

Partner Phubbing, Satisfaction, and Subjective Well-Being: Impact of Digital Technology on Relationships

Partner Phubbing, Satisfação e Bem-Estar Subjetivo: O Impacto da Tecnologia Digital nos Relacionamentos

Partner Phubbing, Satisfacción y Bienestar Subjetivo: El Impacto de la Tecnología Digital en las Relaciones Amorosa



ISSN 0124-0137
EISSN 2027-212X

RESEARCH ARTICLE
Copyright © 2020
by Psicogente

Correspondence
with authors:

iarateixeiraint@gmail.com
sandraelisa.freire@gmail.com

Received: 23-11-2019

Accepted: 31-03-2020

Published: 05-06-2020

Iara do Nascimento Teixeira - Sandra Elisa de Assis Freire
Universidade Federal do Piauí, Parnaíba, Brazil

Summary

Goal: The aim of this study is to investigate the influence of partner phubbing (Pphubbing) on subjective well-being (SWB) and relationship satisfaction.

Method: Participants included 217 people with a mean age of 25 years (min. 18, max. 53; SD = 5.98), of which 62.2% were female. A questionnaire regarding Pphubbing, positive and negative effects, life satisfaction, satisfaction with the relationship, and sociodemographic was administered to them, and data were analyzed using SPSS (v.22).

Findings: A negative correlation was found between Pphubbing and positive affects ($r = -0.32$; $p < 0.01$), life satisfaction ($r = -0.13$; $p < 0.01$) and relationship satisfaction ($r = -0.38$ $p < 0.01$), and a positive correlation was found between Pphubbing and negative effects ($r = 0.33$; $p < 0.01$). Through regression, Pphubbing indicated an influence on relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -0.38$; $p < 0.001$), positive effects ($\beta = -0.32$; $p < 0.001$), and negative effects ($\beta = 0.33$; $p < 0.001$).

Conclusions: Results indicated that participants who experience more Pphubbing tend to have less relationship satisfaction and SWB. Thus, this article quantitatively evaluates Pphubbing in romantic relationships, thus, contributing the promotion of future research regarding the interventions and actions required to raise awareness about the healthy use of the smartphone.

Key words: partner phubbing; well-being; relationship satisfaction; negative emotions; positive emotions

Resumo

Objetivo: Este estudo teve por objetivo investigar a influência do Partner Phubbing (Pphubbing) no Bem-Estar subjetivo (BES) e na satisfação com o relacionamento.

Método: Participaram 217 pessoas com média de idade de 25 anos (min. 18, máx. 53 e $dp=5,98$), sendo 62,2 % do sexo feminino. Estes responderam às escalas de Partner phubbing (Pphubbing), afetos positivos e negativos, satisfação com a vida, satisfação com o relacionamento e questionário sociodemo-gráfico. Os dados foram analisados através do SPSS (v.22).

Resultados: Foi encontrado uma correlação negativa entre Pphubbing e afetos positivos ($r = -0,32$; $p < 0,01$), satisfação com a vida ($r = -0,13$; $p < 0,01$) e satisfação com o relacionamento ($r = -0,38$ $p < 0,01$), como também apresentou uma correlação positiva entre Pphubbing e afetos negativos ($r = 0,33$; $p < 0,01$). Através da regressão, o Pphubbing mostrou influência na satisfação com o relacionamento ($\beta = -0,38$; $p < 0,001$), afetos positivos ($\beta = -0,32$; $p < 0,001$) e afetos negativos ($\beta = 0,33$; $p < 0,001$).

How to cite this article (APA):

Do Nascimento Teixeira, I. & De Assis Freire, S. E. (2020). Partner Phubbing, Satisfaction and Subjective Well-Being: The Impact of Digital Technology on Relationships. *Psicogente* 23(44), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.17081/psico.23.44.3438>

Conclusões: Os resultados sugerem que os participantes que sofrem mais phubbing de seus parceiros tendem a ter menos satisfação com o relacionamento, assim como menos Bem-Estar Subjetivo. Assim, este é um artigo com resultados inéditos para o Brasil e um dos poucos no mundo a avaliar quantitativamente o phubbing nos relacionamentos amorosos. Desta forma, contribui para o fomento de futuras pesquisas na área e para o embasamento de intervenções e ações de conscientização acerca do uso saudável do Smartphone.

Palavras-Chave: partner phubbing; bem-estar; satisfação com o relacionamento; emoções negativas; emoções positivas.

Resumen

Objetivo: Este estudio tuvo por objetivo investigar la influencia del Partner Phubbing (Pphubbing) en el bienestar subjetivo y la satisfacción en las relaciones amorosas.

