

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

Harshita Jain^{1*}, Ayushi Tyagi²

ABSTRACT

Marital relationship holds profound significance, serving as a cornerstone for emotional support, and personal growth. Moreover, the commitment and satisfaction inherent in marriage fosters a sense of security and belonging. Personality traits on the other hand play a crucial role in the success and dynamics of a marriage shaping the interactions, communications, and overall satisfaction. The present study aims at exploring the predicting factors that contributes to phubbing behavior in married individuals. The study sample consisted of 100 married individuals (25-45 years). Significant results of correlation and regression indicated that relationship commitment, relationship satisfaction and personality traits (neuroticism and conscientiousness) have a major role in predicting phubbing behavior of a married individual. This study can provide an insight into relationship dynamics.

Keywords: *Phubbing, Technoference, Relationship Commitment, Relationship Satisfaction, Personality, Ostracism*

Marriage provides a stable and intimate bond where partners can find emotional support, understanding, and companionship, fostering mental well-being. With the development of communication technologies, smartphone have become indispensable in our daily life. Mobile phones are omnipresent and consequently affect the dynamics of intimate relationships. The reason for increased smartphone usage is that they facilitate social interactions and allow people to communicate with others regardless of time and place (Turkle, 2011). They can have positive effects as they allow partners to stay in touch, and show interest when he or she is not around (Murray & Cambell, 2015; Pollmann, Norman, & Crockett, 2021). On the other hand, when mobile phones are used in the presence of one's partner, it can distract from the ongoing conversation and be a source of annoyance and conflict (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015; Dwyer et al., 2018 Przybylski & Weinstein, 2013). Despite the benefits of smartphones for communication and social relationships, the use of technology in social settings might also lead to an unprecedented negative phenomenon: *phubbing*.

The term phubbing is a portmanteau of the words "phone" and "snubbing", and describes the act of snubbing someone in a social setting by paying attention to one's phone instead of

¹Student, IIS Deemed To Be University

²Assistant Professor, Dept of Psychology, IIS Deemed To Be University

*Corresponding Author

Received: June 22, 2024; Revision Received: July 25, 2024; Accepted: July 28, 2024

talking to the person directly in one's company (Haigh, 2012). When this behavior occurs within a marriage, it can have several significant effects like, feeling of neglect, diminished emotional connection, conflict and resentment, and also negative impact on overall mental health.

Relationship Commitment and Phubbing

Relationship Commitment represents a long-term orientation to the relationship, including feelings of attachment to a partner and desire to maintain the relationship (Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Factors such as current satisfaction, feelings of moral or personal obligation, and environmental opportunities and constraints all play a role in commitment process (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Low relationship commitment was a key predictor of relationship stability, with lower commitment associated with higher rates of breakup and divorces (Stanley et al., 2008). Lower levels of commitment in the relationships, individuals with insecure attachment styles, characterized by fear of intimacy or abandonment (Hadden et al., 2007) and have less positive mental representation of their partners and relationships (Slotter et al., 2007).

Relationship Satisfaction and Phubbing

Relationship and/or marital satisfaction may be best understood as, “the degree to which spouses perceive that their partners meet their needs and desires” (Peleg, 2008). Negative communication patterns such as, criticism, defensiveness, contempt, and stonewalling are strong indicators of low relationship satisfaction (Gottman & Levenson, 1992). Individuals who are not satisfied with their relationship may feel less fulfilled and connected to their partners, increasing the need or inclination to engage in phubbing behavior. They are more likely to seek distractions or escape from their relationship through excessive phone use (Wei et al., 2019).

Personality traits and Phubbing

Personality represents behavior and attitudes in the face of events that are consistent and ossified overtime (Eisenbergh, Vaughan, & Hofer, 2009). The five-factor personality model limits a person's personality to the traits of Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Outgoing and sociable nature may predispose them to frequent interactions with digital devices, even in social settings where face-to-face communication is expected or desired (Roberts & David, 2016).

