to prove he or she is wrong."

4.2.2.3 Risk of collapse

Responding to the question whether marriages today at a greater risk of collapse than they were 15 years ago (around the time the mobile phone gained popularity in Kenya), all the three respondents concurred that marriages are at a greater risk of collapse today than they ever were. In their justification for this view, the following reasons were given:

- Pastor Irene Jacca cited changing values. According to her, people are sometimes getting married for the wrong reasons; sometimes due to peer pressure or wrong motivations like material gain. In her view such marriages are not sustainable.

- Mrs. Elecah Mbithi attributed the increased risk of collapse to the diminishing community factor in modern Kenya. As a result, she said, there are fewer support systems making marriages more vulnerable. Agreeing with this view, Pastor Mwithi said that lack of social support contributes to the swelling numbers of failed marriages. He stated that social ties that existed in the past and provided support for young couples are no more. In his opinion, there is too much individualism and people are just “running on their own.” According to him, society has absconded its duty in this sense.

- Mrs. Mbithi also raised the issue of changed attitudes. She observed that today’s couple has a more daring attitude. In her words, “today’s couple is more daring to say it is not working and call it quit.” She observed that although in the earlier days marriages rarely came to a complete collapse, some remained highly dysfunctional only that couples then were not daring enough to walk out.

- Increased awareness of individual rights was also cited as a contributing factor to increased risk of marriage breakages. In this view, Mrs. Mbithi explained that today’s couple is more aware of their individual rights and where these rights are severed, one can easily walk out of the marriage.

- The vulnerability of marriages today was also attributed to lifestyle changes. In his view, Pastor Mwithi, observed that too much priority is given to material possession and wealth
accumulation at the expense of building healthy marriage relationships. He noted that modern lifestyles have tended to put wealth ahead of family in the priority list.

- Pastor Mwthi also isolated increased irresponsibility on the part of spouses as a great cause of marriages collapse today. He said men especially, are increasingly running away from responsibility in their families. In his words, “marriage is work, and the moment you are not ready to work on it, it will collapse.”

- The media also came under sharp criticism. In his opinion Pastor Mwthi indicated that Kenyan media do not appreciate the marriage institution. He said the media provides wrong perceptions of marriage so that young people get married: i) for the wrong reasons and ii) with an expectation that certain things will happen, like break ups are expected any time and they are seen as normal. He said FM stations, especially, are largely to blame for propagating ideals that are not applicable in real life. He observed that socially defined roles are being “trashed” by the media creating perceptions that are not practically achievable in real life situation.

4.2.2.4 Social-economic factor

On the question whether marital problems are more prevalent in certain socio-economic classes, all the three respondents agreed that marital problems affect persons across all socio-economic groups only that their causes differ from one group to another. Pastor Mwthi however added that, the current trend shows the middle and upper classes being more affected than the lower income groups. He said the reason is not very clear but could be due to “too much information overload” among people in the middle and upper classes. In his opinion, the well-off families happen to be more informed because of ease of access to information through electronic media and so forth – they can afford it. According to him, this information overload has not been very helpful because in his opinion, “there is more knowledge than wisdom among these groups.”

Further, Pastor Mwthi, cited financial independence among spouses in the middle and upper classes as a factor that contributes to individualism where one feels, “I can always make it alone” thus easily disregarding their spouse. He said on the other hand, low income groups
could be keeping their families together due to the interdependence created by their level of need.

4.2.2.5 Does the mobile phone contribute to marital instability?

All the three respondents positively indicated that they have dealt with marital issues related to mobile phone usage by spouses. Two of the three respondents indicated that such cases were common in their marital counseling sessions. Mrs. Mbithi specifically noted that such issues are more common among younger couples. She said this could be because young people in their 20's and 30's use the phone more frequently and have more diverse uses of the gadget. She added that the group is more technology savvy and the mobile phone is a lifestyle to them. In her opinion, this could explain why they have more mobile phone related issues in their marriages. On the other hand, she said, the older couples have more specific and limited uses of the mobile phone. Their phones could be mostly for common functions like calling and money transfer. Mrs. Mbithi however suggested that the mobile phone is not fully to blame; she said, “The mobile phone has exaggerated marital issues; problems were there anyway, perhaps the mobile (phone) just exposed them.”

The third respondent, Pastor Jacca, didn’t think marital issues related to mobile phone usage are very common. She said that though they occur, she would not term them as a common occurrence.

4.2.2.6 Marital issues related to mobile phone usage.

Asked to state some of the issues related to mobile phone usage that they have dealt with in their marital counseling sessions, the three respondents bought up the following issues:

a) Suspicion: All the three respondents cited suspicion as a major issue arising from mobile phone usage. Pastor Mwithi spoke emphatically about this saying that, “any case you are dealing with involving suspicion in a marriage, many times it has originated from a mobile phone.” He indicated that many couples have formed the habit of scrolling through their partner’s phones. According to him, the messages therein, may not be related to unfaithfulness but they could be misinterpreted. In his
observation, the mobile phone only comes in to confirm existing suspicion hence fuelling greater problems in a marriage.

On her part, Mrs. Mbithi observed that a lot of mistrust and suspicion in marriages are fuelled by certain mobile phone behavior. She said that some spouses' mobile phone behavior arouses suspicion. Giving an example she said, “If my spouse hardly puts his/her phone down and almost panics when he or she leaves it behind, I am likely to wonder what it is I am not supposed to see. Or if he/she repeatedly refuses to answer my calls, I begin to wonder why.” She added that following this suspicion, some spouses begin to snoop on each other by scrolling through their phones. Others according to her, especially women, simply snoop out of curiosity; maybe just wanting to know, “who is my spouse talking to?” Unfortunately, Mrs. Mbithi says, such snooping can become a habit and eventually develop into a behavior thus causing problems in a marriage.