Método: En el estudio participaron 217 personas con una media de edad de 25 años (min. 18, máx. 53 y $dp = 5,98$), siendo el 62,2 % del sexo femenino. Estos respondieron a las escalas de Pphubbing, afectos positivos y negativos, satisfacción con la vida, escala de satisfacción con la relación y cuestionario sociodemográfico. Los datos fueron analizados a través del SPSS (v.22).

Resultados: Se encontró una correlación negativa y significativa entre el phubbing y los afectos positivos ($r = -0,32$, $p < 0,01$), la satisfacción con la vida ($r = -0,13$; $p < 0,01$) y la satisfacción con la relación ($r = -0,38$ $p < 0,01$), como también presentó una correlación significativa, positiva y moderada entre el phubbing y los afectos negativos ($r = 0,33$; $p < 0,01$). A través de la regresión, el Pphubbing mostró influencia en la satisfacción con la relación ($\beta = -0,38$; $p < 0,001$), afectos positivos ($\beta = -0,32$; $p < 0,001$) y afectos negativos ($\beta = 0,33$; $p < 0,001$).

Conclusiones: Los resultados sugieren que los participantes que sufren más phubbing de sus parejas tienden a tener menos satisfacción con la relación, así como menos bienestar subjetivo. Por lo tanto, este es un artículo con resultados inéditos para Brasil y uno de los pocos en el mundo en evaluar cuantitativamente el phubbing en las relaciones amorosas. De esta forma, contribuye al fomento de futuras investigaciones en el área y para el basamento de intervenciones y acciones de concientización acerca del uso saludable del Smartphone.

Keywords: partner phubbing; well-being; relationship satisfaction; negative emotion; positive emotion

1. INTRODUCTION

Mobile communication technology, especially smartphones, has taken an increasing role in people's lives. From 2000 to 2015, there was an 806% increase in the number of internet users globally (per 100 inhabitants) reaching the figure of 4.43 billion, and the majority of this increase was due to gadgets like smartphones, tablets, and notebooks ([Patrão & Sampaio, 2016](#)). As a result of their evolution, these devices allow internet access at any time or place that adds multiple functions, ranging from email exchanges to video calls and banking transactions. Most widely used functions are access to social networks and games ([Karadag et al., 2015](#)). In Brazil alone, there are already 230 million active smartphones, 48 million devices are sold annually as internet users report a preference for smartphones for internet access ([Meirelles, 2019](#); [Ofcom, 2015](#)).

According to [Perasso \(2016\)](#), with the emergence of nanotechnologies, artificial intelligence, and 3D printers, we are experiencing the fourth technological revolution. The technology has reached all aspects of human life with the potential to improve the quality of life of individuals, including their romantic relationships. With technology, relationships have

undergone changes over the years and have crossed paths since the early stages of the internet, a tool to seek intimate partners and relate with others ([Gillmor, 2007](#)). Ever since experiments with the first computers at Stanford, from social networking sites such as ParPerfect and Badoo to the current geolocation applications like Tinder and Happn for smartphones, users have several relationship possibilities in the palm of their hands. This digital revolution has made the previously unimaginable relationships between people who are not physically present in the same place and may never meet possible ([Féres-Carneiro & Ziviane, 2009](#); [Figueiredo, 2016](#)).

However, this connectivity between people distant from each other has pushed away the ones who are actually physically close. Despite being close, they are not completely present or available ([Turkle, 2011](#)). [Misra, Cheng, Genevie & Yuan \(2016\)](#) described this behavior as “absent presence,” where despite being present, the partner needs to compete with their partner’s cell phone for attention, undermining not only the willingness to be present for the each other but also the ability to offer quality time together. This proves to be extremely harmful to relationships because interpersonal interaction between partners is one of the most important predictors of relationship satisfaction ([Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000](#); [Kim et al., 2016](#)).

It has become common to be with the other but compulsively check cell phone multiple times, without even receiving notifications or calls ([Viacana, Francisquetti, de Oliveira Junior, 2016](#)). Individuals develop a fear of missing events, conversations, and experiences taking place in their social circles mediated by the smartphone. Thus, these individuals are led to add cell phone into their routine, with a ritual of checking the device ([Deusen, Bolle, Hegner, & Kommers, 2015](#); [Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas, 2016](#)). Data shows that majority of the people (89%) admit to having carried their cell phone with them in their last social interaction, 79% have used their cell phone during face-to-face conversations, and 52% have texted others while on a romantic encounter ([Harrison, Bealing, & Salley, 2015](#); [Rainie & Zickhur, 2015](#); [Lenhart & Duggan, 2014](#)).