The act of snooping, according to Pastor Mwithi, is in itself a problem. He said the behavior irritates the owner of the phone resulting in arguments. He noted that this practice has been taken to another level where spouses are “spying on each other” on phone. He said that couples are using mobile phone applications to access text messages sent to a spouse so that the message is received in the other spouse’s phone also. Such snooping, he said, causes fights sometimes unnecessarily because even innocent messages are misinterpreted and misunderstood thus fuelling disputes. He was however quick to add that the mobile phone is not the cause, according to him, it just reveals underlying issues. He said that even where suspicion is the issue, the mobile phone does not create it, its user’s behavior does.

b) Extra-marital affairs/cheating: Two of the respondents cited this as a marital problem associated with mobile phone usage. Pastor Jacca observed that spouses are beginning and sustaining extra-marital affairs on mobile phone. She said that with the mobile phone, it has become very easy to cheat. In her opinion, some extra-marital affairs are begun based on lies and are sustained using mobile phone. She said the mobile phone has made it possible for a married person to secretly sustain an affair outside their marriage. She observed that some innocent single people are made to believe that the person they are dating is single as well (though married) and this lie is comfortably
sustained using the phone since the two can continuously keep in touch and the married person can always lie about his/her whereabouts even when with his or her spouse. Pastor Jacca however added that the mobile phone is not to blame for cheating; she said, “It (mobile phone) has only made cheating easier. Cheating was there way before, the mobile phone just made it better. It has put finesse to the cheating; you can do anything on this gadget.”

She also noted that the mobile phone has diversified cheating. In her words, “emotional and sexual desires are all fulfilled on this gadget (mobile phone) effectively.” In this case she referred to other forms of cheating like watching pornography and online flirting.

In his view, Pastor Mwithi equally agrees that the mobile phone contributes to infidelity. He said that many extra-marital affairs today are conducted through mobile phones.

c) **Confusion and misinterpretation:** Mrs Mbithi observed that text messages are a problem since they sometimes result in a lot of confusion. She said, “A text message does not fully represent thoughts and feelings and it cannot be questioned.” She added that even if another text message is sent to clarify the first one, it dies not communicate emotions and feelings in the absence of the sender. She said the misunderstandings resulting from such confusion brew disagreements and unnecessary arguments.

d) **Misuse:** Misuse of the mobile phone was mentioned by two of the three respondents. Pastor Jacca indicated that some spouses use their mobile phones carelessly in their communication with each other. According to her, some send insults and abuses to each other via mobile phone thus aggravating problems in relationships.

Raising the same issue of misuse, Mrs Mbithi noted that most mobile phone related issues arise from misuse of the gadget. She said it all boils down to “the how of phone usage.” She noted that issues that are supposed to be addressed face-to-face in a marriage are resolved on phone. She said, “You can tell off a spouse on phone yet you were both at home the previous night and you said nothing. Communication is already a major challenge in marriages and it is made worse by the mobile phone – its misuse.”
e) **Stress**: Elecah Mbithi noted that the mobile phone can be very stressful. She said that with the mobile phone, one is not in control of who calls and when. In her view this stress originates from intrusion of privacy, nagging and irritation. She observed that calls intrude people’s privacy, for example, interrupting family time. Mrs Mbithi added that with phones, there is no space for personal time. Mrs Mbithi noted that the way people use mobile phones can really strain relationships; that a person can call or text his or her spouse too many times in a day thus causing irritation. She emphasizes that spouses need some space too. She explains that such persistent calls could be due to mistrust and the calling partner does it simply to track his or her spouse in order to establish their whereabouts.

f) **Exposure to external enemies**: According to Mrs Mbithi, the mobile phone makes marriages vulnerable to ‘haters.’ She indicated that people who maliciously intend to ruin a marriage sometimes use the mobile phone to achieve this objective. They send text messages that are intended to be seen by their receiver’s spouse in order to ruin the target person’s relationship. Mrs Mbithi observed that such people would do so in an effort to take revenge.

4.2.2.7 Effect of mobile phone on communication in marriages.

On the question whether the mobile phone has changed the way spouses communicate and interact in marriages, all the three respondents agreed that there indeed has been a change; that communication is no longer the same. Two of the respondents, Pastor Jacca and Mrs Mbithi described the change as both positive and negative, while Pastor Mwithi described the change as positive.

In her opinion, Mrs Mbithi indicated that whether the change is positive or negative among individual couples depends on how the mobile phone is used. She said the gadget could enhance relationship or destroy depending on how its users apply it. She explained that where the mobile phone is overused has overcome largely impersonal. In her words, “communication on mobile phone is exclusive of gestures, eye contact and body language. The communication is impersonal and can replace relationship.”
Agreeing with Mbithi’s observation, Pastor Jacca made a similar observation saying that the mobile phone has taken the place of personal/face to face communication and has therefore to some extent become a barrier to relationship. She said mobile phone is impersonal to the extent that is minus body language. She said in mobile phone communication, “you cannot see the other person’s expressions. Body language transfers a particular kind of communication that the mobile phone cannot.”

Pastor Jacca also noted that with the increased use of mobile phones, honest communication is lacking. People lie about their whereabouts, what they are doing and so on, simply because the spouse on the other end may not be able to verify the information. She was however quick to add that the dishonesty is not about the mobile phone but about the person using the phone.

In addition, Pastor Jacca noted that there are some positive changes brought about by the mobile phone. She said the mobile phone has made communication easier so that spouses can communicate more often. She observed that couples are able to keep in touch at all times even in the midst of their busy work schedules. Spouses, according to her, can affirm each other by sending a love message on phone thus strengthening the relationship.

Finally Pastor Jacca indicated that the mobile phone keeps communication lines open. In her words, “communication builds relationship. Relationships must be built and they are not built on silence or assumptions.” Pastor Mwithi agreed with this assertion saying that the constant calls made by spouses to each other build relationships. He also agreed that the mobile phone keeps communication lines open, saying that, “through the mobile phone, people can let out what they are shy or afraid to say in a face-to-face encounter especially in case of a conflict.” He however added that if this is misused, it could have negative implications.

4.2.2.8 Would marriages be different today without mobile phones?

Both Pastor Mwithi and Mrs. Mbithi agreed that marriages would be different from what they are today if the mobile phone was not in use. Pastor Jacca on the other hand observed that marriages would be the same even without the mobile phone.

In her argument, Mrs Mbithi observed that communication would be more difficult and life would be more expensive as spouses would have to move from point A to B to simply pass a
message that would have been communicated on phone. She however noted that though the mobile phone enhances communication in this way, it is only good when used in moderation. She lamented, “I am afraid who teaches us (society) mobile phone etiquette? There is need for people to learn mobile phone etiquette.”

Mrs. Mbithi also observed that though communication on mobile phone is easier, it has taken away a good form of communication between people who love each other that would have been preserved if the gadget was never around. She lamented that the phone has replaced written notes. In her words, “letters were given much thought, they were more personal. Even the type and the color of the writing pad mattered.” she however added that the type of communication you adopt, all depends on choice; one could adopt the two modes of communication effectively.

On his part, Pastor Mwithi said that the absence of the mobile phone could have both positive and negative implications on marriages. Regarding the negative implication, he said that it would be difficult for spouses to keep in touch frequently; relationship enhancing communication like sending love messages on SMS would be cut off and it would be very difficult for spouses to pass critical information in real time. On the other hand, he said the absence of the mobile phone would result in more bonding as people engage in face to face communication. According to him families would spend more time together as opposed to individuals spending more time on phone text messaging, calling, emailing, and interacting on social networks. He observed that, occasional withdrawal of the gadget could have a positive impact. Giving a practical example, he said his church had a program called ‘Encounter’ where faithful go for a three day retreat, every year, without a mobile phone. He explained that the absence of the mobile phone allowed members an opportunity to reflect on their lives and their relationship with God without any intrusion or distraction. He indicated that he had observed positive change in the lives of those who took part in the program.

Considering a situation where the mobile phone was no more, Mrs. Mbithi observed that that would not necessarily mean more face-to-face communication. She said, “It could get worse. Maybe the mobile phone makes thing better because if you do not want to talk to your spouse, you could tell them off on phone.” That, she says, in some way opens communication and allows a channel for people to let out their feelings. According to her, the absence of a phone would not mean healthier relationships because communication between spouses would still depend on
their choices and priorities. She said, “One may not have a mobile phone but could still choose not to speak to his or her spouse.” She sums up her argument by saying, “the mobile phone is a matter of choice and personal discipline; it is a resource. We could misuse it or use it to our benefit.”

Pastor Jacca explained her view that the absence of the mobile phone would not make a difference in marriages, by saying; “the genesis of marriage is commitment not the means by which people will live after that. When you get married, it’s about commitment not about how you are going to function.” In conclusion she said, “The mobile phone is a means not a definition of life and technology is meant to enhance not to kill.”

4.2.3 Conclusion

The findings from the interviews with the three respondents, who would be considered as authorities in the topic of this study due to their experience, nature of their work and training, largely exonerated the mobile phone from the blame of breaking marriages. The mobile phone emerges as communication tool that has numerous benefits including ease of communication, enhancing relationship and opening lines of communication among conflicting spouses. The information from the interviews however indicates that the mobile phone contributes to increased impersonal communication, dishonesty, mistrust and infidelity in marriages. However there is a general agreement that the phone is not to blame for the vices in marriages that result in breakups. The responsibility lies with the user of the gadget rather than the gadget itself. The mobile phone is simply a means that effectively propagates already existing values based on individual choices. Society also came under sharp criticism for abandoning the joint responsibility of nurturing young marriages and instilling proper values. From the findings of this interview it was clear that the mobile phone has become a problem simply because of the collapse of its users’ value systems.
4.3 Analysis and presentation of findings of data collected through questionnaires.

4.3.1 Demographic characteristics

4.3.1.1 Gender

In the frequency distribution table, pie chart below, out of the 49 respondents 36.7 % were female while the remaining 63.3% were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.2 Age

In the frequency distribution table and Bar chart below represent the percentages of ages of the respondents.

1 represents those respondents whose ages were 40 years and above
2 represent those respondents whose ages fell from 36 to 39 years
3 represent those respondents whose ages fell from 31-35 years
4 represents respondents whose ages were from 25-30 years while
5 represent the respondents whose ages were below 25 years.
In the distribution table below, those respondents whose ages were above 40 years were 10.2%, those whose ages fell between 36-39 years accounted for 26.5%, those whose ages were between 31-35 years accounted for 40.8%, those respondents whose ages fell between 25-30 years accounted for 18.4% while those ages were below 25 years accounted for 4.1%

**Table 4.3.2 AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.3. Employment Status

Among the 49 respondents, 31 (63.3%) of the respondents are in formal employment, 15 (30.6%) are self-employed while the other 3 who represent 6.1% are unemployed.
### Table 4.3.3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYED</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3**
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4.3.1.4 Income level

The frequency distribution table given below represents the distribution of the income level among the respondents. The low income group accounted for 20.4%, those middle level income accounted for 69.4%, while the high income level accounted for 10.2% of all the respondents.

Table 4.3.4 INCOME_LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.5 Education level

In the frequency distribution table below, the level of education of the respondents were classified and the following results were obtained. 1 out of the 49 respondents did not disclose his/her level of education. Those who obtained a graduate level of education accounted for 40.8% (20), post graduate and above accounted for 26.5% (13), followed by 8.2% (4) while secondary level of education were 11 (22.4%) of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL_LEVEL</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE/DIPLOMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST GRADUATE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.6 Length of marriage

In the frequency distribution table below shows the length of time the respondents have been in the marriage institution. The data is categorized into the following groups: A shows those who have been married for less than 5 years; B indicates those married between 6-10 years; C indicates those married between 11-15 years; D indicates those married between 16-20 years; E indicates those married between 21-25 years; F indicates those married between 26-30 years and G indicates those married between 31-35 years.

The frequency distribution table shows that those spouses who are married below 5 years are 36.7% (18), those who are married between 6 to 10 years account for 34.7% (17), those whose marriages have lasted between 11 to 15 years account for 14.3% (7), those whose marriages have
lasted between 16 to 20 years are 4.1% (2), those with their marriages lasting between 21-25 in the category E account for 2% (1), the same percentage applies to those whose marriages have lasted between 26-30 years while those who did not respond to this question were 3 (6.1%).

### Table 4.3.6 LENGTH_OF_MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.7 Period of phone ownership

In the distribution table below shows the length of time the respondents have had a mobile phone. 5 people have owned a phone for less than 2 years and therefore fall in category A in the table which represents below 2 years of ownership. Those who have owned a phone for a period between 2-4 years are represented by “B” and they account for 3 (6.1%) of the respondents. Those who have owned a phone between 4-6 years are represented by “C” and are 12 (24.5%), those who have owned a phone between 6-8 years are represented by “D” and are 8 (16.3%), those who have had a phone for 8-10 years are 7(14.3%) and represented by “E”. Those who have owned a phone for between 10-12 years account for 12 (24.4%) and are represented by “F”
and those who have owned phone between 12-14 years account for 2(4.1%) and are represented by “G”.