The mere presence of the smartphone in face-to-face interactions has been a cause of conflicts, reducing perceived proximity, the quality of conversation, and empathy between people close to them ([Przybylski & Weinstein, 2013](#); [Roberts & David, 2016](#)). [McDaniel & Coyne \(2016\)](#) highlights that the conflict caused around this is because of constant interruptions due to paying attention to the phone and implicitly conveying that the phone is more important than the partner, thus interfering with

the quality of the relationship. Moreover, verbal and nonverbal behavior toward one's partner, such as not making eye contact or not responding immediately, can affect the partner's image ([Abeele, Antheunis & Schouten, 2016](#)). This behavior of using the smartphone/being distracted by the smartphone while in the company of another person is called phubbing ([Ugur & Koc, 2015](#)). The word was created from the process known, in the Portuguese language, as a neologism by agglutination, which is the composition of a new word from the junction of two or more words. Phubbing is a combination of word "phone" and "snubbing" ([Mcquarie, 2017](#)).

Studies of Partner phubbing (Pphubbing) are still at an early stage in the world, and particularly, in Brazil. The primary study in the area fostered the creation of the partner phubbing scale (PPS) ([Roberts, & David, 2016](#)), a Likert-style scale that evaluates the behavior of the respondent's partner as well as investigates the influence of Pphubbing on the respondent's relationship satisfaction. The analysis concluded that life has become a complete distraction due to the smartphone, considering the results indicating Pphubbing as having a negative impact on relationship satisfaction, working as a generator of conflicts. The PPS has had its psychometric properties confirmed in several countries, such as Brazil (Teixeira & Freire, in press), Portugal ([Água, Coelho, Lourenço, Patrão, & Leal, 2018](#)), Turkey ([Cizmeci, 2017](#)), Puerto Rico ([González-Rivera, Segura-Abreu, & Urbistondo-Rodríguez, 2018](#)), and China ([Wang, Xie, Wang, Wang, & Lei, 2017](#)). The Chinese, Portuguese, and Puerto Rican study went beyond scale validation. For the sample collected in China and Portugal, Pphubbing is correlated with lower satisfaction in romantic relationships and greater depressive symptoms ([Wang et al., 2017; Água et al., 2018](#)). For the study conducted in Puerto Rico, the only study conducted in Latin America till date, suffering Pphubbing was correlated with depressive symptoms, anxiety, stress, and lower psychological well-being, in addition to confirming the role of mediation of satisfaction in relation to Pphubbing, psychological well-being, and mental health.

As evidenced in study by [Lucas and Diener \(2015\)](#), this satisfaction is related to the cognitive dimension of subjective well-being (SWB) and can be expressed at different levels: life satisfaction in general, satisfaction with an entire domain of life, and satisfaction with certain aspects of a domain. Satisfaction, a cognitive judgment made by an individual about his or her life, can be a mediator of emotions, increasing or decreasing positive and negative emotions, and thus influencing

happiness ([Diener, Suh, & Oishi, 1998](#); [Cachioni, Delfino, Yassuda, Batistoni, Melo, & Domingues, 2017](#)). Emotions, or effects, refer to the second dimension of SWB, the effective dimension. Positive effects correspond to a state of pure contentment, enthusiasm, alertness. High levels of positive effect mean high energy, concentration, and satisfaction, and low levels of positive effect are linked to sadness. Negative effects refer to a general dimension of anguish and dissatisfaction, encompassing various aversive mood such as hatred, fear, and anger. Low levels of negative effect bring calm and tranquility ([Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988](#)). The subject is said to have SWB when there is the presence of positive effects, the absence of negative effects, and high life satisfaction. High life satisfaction is linked to positive functioning, whereas low life satisfaction is related to depressive symptoms ([Portella, de Moura Scortegagna, Pichler, & Graeff, 2017](#)). The meta-analysis conducted by [Proulx, Helms and Buehler \(2007\)](#) pointed out that SWB is closely linked to the quality of relationship since the two influence each other. Good levels of SWB contribute to a quality relationship and a good quality relationship provides SWB.

Considering the perception that the inattention caused by smartphones is capable of harming the quality of relationships and the importance that SWB has as an enhancer of marital quality, this research sought to investigate the influence of Pphubbing on the SWB and relationship satisfaction of couples. This study observes how this phenomenon, which has become common in relationships, can affect life satisfaction and positive and negative effects. Thus, this is the first study in Brazil to address these variables, contributing to the fostering of future research and serve as the basis of interventions and actions to raise awareness about the healthy use of smartphones.

2. METHOD

2.1. Design

This is a quantitative, correlational, ex-post facto study ([Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Zechmeister, 2012](#)).

2.2. Sample

A total of 217 people, including 62.2% females, participated in this study in a non-probabilistic manner (for convenience), with a mean age of 25 years (min. 18, max. 53 and SD = 5.98). Of them, 71.4% were dating, followed by 21.7% who were married, 5.5% were engaged, 0.9% were in other relationships, and 0.5% were remarried. The mean duration of the relationship was 46.8 months (min. 6 months, max. 324 months, and SD =

54.3). In terms of education, 52.1% had an incomplete higher education, 17.1% had completed higher education, 17.1% had a postgraduate degree, 11.5% had completed high school, 1.8% had an incomplete secondary education, and 0.5% had only completed elementary school. These people were approached at their work place, on the streets, at their homes, or at the university once they made themselves available to participate in the research. The inclusion criteria were that the participant should be over 18 years of age and in a romantic relationship (dating, engagement, marriage, stable union) with a minimum of 6 months of relationship. Cases not meeting these criteria were excluded.

2.3. Instruments

2.3.1. Partner Phubbing Scale – Proposed by Roberts and David (2016).

A 5-point Likert scale (1 = Never; 5 = All the time), validated for the Brazilian context by Teixeira and Freire (in press), aims to measure the behavior of Pphubbing in romantic relationships. The version has 8 items in a single-factor structure and aims to measure Pphubbing behavior among intimate partners. The scale has a reliability of 0.88, with all items having a factor load above 0.50.

2.3.2. Positive and Negative Effect Schedule

This instrument, used internationally, was proposed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988) and adapted for Brazil by Giacomoni and Hutz (1997), a paper presented at an event and later published in Zanon and Hutz (2014). It is a scale comprising 20 items, 10 of which assess negative effects and 10 that evaluate positive effects. It also comprises the two orthogonal factors of the scale: positive effect ($\alpha = 0.88$) and negative effect ($\alpha = 0.86$). The items consist of adjectives that must be answered on a 5-point Likert-type response scale, 1 being “not at all” and 5 “extremely,” in which people mark a number corresponding to the level of extent they feel their emotions are described by the adjectives.

2.3.3. Life Satisfaction Scale

This scale was proposed by [Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin \(1985\)](#) and was adapted and validated for Brazilian adults and adolescents by [Giacomoni and Hutz, 1997](#). A factor analysis indicated an unidimensional nature of the scale, which is composed of five items that evaluate, in a global manner, the cognitive aspects of SWB. Examples of items are “My life is close to my ideal” and “So far I have achieved the important things I want in life.” This scale has adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.91$). The key

answers are a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 7 “strongly agree.”

2.3.4. Global Relationship Satisfaction Scale

A scale constructed by [Rusbult \(1983\)](#), translated and validated by [Wachelke, de Andrade, Souza, and Moraes \(2007\)](#) with a high Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (0.90). It consists of three items namely: “I am satisfied with my relationship,” “I am satisfied with my partner in terms of his or her role in the relationship,” and “I am satisfied with my relationship with my partner.” These are answered through a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 5 being “strongly agree.”

2.3.5. Sociodemographic Questionnaire

Participants answered a series of sociodemographic questions like gender, age, marital status, religion, and marital status. The purpose of this questionnaire was to characterize the sample.

2.4. Procedures

After approval by the competent Ethics Committee, the participants were provide two copies of free and informed consent form. The form was read and both the copies were signed by each participant before answering the questionnaire. The confidential and secret nature of participation in the research was also emphasized, assuring that the results will only be presented at events or in scientific journals. A single researcher applied the questionnaires, declaring himself or herself to be in charge of the objectives of the research and providing the instructions for the correct completion of the instruments. This research respects the contents of the Declaration of Helsinki as well as the ethical norms of the American Psychological Association (APA).

2.5. Data Analysis

To characterize the sample, the SPSS program (version 22) was used to perform Pearson’s *r* correlation, linear Regression, and descriptive statistics (measures of central tendency, dispersion, and frequency distribution).

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Descriptive Analyses

Participants were asked about the frequency of their smartphone use and how often they felt uneasy when not being able to use the device. Majority of the participants said that they “always” used a smartphone (61.3%), followed by “frequently” (30.9%), “sometimes” (6.9%), and “rarely” (0.9%); none of the participants declared that they “never” used a smartphone.

Regarding the concern about the impossibility of using the smartphone, the most frequent answer was “sometimes” (30.4%), followed by “often” (24%), “always” and “rarely” (18% each) and “never” (9.7%).