**Table 4.3.7 HOW_LONG_OWN_A_PHONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Mobile Phone Uses

4.3.2.1 Frequency of the usage of mobile phone

4.3.2.1.1 Calling

The frequency distribution table below shows that 100% of the respondents use mobile phones for calling.

Table 4.3.8 CALLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.1.2 Text messaging

The frequency distribution table above shows that all respondents 100% use mobile phones for text messaging.

Table 4.3.9 TEXT MESSAGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.1.3 Emails

Of those respondents who were interviewed, 24 (49%) do not use their mobile phones for emails while those who use their phones for emails were 25 (51%).

Table 4.3.10 EMAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.1.4 Money transfer

In this question as to whether the respondents use their mobile phones for money transfer, only 5 (10.2%) out those targeted respondents do not use their phones for this purpose otherwise the rest 44 (89.8%) use their mobile phones for money transfer.

Table 4.3.11 MONEY TRANSFER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.1.5 Internet research

Of all the 49 respondents, 24 (49%) do not use mobile phones for internet while the remaining 25 (51%) do.

Table 4.3.12 INTERNET RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.1.6 Social network

29 (59.2%) of the respondents reported that they do not use their mobile phone for social network while 20 (40.8%) use their mobile phones for social network. The social networks included twitter and face book.

Table 4.3.13 SOCIAL_NETWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.1.6 Entertainment

26 (53.1%) of the 49 respondents indicated that they do not use their mobile phones for entertainment while 23 (46.9%) agreed that they use their mobile phones for entertainment purposes. Under this category the applications were; watching movies, downloading and listening to music.

Table 4.3.14 ENTERTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8
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4.3.2.2 Three priority uses of mobile phone

This question attempts to investigate the top three uses of mobile phones by the respondents. The answers to this question helped to authenticate the results provided in 4.3.2.1 above. Here the respondents were asked to individually state their top three priority uses of their mobile phones. The following results were obtained: calling, money transfer and e-mail accounted for 2 (4.1%), calling money transfer and watching movies accounted for 1 (2%), calling money transfer were 1 (2%), calling and text messaging were 6 (12.2%), calling, text messaging and, e-mail 1 (2%), calling, text messaging and face book 1 (2%), calling, text messaging and money transfer 37 (75.5%). In this regard, the top three common uses of the mobile phone emerged as calling, text messaging and money transfer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Uses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, EMAIL, MONEY TRANSFER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, MONEY TRANSFER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, MONEY TRANSFER, WATCH MOVIE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, TEXT MESSAGING</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, TEXT MESSAGING, EMAIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, TEXT MESSAGING, FACEBOOK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLING, TEXT MESSAGING, MONEY TRANSFER</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Average time spent on mobile phone per day

The question sought to establish the amount of time on average users spent on their mobile phones daily. The answers to this question were useful in establish how much the mobile phone has preoccupied the daily lives of spouses.

The frequency distribution table below shows the length of time spent on phone per day by respondents. Category “A” represents those who spend below 2 hours a day; they accounted for 21 (42.9%) of the respondents; “B” represents those who spend between 2-4 hours and they accounted for 20 (40.8%); “C” represents those who spend 4-6 hours and they accounted for 4 (8.2%); “D” represents those who spend 6-8 hours and they accounted for 1 (2.0%); “E”
represents those who spend 8-10 hours and they accounted for 1 (2.0%); "F" represents those who spend 10-12 hours and they accounted for 1 (2.0%) of the respondents. NR represents the respondents who gave no reply to this question and they were 1 (2.0%).

Table 4.3.16 EVERAGE_TIME_SPENT_ON_PHONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that 83.7% (41) of the respondents spend an average of 4 hours and below on their mobile phones per day. That’s about 1/6 of a day.
4.3.4 Interacting with family

This question asked the respondents to indicate what percentage of the time they spend on their phones per day, is used interacting with their families. The question was intended to assess whether the phone is a relationship enhancing tool or it helps to alienate its users from their families. The frequency distribution table below gives how much time they spend on phone with their families compared to the overall time the respondents spend on phone in a day. In the frequency distribution table below and the graph, the percentages of time spent interacting with
family is represented by the following codes: “A” represents Below 20%, “B” 20-40%; “C” 40-60%; “D” 60-80% and “E” 80% and above of the overall time spent on phone per day.

Table 4.3.17 INTERACTING WITH FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERACTING_WITH_FAMILY

4.3.4.1 How gender influence interaction with family

The table below represents a cross tabulation of the variables of gender and mobile phone time spent interacting with family. The purpose was to establish who between the male and the female spouses are likely to use the mobile phone as a unifying rather than an alienating tool.

As reflected in the table below, more females (6) than males (4) spend over 60% of their time on phone interacting with family. This is despite the fact that males formed the majority of the respondents in this survey. On the other half of the male respondents, 18(56.3%) spend below 20% of their overall time spent on phone, interacting with family.
Table 4.3.18 gender and interaction with family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV. TIME PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17 = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4.2 How level of education affects interaction with family

The table below is a cross tabulation showing the relationship between the respondents' level of education and the average percentage of their mobile phone time used interacting with family. The purpose for this cross tabulation was to assess whether individuals' level of education affects the amount of time they commit to interacting with family on phone.

The table indicates a uniform trend where the numbers for each category of education level are higher for the minimum percentage of time (below 20%) spent interacting with family and the numbers grow smaller as the percentages increase for all the categories. There is no identifiable distinction of the mobile phone time interactions with family along the variable, level of education.

Table 4.3.19 level of education and interaction with family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV. TIME PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4.3 How level of income affects interaction with family

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, level of income and the percentage of time spent interacting with family on phone. The purpose was to establish whether the economic factor has any bearing on the amount of time individuals commit to interacting with family on phone.

Table 4.3.20 Level of income and interaction with family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV. TIME PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4.3 How age affects phone time spent interacting with family

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, age and the percentage of time spent interacting with family on phone. The purpose was to establish whether the age variable has any bearing on the percentage of the overall time spent on phone, committed to interacting with family.