3.2. Correlations and Regressions

The first analysis performed was a Pearson’s r correlation between Pphubbing, relationship satisfaction, and the elements of SWB, i.e., life satisfaction, positive effects, and negative effects. The results demonstrated significant correlations between these measures, which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Correlation between Partner Phubbing, Positive Effects, Negative Effects, and Life Satisfaction

	1	2	3	4
1. Partner Phubbing				
2. Positive Effects	-0.32**			
3. Negative Effects	0.33**	-0.51**		
4. Life Satisfaction	-0.13*	0.46**	-0.38**	
5. Relationship Satisfaction	-0.38**	0.54**	-0.49**	0.41**

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ (single-tail test)

A negative and significant correlation can be observed between Pphubbing and positive effects ($r = -0.32$, $p < 0.01$), life satisfaction ($r = -0.13$; $p < 0.01$), and relationship satisfaction ($r = -0.38$ $p < 0.01$), as well as a significant positive and moderately positive correlation between Pphubbing and negative effects ($r = 0.33$; $p < 0.01$). Result indicates that the more the subject is exposed to Pphubbing, the more he or she experiences negative effects and experiences less life satisfaction, less satisfaction with the relationship, and less positive effects, indicating that he or she has less SWB and less satisfaction with the relationship. The analysis also showed significant correlations between positive and negative effects ($r = -0.51$; $p < 0.01$), life satisfaction and positive effects ($r = 0.41$; $p < 0.01$), life satisfaction and negative effects ($r = -0.38$; $p < 0.01$), satisfaction with the relationship and life satisfaction ($r = 0.41$; $p < 0.01$), satisfaction with the relationship and positive effects ($r = 0.54$; $p < 0.01$), and satisfaction with the relationship and negative effects ($r = -0.49$; $p < 0.01$). This indicates that in the presence of greater satisfaction with the relationship, there is a tendency to have greater life satisfaction, more positive effects, and fewer negative effects; whereas in the presence of positive effects, there is a decrease in negative effects, which also occurs with higher scores in life satisfaction (decrease in negative effects and increase in positive effects).

To increase knowledge about the influence of Pphubbing on relationship satisfaction, life satisfaction, negative effects, and positive effects, linear regressions were performed using Pphubbing as the independent variable and relationship satisfaction, life satisfaction, positive effects, and negative effects as dependent variables. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Linear Regression

PARTNER PHUBBING	BETA	R ²	R ² SET	R ² CHANGE
Relationship Satisfaction	-0.38*	0.14*	0.14*	0.14*
Life Satisfaction	-0.13**	0.01**	0.01**	0.01**
Positive Effects	-0.32	0.10*	0.09*	0.10*
Negative Effects	0.33	0.11*	0.11*	0.11*

Note: *p < 0.001; **p < 0.05

According to the results, it can be inferred that Pphubbing scores inversely explain relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -0.38$, $t = -6.1$, $p < 0.001$) and the presence of positive effects ($\beta = -0.32$; $t = -4.9$; $p < 0.001$) and explain the presence of negative effects ($\beta = 0.33$; $t = 5.2$; $p < 0.001$). Regarding life satisfaction, despite being statistically significant, the results are very marginal ($\beta = 0.13$; $t = -2.0$; $p < 0.05$). Pphubbing contributed to explain 14% of the variance in relationship satisfaction and about 10% of the variance in the presence of positive effects in a direct and negative manner, as well as explaining 11% of the variance of negative effects in a direct and positive manner. According to these data, the influence that Pphubbing has on the decrease in satisfaction with the relationship and positive effects and on the increase in negative effects is evident.

4. DISCUSSION

This study aims to verify the relationships between Pphubbing, SWB, and relationship satisfaction. For this purpose, using a sample of people involved in some type of romantic relationship, a correlation was conducted between Pphubbing, life satisfaction and feelings (SWB), followed by a correlation between Pphubbing and satisfaction with the relationship, which was deepened when using a linear regression. From the results achieved, it can be stated that the desired study objectives were achieved.

Among the participants, most of whom are smartphone users, it was observed that, as Pphubbing is practiced, people tend to experience more negative effects and less positive effects, life satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction. Therefore, it can be suggested that the practice of Pphubbing has contributed to people not making a positive assessment of their romantic relationship. These results corroborate most of the research

involving the impact of technology on relationships, especially those that have used the PPS, beginning with the research conducted by the authors of the scale themselves, who after constructing and validating it found negative correlations between Pphubbing and life satisfaction as well as between Pphubbing and relationship satisfaction ([Roberts & David, 2016](#)).

Similar results were also found for relationship satisfaction. In China, [Wang et al. \(2017\)](#) found phubbing as an important factor for reducing satisfaction and consequent depression; in Portugal, [Água et al. \(2018\)](#) suggest that phubbing can reduce satisfaction due to both phubbing and the conflicts resulting from it; and in Puerto Rico, [González-Riviera, Segura-Abreu, and Urbistondo-Rodríguez \(2018\)](#), point out that participants who scored higher in Pphubbing showed lower satisfaction in relation to the partner, lower SWB, more depressive symptoms, stress, and anxiety.

Thus, it can be stated that, for the sample studied, Pphubbing has a negative impact on relationships, on the level of SWB, and on satisfaction with the relationship, bringing consequences for life as a couple and the individual life of each partner. According to the literature, SWB and relationship satisfaction are linked, since a positive assessment of relationship satisfaction is linked to greater life satisfaction and fewer negative effects ([Snyder & Lopez, 2009](#)). These results can be explained by the fact that interactions between partners are considered to be one of the most important predictors of relationship satisfaction ([Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000](#)); therefore, the emerging need of one partner to be available to the smartphone may seem that the device deserves more attention than the other partner, generating conflict in the relationship and decrease in intimacy ([McDaniel & Coyne, 2016](#); [Halpern, & Katz, 2017](#)). It is necessary to be present for the other and there has to be a connection between the two. It is also important to highlight that when partners are less satisfied with their relationships, they tend to have less expression of positivity, fewer demonstrations of love and affection, as well as less sexual activity, which can lead to the end of the relationship ([Gottman, 1998](#)).

Another way to explain the behavior of Pphubbing is by considering the cyclical form of the relationships between the variables studied. The present study suggests the reduction of SWB due to the Pphubbing. Other studies point toward low SWB being one of the determinants of Pphubbing ([Benvenuti, Błachnio, Przepiorka, Daskalova & Mazzoni, 2019](#)). In other words, couples who are already dissatisfied with their relationship can use the smartphone as a form of escape, just like Pphubbing has also been pointed out as an escape from boredom ([Oduor et al., 2016](#)), loneliness, anxiety, and worry ([Karadag et al., 2015](#)). Thus, such engagement with technology, as pointed out in the descriptive results, may be motivated by a

need to manage negative feelings ([Kardefelt-Winther, 2014](#)).

There are more determinants of Pphubbing behavior found in the current literature. The personality trait neuroticism is characterized by the avoidance of face-to-face contact, which may lead individuals to prefer conversations mediated by the internet and devices such as the smartphone, making the trait of neuroticism a risk factor for phubbing ([Kayış et al., 2016](#)). [Erzen, Odaci and Yeniçeri \(2019\)](#) points to a positive correlation between neuroticism and phubbing. Moreover, phubbing has been associated as being a consequence of digital dependencies. [Karadag et al. \(2015\)](#) highlights that first individuals become dependent to social media and the internet, which lead them to depend on the smartphone and eventually this behavior becomes phubbing.

These results satisfied the objectives of the study, serving to foster future studies on Pphubbing in relationships, especially in Brazil, as well as providing information to meet the need for studies of the determinants of SWB ([Umaña, 2007](#)). The impact of the study goes beyond theory and extends to its social relevance in view of the possibility of serving as a basis for policies aimed at the healthy use of technology, as well as for clinical interventions within the context of couples therapy. However, there are some limitations of this study. The small number of participants and the fact that they were collected in a non-probabilistic manner, with the majority of the sample having completed/incomplete higher education, may affect the generalization of the results. Therefore, it is suggested that future studies consider larger and more diverse samples, as well as use other types of statistical analysis and investigate relationships with other constructs, such as intimacy and conflicts related to smartphone use.

Conflict of Interest: There was no conflict of interest on the part of any author.

Thanks: We would like to thank the Federal University of Piauí and the study participants for making this study possible.

Financing: We received no funding for the study.