Table 4.3.21 Age distribution and time spent interacting with family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV. TIME PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>40yrs and above</th>
<th>36-39 yrs</th>
<th>31-35 yrs</th>
<th>25-30 yrs</th>
<th>Below 25 yrs</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 Affected communication between spouses

The question sought to establish whether the adoption of mobile phone has affected the way spouses communicate with each other. The frequency distribution table and the graph below present the responses given to this question. 34 (69.4%) said YES, indicating that the mobile phone has affected their communication with spouses. 13 (26.6%) said NO, indicating that the mobile phone has had an effect on their communication with spouses; while 2 (4.1%) gave no reply to this question.

Table 4.3.22 Affected communication with spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.6 Description of the effect of mobile phone on spouses' communication

The question asked how the use of mobile phone affected spouses' communication. The respondents were asked to describe the effect as either positive, mostly positive, negative or mostly negative. The following results were obtained: 2 (4.1%) of the respondents reported that it is mostly negative; 7 (14.3%) reported that it was mostly positive; 8 (16.3%) of the respondents described it as negative, while 32 (65.3%) reported that the mobile phone effect on their communication with spouses was positive.
Table 4.3.23 Effect on communication with spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>MOSTLY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOSTLY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13

AFFECTED_WAY_COMMUNICATE_SPOUSE
Respondents were then asked, in an open ended question, to explain why they referred to the effect of the mobile phone on their communication with spouses as either positive or negative. The following explanations were gathered from the respondents’ answers.

Those who termed the effect as positive gave their reasons as summarized below:

- The mobile phone has improved communication and enhanced access to each other since spouses keep in touch all day even during working hours.
- It is a convenient means of communication; spouses can communicate and handle emergencies without having to move physically from one point to another.
- Misunderstandings can easily be solved on phone without face-to-face confrontations.
- It provides assurance when a spouse calls and you get to know where they are and what they are doing.
- It has made daily consultations easier and one can get immediate feedback on pressing issues.
- It makes easier to express needs and expectations.
- Misunderstandings can be cleared faster without having to wait until spouses get to meet.
- It enhances relationship; people feel close to each other when they keep calling.
- Encourages openness since people can say more on phone than they would dare say face to face.
- It helps in maintaining long distant relationships.

Those who termed the effect as negative gave their reasons as summarized below:

- Some said that they talk less and text more and therefore there is less bonding.
- Scrolling through a spouse’s phone creates suspicion as the spouses see what was termed as ‘imaginary competitors’ in the messages.
- People increasingly sort out their issues on phone and there is not much said when they are together.
- It creates mistrust and also irritates when a spouse always wants to know who is on the other end when one is calling.
- It worsens communication since spouses keep quarreling about cheating.
- One has no control over who calls or texts and some of this communication erodes one’s confidence in a spouse’s character.
- It bleaches one’s privacy when a spouse keeps flipping through their text messages.

### 4.3.7 The use of phone for purposes hidden to spouse

The question asked the respondents to indicate whether they ever used their phones for purposes they would rather remained hidden to their spouses. The following results, as presented in the frequency table and the graph below, were obtained. 23 (46.9%) of the respondents said they had no hidden uses; 21(42.9%) said they had hidden uses, while 5(10.2%) gave no reply to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3.24 Hidden uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those respondents, who positively confirmed that they have certain uses of their phones that they would not reveal to their spouses, were asked, in an open ended question, to give examples if such uses. The following answers were obtained:

- 8 respondents said they make calls or send text messages to secret lovers, whom some referred to as “mpango wa kando”.
- 2 respondents said they use their phones to flirt with people of the opposite sex.
- 3 respondents said they would not reveal their communication with friends or clients of the opposite sex since it would be misinterpreted and misunderstood by spouse.
• 1 respondent said they receive calls and text messages from secret admirers, which they hide from their spouse.
• 2 respondents said they transact certain secret business deals on phone and would not reveal this to their spouses.
• 2 respondents said they conduct secret money transfers on phone.
• 1 respondent said they divulge family related information via phone and they therefore do so secretly.

4.3.7.1 Gender in relation to hidden uses of the mobile

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, gender and secret use of the mobile phone. The purpose was to establish which gender engages more in the use of the mobile phone for purposes they would not reveal to their spouses. Out of the 31 male respondents, 17 (54.8%) of them said they had hidden uses; 13 (41.9%) said they had no hidden uses, while 1 (0.3%) gave no reply to this question. On the other hand, out of the 18 female respondents, 4 (22%) had hidden uses of their mobile phones; 10 (55.5%) said they had no hidden uses; while 4 (22%) gave no reply to this question. In this regard, more men than women indicated that they had secret uses of their mobile phones.

Table 4.3.25 Gender and hidden uses of the mobile phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18     = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7.2 Level of education in relation to hidden uses of the mobile

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, level of education and secret use of the mobile phone. The purpose was to establish whether individuals’ level of education
contributes to their use of the mobile phone for purposes they would not reveal to their spouses. Of the 12 respondents with post graduate qualifications, 5 (41.7%) had hidden uses while 6 (50%) had no hidden uses. Of the 21 university graduate respondents, 7 (33.3%) had hidden uses while 11 (52.4%) had no hidden uses. Out of the 11 respondents with secondary school level of education, 6 (54.5%) had hidden uses of their phones while 5 (45.4%) had no hidden uses. Out of the 4 primary school leavers, 3 (75%) had hidden uses of their phones while 1 (25%) did not respond to this question. From this analysis, individuals with lower levels of education (primary and secondary school level) show a higher frequency secret uses of the mobile phone than those with higher levels of education (graduate and post graduate qualifications).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3.26 Level of education and hidden uses of the mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO HIDDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7.3 Level of income in relation to hidden uses of the mobile phone

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, level of income and secret use of the mobile phone. The purpose was to establish whether there is a relationship between individuals’ level of income and their use of the mobile phones for purposes they would not reveal to their spouses. Out of 5 high income earners, 2 (40%) had hidden uses. Out of 34 middle income earners, 14 (41.2%) had hidden uses and out of 10 low income earners 5 (50%) had hidden uses.
Table 43.27 Level of income and secret uses of the mobile phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7.4 Age distribution in relation to hidden uses of mobile phone

The table below presents a cross tabulation of the variables, age and secret use of the mobile phone. The purpose was to establish whether there is a relationship between age and use of the mobile phones by individuals for purposes they would not reveal to their spouses. This the category of 25 years and below had only two respondents, it was not considered while reporting the results of this analysis. Categories 1 (40 years and above), 2 (36-39 years), 3 (31-35 years) and 4 (25-30 years) were considered. Out of the 5 respondents in category 1, 1 (20%) had hidden uses; out of 13 respondents in category 2, 7 (53.8%) had hidden uses; out of the 20 respondents in category 3, 8 (40%) had hidden uses while out of the 9 respondents in category 4, 4 (44.4%) had hidden uses. From this analysis, the respondents between the age of 36-39 years of age has reported the highest frequency of hidden uses of the mobile phone while respondents of 40 years and above reported the least frequency of hidden uses of the mobile phone.