REFERENCES

- Abeele, M. M. V., Antheunis, M. L., & Schouten, A. P. (2016). The effect of mobile messaging during a conversation on impression formation and interaction quality. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, 562-569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.005>
- Água, J., Coelho, C., Lourenço, M. G., Patrão, I., & Leal, I. (2018). Partner phubbing (Pphubbing): Portuguese validation. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Child and Adolescent Psychology* (pp.200-201). <http://actas.lis.ulusiada.pt/index.php/cipca/article/view/684>
- Benvenuti, M., Błachnio, A., Przepiorka, A. M., Daskalova, V. M., & Mazzoni, E. (2019). Factors related to phone snubbing behavior in emerging adults: The phubbing phenomenon. In M. Desjarlais (Ed.), *The psychology and dynamics behind social media interactions* (pp. 164-187). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9412-3.ch007>
- Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 964-980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x>
- Cachioni, M., Delfino, L., Yassuda, M., Batistoni, S., Melo, R., & Domingues, M. (2017). Subjective and psychological well-being of elderly participants in a University Open to the elderly. *Brazilian Journal of Geriatrics and Gerontology*, 20(3), 340-351. <http://doi.org/10.1590/1981-22562017020.160179>
- Chotpitayasunondh, V., & Douglas, K. M. (2016). How “phubbing” becomes the norm: The antecedents and consequences of snubbing via smartphone. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 9-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.018>
- Cizmeçi, E. (2017). Disconnected, though satisfied: Pphubbing behavior and Relationship satisfaction. *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication*, 7(2), 364-375. <https://doi.org/10.7456/10702100/018>
- Deusen, A. J. A. M., Bolle, C. L., Hegner, S. M., & Kommers, P. A. M. (2015). Modeling habitual and addictive smartphone behavior. The role of smartphone usage types, emotional intelligence, social stress, self-regulation, age, and gender. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45, 411-420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.039>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Suh, E. & Oishi, S. (1998). Recent findings on subjective well-being. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 2, 25-41. <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-43193-002>
- Erzen, E., Odaci, H., & Yeniçeri, İ. (2019). Phubbing: Which personality traits are prone to phubbing?. *Social Science Computer Review*, 39(1), 56-69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439319847415>
- Féres-Carneiro, T., & Ziviani, C. (2009). Contemporary conjugalities: A study on the multiple love arrangements of today. *Couple and Family: Permanences and ruptures*. São Paulo. Psychologist's House (pp. 83-107). http://www.puc-rio.br/pibic/relatorio_resumo2010/Abstracts/ctch/psi/PSI-Vanessa-Polyana.pdf

- Figueiredo, L. B. D. (2016). Tinderellas: Love search through smartphone apps. <https://tede2.pucsp.br/bitstream/handle/18981/2/L%C3%ADgia%20Baruch%20de%20Figueiredo.pdf>
- Giacomoni, C. H. & Hutz, C. S. (1997). The measurement of subjective well-being: positive and negative affect scale and life satisfaction scale [Abstracts]. In *Inter-American Society of Psychology (Org.). Annals XXVI Inter-American Congress of Psychology* (p.313). São Paulo: SIP.
- Gillmor, C. S. (2007). Stanford, IBM 650 and the first trials of computer date matching. *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing*, 29(1), 74-80. <http://doi.org/10.1109/MAHC.2007.13>
- González-Rivera, J., Segura-Abreu, L., & Urbistondo-Rodríguez, V. (2018). Phubbing en las relaciones románticas: Uso del celular, satisfacción en la Pareja, bienestar psicológico y salud mental. *Interacciones: Revista de Avances en Psicología*, 4(2), 143-151. <https://doi.org/10.24016/2018.v4n2.117>
- Gottman, J. (1998). *Marriage: Why do some work and others don't?* São Paulo: Objetiva.
- Halpern, D., & Katz, J. E. (2017). Texting's consequences for romantic relationships: A cross-lagged analysis highlights its risks. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71, 386-394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.051>
- Harrison, M. A., Bealing, C. E., & Salley, J. M. (2015). 2 TXT or not 2 TXT: College students' reports of when text messaging is social breach. *The Social Science Journal*, 52(2), 188-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2015.02.005>
- Karadag, E., Tosuntas, S.B., Erzen, E., Duru, P., Bostan, N., Sahin, B.M., Culha, I., Babadag, B. (2015). Determinants of phubbing, which is the sum of many virtual addictions: A structural equation model. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 4(2), 60-74. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.4.2015.005>
- Kardefelt-Winther, D. (2014). A conceptual and methodological critique of internet addiction research: Towards a model of compensatory internet use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31(1), 351-354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.059>
- Kayış, A. R., Satici, S. A., Yılmaz, M. F., Şimşek, D., Ceyhan, E., & Bakioglu, F. (2016). Big five-personality trait and internet addiction: A meta-analytic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.012>
- Kim, Y., Jeong, J., Cho, H., Jung, D., Kwak, M. Rho, M. J., Yu, H., Kim, D., & Choi, Y. (2016). Personality factors predicting smartphone addiction predisposition: Behavioral inhibition and activation systems, impulsivity, and self-control. *PLOS ONE*, 11(8), e0159788. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159788>
- Lenhart, A., & Duggan, M. (2014). *Couples, the internet, and social media*. Pew Internet and American Life Project. <https://www.pewinternet.org/2014/02/11/couples-the-internet-and-social-media/>
- Lucas, R. E., & Diener, E. (2015). Personality and subjective well-being: Current issues and controversies. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, M. L. Cooper, & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Volume 4*.

- Personality processes and individual differences* (pp.577-599). Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-35883-029>
- McDaniel, B. T., & Coyne, S. M. (2016). "Technoference": The interference of technology in couple relationships and implications for women's personal and relational well-being. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 5(1), 85-98. <http://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000065>
- Mcquarie (2017). *Mcquarie dictionary: Australia's national dictionary*. Sydney, Australia: Mcquarie Dictionary Publishers.
- Meirelles, F. D. S. (2019). 30th annual IT use survey. https://eaesp.fgv.br/sites/eaesp.fgv.br/files/pesti2019fgvciappt_2019.pdf
- Misra, S., Cheng, L., Genevie, J., & Yuan, M. (2016). The iPhone effect: The quality of in-person social interactions in the presence of mobile devices. *Environment and Behavior*, 48(2), 275-298. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013916514539755>
- Oduor, E., Neustaedter, C., Odom, W., Tang, A., Moallem, N., Tory, M., & Irani, P. (2016). The frustrations and benefits of mobile device usage in the home when co-present with family members. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems- DIS*, pp. 1315-1327. http://willodom.com/publications/DIS2016/p1315-oduoer_DIS2016.pdf
- Ofcom. (2015). *The communications market report 2015*. England. <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/research-and-data/multi-sector-research/cmr/cmr15>
- Patrão, I., & Sampaio, D. (2016). *Online dependencies: The power of technologies*. Lisbon: Pactor. https://issuu.com/lidel/docs/9789896930608_dependncias_online
- Perasso, V. (2016). What is the 4th Industrial Revolution – and how should it affect our lives. BBC. <http://www.bbc.com/portuguese/geral-37658309>
- Portella, M. R., de Moura Scortegagna, H., Pichler, N. A., & Graeff, D. B. (2017). Happiness and satisfaction with life: the voice of adult and elderly women. *Brazilian Journal of Human Aging Sciences*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.5335/rbceh.v14i1.5960>
- Proulx, C. M., Helms, C. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital quality and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(3), 576-593. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00393.x>
- Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2013). Can you connect with me now? How the presence of mobile communication technology influences face-to-face conversation quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(3), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512453827>
- Rainie, L., & Zickuhr, K. (2015). *Americans' views on mobile etiquette*. Pew Research Center, 26. <https://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/26/americans-views-on-mobile-etiquette/>
- Roberts, J. A., & David, M. E. (2016). My life has become a major distraction from my cell phone: Partner phubbing and relationship satisfaction among romantic partners. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 134-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.058>
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The

- development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101-117. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.45.1.101>
- Shaughnessy, J. J., Zechmeister, E. B., & Zechmeister, J. S. (2012). *Research methodology in psychology*. Brasilia, Brazil: AMGH Editora.
- Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2009). *Positive psychology: A scientific and practical approach of human qualities*. (R. C. Costa, Trad). São Paulo: Artmed.
- Teixeira, I. N., & Freire, S. E. A. (2020). Partner phubbing scale: Evidence of validity and accuracy. *Summa Psicológica*, 17(1).
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York: Basic Books. <http://alonetgetherbook.com/>
- Ugur, N & Koc, T. (2015). Time for digital detox: Misuse of mobile technology and phubbing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 1022-1031. <https://foi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.491>
- Umaña, C. M. (2007). Perspectiva psicológica del bienestar subjetivo. *Psychogente*, 10(18). <http://revistas.unisimon.edu.co/index.php/psicogente/article/view/1559>
- Viacana, J. J. C., Francisquetti, J. Q., Lima, L. R. D. S., & de Oliveira Junior, E. (2016). I need to touch my cell phone: the influence of self-control and ego depletion on smartphone use. *Brazilian Journal of Marketing*, 15(1), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.5585/remark.v15i1.2881>
- Wachelke, J. F., de Andrade, A. L., Souza, A. M., & Moraes, R. (2007). Complementary study of the factorial validity of the factorial scale of relationship satisfaction and prediction of global satisfaction with the relationship. *PsicoUSF*, 12(2), 221-225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-82712007000200010>
- Wang, X., Xie, X., Wang, Y., Wang, P., & Lei, L. (2017). Partner phubbing and depression among married Chinese adults: The roles of relationship satisfaction and relationship length. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 110, 12-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.014>
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A. & Tellegen, A. (1988) Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Zanon, C. & Hutz, C. S. (2014). Scale of positive and negative affects (Panas). In Hutz, C. S. *Evaluation in positive psychology*. Porto Alegre: Artmed.

This work is below: Creative commons attribution 4.0 international license. The beneficiary of the license has the right to copy, distribute, exhibit and represent the work and have derivative works always and when they recognize and cite the work in the manner specified by the author or the licensant.