Table 43.28 Age distribution in relation to hidden uses of mobile phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN USE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.8 Password on phone

The question asked the respondents whether they had a pass word on their phones. Those respondents whose mobile phones have password were 25 (51%), and those whose phones do not have passwords account for 24 (49%).

Table 4.3.29 Password on phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15
4.3.9. Password known to spouse
This question attempted to find out if the pass words of the mobile phones owned by married couples are known to their spouses. The following results were obtained; those whose passwords are not known by the spouses were 13 (26.5%) out of the 49 respondents, 20 (40.8%) while 16 (32.7%) did not disclose whether their passwords were known or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16
4.4.10 Sharing of phones between spouses

This question attempted to investigate whether spouses share their mobile phones freely. The following results were obtained: those who do not share their phones freely accounted for 15 (30.6%), those who share freely with their freely were 32 (65.3%) while those who did not respond to this question were 2 (4.1%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3.31 Sharing phone freely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were then asked, in an open ended question, to give a reason as to why they would or would not share their phones freely with spouses. The answers obtained are summarized below.

Those who would freely share their phones gave reasons such as:

- Majority of the respondents who share phones said it is because they had nothing to hide.
- Trust was given as a reason for sharing with some saying they did so because they trusted each other and others saying they were doing so to establish trust.
- A good number of respondents said they did so because openness and transparency was a value and a common practice in their relationship.
- Some said they shared phones to reduce suspicion.
Economic reasons were given with some low income earners saying they could only afford one phone, which they share with their spouses. Those who indicated that they would not be willing to share their phones with spouses gave the following reasons:

- To conceal extra marital affairs commonly referred to as “mpango wa kando” in the responses given.
- Some communication if seen by spouse would raise suspicion and degenerate into quarrels.
- Innocent communication could be misinterpreted and raise suspicion.
- Some said they considered their phones and the communication therein private.
- Some respondents indicated that their phones were a business tool and therefore had nothing to do with their spouses.

43.10.1 Gender in relation to sharing phones with spouses

The table below presents a cross tabulation between the variable, gender and phone sharing. The purpose was to establish who between the male and female respondents would rather keep their phones away from their spouses. Out of the 31 male respondents 19(61.3%) would share their phones freely while 11 (35.5%) would not share their phones freely with their spouses. On the other hand, out of the 18 female respondents, 13(72.2%) would share their phones freely with their spouses while 4(22.2%) would not. From this analysis, more females than males are willing to share their phones freely with their spouses.

Table 43.32 Gender and sharing phones with spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOES NOT SHARE</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHARE</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18 = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.10.2 Income level in relation to sharing of mobile phones by spouses

The table below presents a cross tabulation between the variable, level of income and phone sharing. The purpose was to establish who individuals' level of income would affect their willingness to share their phones with spouses. Of the 5 high income earners, 2 (40%) would share their phones freely while 2 (40%) would not. Out of the 35 middle income earners 25 (71.4%) would share their phones freely while 8 (22.9%) would not. Of the 10 low income earners, 5 (50%) would share their phones freely while 5 (50%) would not.

Table 4.3.33 Income level and sharing of mobile phones by spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT SHARE PHONE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE PHONE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.11 Mobile phone related disputes

For this question, the researcher wanted to find out whether the respondents had ever had a conflict in their marriage. The following results were obtained; Those who had never dealt with conflict in their marriages were 25 (51%), those who had dealt with conflict in their marriage arising from the use of mobile phone were 21 (42.9%) while those with no response were 3 (6.1%).

Table 4.3.34 Mobile phone disputes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.12 Rating of mobile phone effect on marriage

Rating of mobile phones on marriages got the following results; Out of 49 respondents, 4(8.2%) did not disclose their ratings. 63.3% (31) of the respondents reported the ratings to be beneficial, destructive and extremely beneficial each received 5(10.2%), while very beneficial got 4 (8.2%) of the respondents.
Table 4.3.35 Rating mobile on marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTRUCTIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19
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4.3.13 Rating of marriage

The question asked the respondents to rate their marriages as happy, very happy or extremely happy, or unhappy, very unhappy or extremely unhappy. The frequency distribution table and the bar chart below represent respondent views on marriages. The following responses were obtained: those who were extremely happy were 4 (8.2%), happy were 27 (55.1%), and unhappy were 3 (6.1%), very happy 10 (20.4%), very unhappy 1 (2%).

4.3.36 Marriage rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHAPPY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HAPPY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY UNHAPPY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.14 Has the mobile contributed to the happiness or unhappiness in marriage?

The question asked the respondents to state whether the mobile phone had contributed to the state of the happiness or unhappiness in their marriages. 28.6% of the respondents said NO, while 63.3% said YES. 8.2% of the respondents did not provide an answer to this question.
### 4.3.37 Contributed to state of marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid NO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21
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CHAPTER 5

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings, the conclusions and recommendations. In addition suggestions for further research are provide.

5.2 Summary of the findings

5.2.1 Demographic information

Demographic data from the questionnaires were collected and analyzed to provide more information for confirming the findings, mainly on how the mobile phone is used in the context of marriages.

It was found that 63.3% of the respondents were male while 36.7% were female.

4.15 of the respondents were below the age of 25 years, 10.2% were 40 years of age and above, while majority of the respondents, 85.8%, were between the ages of 25 to 39 years.

63% of the respondents were employed, 30.6% were self employed and 6.1% were unemployed.

The high income earners constituted 10.2% of the population, 20.4% were low income earners while 69.4% were middle income earners.

63.3% of the respondents had graduate level education and above, while 30.6% had secondary level of education and below.

Of all the respondents, 71.4% had been married for ten years and below, while 28.5% had been married for more than ten years.

55% of the respondents had owned a phone for 6 years and above, while 45% had owned a phone for less than 6 years.
5.2.2 Mobile phone uses

Calling, text messaging and money transfer emerged as the most common uses of the mobile phone, with calling and texting having 100% usage while money transfer had 89.8% usage.

5.2.3 Time spent on phone

It was found that, 83.7% of the respondents spend an average of 4 hours and below on phone per day, while 12.2% spend between 4 to 10 hours on phone in a day.

5.2.4 Average time spent on phone with family

It was found that 44.9% of the respondents spend below 20% of their overall time spent on phone in a day, interacting with family. Majority of the respondents in this category were male. 34.6% of the respondents spend between 20 to 60% of their time on phone interacting with family. 20.4% spend more than 60% of their time on phone per day interacting with family. Majority of the respondents in this category were female.

5.2.5 Mobile phone effect on communication in marriage

69.4% of the respondents confirmed that the mobile phone had affected the way they communicated with spouses while 26.5% said it had no effect.

Of all the respondents, 79.6% the effect of the mobile phone on their communication with spouses as either positive or mostly positive. They highlighted multiple benefits including: easier and convenient communication, enhanced openness and bonding among others.

5.2.6 Passwords and sharing of phones

49% of the respondents had passwords on their phones while 51% had no passwords. Majority of those who had passwords said their passwords were known to their spouses.

63.3% of the respondents expressed willingness to share their phones freely with their spouses while 30.6% indicated they would not share their phones with spouses. Some of the reasons given for not sharing the phone included: concealing extramarital affairs, fear of being
misunderstood, and not wanting to raise unnecessary suspicion resulting from certain mobile phone communication.

5.2.7 Hidden uses of the phone

42.9% of the respondents said they had hidden uses the mobile phone that they would not reveal to their spouses. This percentage constituted 21 out of the 49 respondents. Out of the 21, eight of them confessed to have involved in cheating, and 2 were involved in flirting. The hidden uses as outlined by this category of respondents included communication with illicit lovers, flirting, conducting secret business deals and money transfers among others.

It emerged, that more men than women have hidden uses of their mobile phones; individuals with lower levels of education registered a higher frequency of hidden uses of the phone; and respondents who were in the 30’s age bracket registered a higher frequency of hidden uses.

5.2.8 Mobile phone related disputes

It was found that, 42.9% of the respondents have dealt with mobile phone related disputes in their marriages while 51% have not.

5.2.9 Rating of mobile phone effect on marriages

73.5% of the respondents rated the mobile phone as beneficial to their marriages. Only a small percentage of the respondents rated the mobile phone as destructive in their marriages.

5.2.10 State of marriages

83.7% of the respondents termed their marriages as, happy, very happy or extremely happy. Only a small percentage termed their marriages as unhappy.

63.3% indicated the mobile phone had contributed to the happiness or unhappiness of their marriage while 28.6% said the mobile phone had nothing to do with the state of their marriages.
5.2.11 Findings from personal interviews

The three persons interviewed, a professional counselor, a pastor—who also serves as a marriage counselor and another professional counselor who is also a pastor, were considered authorities in the topic of this research study.

It emerged that marriages are at a greater risk of collapse, in modern Kenya and the reasons given included: collapse of the values system; disintegration of society that has resulted in increased individualism thus denying marriages the much needed social support; changing attitudes towards marriage; increased awareness of individual rights and media influence.

For the reason that marriages are more fragile, couples are increasingly seeking marital counseling in the bid to save their marriages. It emerged that marital challenges are present across all socioeconomic groups.

It was notable that all the three counselors (inclusive of pastor) did not raise the issue of the mobile phone as a contributing factor to marital challenges until the gadget was introduced into the discussion by the interviewer. From this it was found that the mobile phone is not one of the key contributors to marital challenges.

The counselors on their part confirmed that the mobile phone contributes to marital problems like suspicion, extramarital affairs, misunderstandings, stress, among others. They however were all in agreement that the mobile phone is not to blame for these problems. Exonerating the gadget from the blame, the counselors placed the blame on its users. What came into question were the values upheld by the users and their moral standing and not the presence of the gadget in marriages.

The mobile phone was accorded a lot of positive attributes and many positive changes in marriages were attributed to its adoption. Among these changes included: ease of communication, enhanced relationships, among others.
5.3 Conclusions

There was a lot of collaboration between the information gathered from counselors and from individual spouses. The mobile has both positive and negative contributions to the marriage institution. The positives however outweigh the negatives by far. Even where there is negative contribution, it is not because of the phone but because of the use subjected to by it is subjected to by its users.

Spouses therefore are to blame for their misuse of the phone that affects that affects their marriages negatively. Society is also to blame for the increased fragility of marriages because of its failure to cultivate proper values that would help in building strong marriages. Society has also failed in its duty to support young marriages leaving the young couples to navigate through it all by themselves.

The mobile phone is a means of communication and not a participant in the communication process. It is simply a means that effectively propagates already existing values based on individual choices. The participants in a communication process have a choice on how to use or not use the phone either to their benefit or detriment. The following quotes adequately support this conclusion.

“The mobile phone is a matter of choice and personal discipline; it is a resource. We could misuse it or use it to our benefit.” - Mrs. Elecach Mbithi.

“The mobile phone is a means not a definition of life and technology is meant to enhance, not to kill.” - Pastor Irene Jacca.

5.4 Recommendations

From the findings of this research it is obvious that the mobile phone is affecting marriages and although the positive effects outweigh the negatives, the negatives cannot be ignored. Issues of infidelity and suspicion have long-term detrimental effects on marriages. The real cause of these issues has emerged as “the how” of mobile phone uses by spouses.
It would be of great help and importance that mobile phone users are sensitized on mobile phone etiquette. Moral and ethical ways of using mobile phones should be prescribed to users. This responsibility should be taken up by the government as well as mobile phone companies and service providers as part of their corporate social responsibility (CSR).

The society through its social, academic and religious institutions must take up its role of instilling proper social and moral values in order to save the marriage institution from imminent collapse and to control negative factors like misuse of mobile phones.

5.5 Suggestions for further research.

Although this study exonerated the mobile phone from the blame of causing infidelity and broken marriages, the gadget and other forms of technological adoptions have undoubtedly changed the nature of interpersonal communication and the earlier definitions of this type of communication. It occurs that interpersonal communication has to be redefined in the absence of some of its previously defining characteristics such as: close physical proximity, presence of many sensory channels and non-verbal cues. Equally, interpersonal relationships are taking a new form as they become increasingly mediated. It should interest communication experts to seek to scientifically redefine interpersonal communication in the wake of increased technological adoptions.

It is evident that infidelity is on the increase. It would therefore be important for sociologists to try and establish what the real trigger of infidelity is. It would be particularly important to study persons in the age bracket of 30’s since they seem to be the most affected by the problem.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

1. Kindly tick your gender.
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. Kindly indicate your age. Tick appropriately.
   - [ ] 40 years and above
   - [ ] 36–39 years
   - [ ] 31–35 years
   - [ ] 25–30 years
   - [ ] Below 25 years

3. Are you: (Tick appropriately)
   - [ ] Employed
   - [ ] Self employed
   - [ ] Unemployed

4. State your profession _____________________

5. Would you consider your income per month as:
   - [ ] High income
   - [ ] Middle level income
   - [ ] Low income

6. What is your level of education? Tick appropriately.
   - [ ] Post graduate and above
   - [ ] Graduate level
   - [ ] Secondary School level (K.C.S.E or equivalent)
   - [ ] Primary School level (K.C.P.E) or equivalent
   - [ ] Below Primary School
   - [ ] Any other (specify) _____________________
7. Are you married?  
   [ ] YES  
   [ ] NO  

8. How long have you been married?  
   ___________________________ (indicate period in years/months)  

9. Do you own a mobile phone?  
   [ ] YES  
   [ ] NO  

10. For how long have you had a mobile phone, that is, since you bought your first one?  
    ___________________________ (specify period in years/months)  

11. You use your mobile phone for:  
    (tick all those that apply to you)  
    
    A. [ ] Calling  
    B. [ ] Text messaging  
    C. [ ] Emails  
    D. [ ] Money transfer  
    E. [ ] Internet research  
    F. [ ] Facebook  
    G. [ ] Twitter  
    H. [ ] Watch movies  
    I. [ ] Download and listen to music  
    J. [ ] Any other (specify)  

12. The options in question 11 above are presented in a numbered list marked by letters A-J.  
    Following the list above, tick below your top three (3) priority uses of the mobile phone.  
    
    A. [ ]  
    B. [ ]  
    C. [ ]  
    D. [ ]  
    E. [ ]  
    F. [ ]  
    G. [ ]  
    H. [ ]  
    I. [ ]  
    J. [ ]
13. How much time on average do you spend on your mobile phone per day?

_________________________ (indicate period in hours/minutes)

14. On average, what percentage of the time you spend on your mobile phone is spent interacting with your family/spouse?

- [ ] 90% and above
- [ ] 80%
- [ ] 70%
- [ ] 60%
- [ ] 50%
- [ ] 40%
- [ ] 30%
- [ ] 20%
- [ ] 10%
- [ ] Below 10%

15. Has the mobile phone in any way affected the way you communicate with your spouse? (tick appropriately)

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

16. How would you describe the effect (if any) of the mobile phone on your communication with your spouse? (Tick appropriately)

- [ ] Positive
- [ ] Negative
- [ ] Mostly Positive
- [ ] Mostly negative

17. Give a brief explanation to support your answer in question 16 above.
18. Have you ever used your phone for purposes you would rather remain hidden to your spouse?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

If you answer is YES, kindly give one example of such usage.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

19. Do you have a password for your mobile phone?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

20. Is your phone’s password (if any) known to your spouse?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

21. Would share your mobile phone freely with your spouse?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

Give reason for your answer.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
22. Have you ever had to deal with a dispute in your marriage resulting from you or your spouse’s usage of the mobile phone?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

23. Tick below to select your rating on the effect the mobile phone has had on your marriage.

[ ] Beneficial
[ ] Very beneficial
[ ] Extremely beneficial
[ ] Destructive
[ ] Very destructive
[ ] Extremely destructive

24. You would term your marriage as: (tick appropriately)

[ ] Happy  [ ] Unhappy
[ ] Very happy  [ ] Very unhappy
[ ] Extremely happy  [ ] Extremely unhappy

25. Has the mobile phone in any way contributed to the state of your marriage as you have indicated in question 14 above?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.
Appendix 2: Interview Schedule

1. Name of interviewee ____________________________________________

2. Gender ___________________________________________________

3. Profession/ field of specialization ____________________________________________

4. Title _________________________________________________

5. Kindly describe what you do as a counselor / religious leader, pastor etc (whichever is appropriate as indicated in 4 above) ____________________________________________

6. How is the demand for marital counseling? Would you rate it as high or low in today’s society? ___________________________

7. What would you attribute to the increase or drop (depending on answer to Q 6) in demand of marital counseling today? ______________________________________

8. Are marriages today at a greater risk of collapse than they were 15 years ago?

   □ YES  □ NO

   Explain (some justification for the answer) ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________
9. Based on your counseling experience, are marital problems common in all socio-economic classes or are they more prevalent in some?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. As a counselor/pastor etc, have you ever dealt with marital issues that are related to the way spouses use their mobile phone?

□ YES  □ NO

11. If the answer to question 10 is yes, are such cases common? __________________

Would you rate them as:  □ Very rare
                          □ Rare
                          □ Common
                          □ Very common

(tick appropriately)

12. What are some of the issues, related to use of mobile phones, which arise in marriages?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
13. Based on your interaction with your clients/faithful (depending on whether it is a professional counselor or religious leader), do you think the mobile phone has changed the way spouses communicate and interact?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

14. How would you describe the change mentioned in Question 13 above? Please tick appropriately from the list below.

☐ Negative  ☐ Positive

Briefly explain your view.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. What do you think would be different about marriages today if we didn’t have the mobile phone?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for your assistance.