When one partner consistently engages in phubbing behavior, it can lead to feelings of neglect, frustration, and even resentment on the other partner. This constant distraction can prevent meaningful communication and bonding moments between partners, weakening their emotional connection and intimacy in the relationship (Abeele et al., 2019). Overtime, the cumulative effect of phubbing can ultimately reduce overall relationship satisfaction (Utami, Anam, & Noorrizki, 2021). Phubbing is negatively associated with commitment along with satisfaction in the relationships (Sun & Yoon, 2023). For fostering and strengthening of the marital relationships, knowing the cause of phubbing behavior is very necessary.

Present study

In the present study, we investigated the predictors of phubbing behavior in married individuals. The consequences and impact of the phubbing behavior have been studied in the past. However, the predictors or causes of the behavior is less explored area. Given the relationship established in the literature,

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

We developed three hypotheses:

- H1: There is an impact of relationship commitment on phubbing behavior.
- H2: There is an impact of relationship satisfaction on phubbing behavior.
- H3: There is an impact of personality traits on phubbing behavior.

METHOD

Procedure

The research was conducted in 2 phases. In the first phase, on the basis of criteria of inclusion and exclusion the sample was selected for the study. After obtaining an informed consent from the participants the measures of the study were administered on them. In the second phase, data trends were studied and results analyzed. Thereafter, the results were compiled and studied for further implication.

Sample

Hundred married individuals (Male = 50, Female = 50), aged 25 to 45, participated in the study.

Measures

- **Demographics** participants indicated their name, age, sex and years of marriage.
- **Phubbing:** Generic Scale of Phubbing (GSP) developed by Chotpitayasunondh and Douglas in 2018 to assess phubbing behavior. It is a 4 factor 15 item scale. Participants respond to items on a seven-point scale, with a label associated with each point Likert scale (1 = *Never*, 2 = *Rarely*, 3 = *Occasionally*, 4 = *Sometimes*, 5 = *Frequently*, 6 = *Usually*, 7 = *Always*). The four factors are as follows: (a) Nomophobia (b) interpersonal conflict (c) self-isolation and (d) problem acknowledgement.
- **Personality Traits:** The Brief Version of the Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI-10) is adapted from Rammstedt, B. & John, O.P. (2007), It is a 10 item scale designed to assess the personality correlates of an individual. It is a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Disagree strongly* to 5 = *Agree strongly*. Some items are reverse scored. The scale measures 5 broad dimensions of personality, Openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism.
- **Relationship Satisfaction:** Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) developed by Hendrich in 1988. It is a 7 item scale designed to measure general relationship satisfaction. It is a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *low satisfaction* to 5 = *high satisfaction*. Two items from the list are reverse scored. RAS was used by Ippolito in 2020 to examine the relation between phubbing, being phubbed and relationship satisfaction.
- **Relationship Commitment:** Relationship Commitment Scale (RCS) developed by Schumm et al. in 1986. It is a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Strong Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Disagree*. The scale constitutes 4 items to measure the commitment in the relationship.

RESULTS

Correlational Analyses

To explore the associations between the variables of interest we conducted correlational analyses. Phubbing behavior was associated with relationship commitment ($r = -.537, p < .001$), and relationship satisfaction ($r = -.711, p < .001$). Within the personality traits phubbing behavior was associated with Extraversion ($r = .261, p < .001$), Conscientiousness ($r = .391, p < .001$), and Neuroticism ($r = .060, p < .001$). See Table 1 for detail.

Table 1 Correlation among the variables of interest

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phubbing Behavior								
Relationship Commitment	-.537**							
Relationship satisfaction	-.711**	.539**						
Extraversion	.261**	-.274**	-.089					
Agreeableness	-.026	.083	-.062	-.077				
Conscientiousness	.391**	-.268**	-.335**	.184	.034			
Neuroticism	.601**	-.442**	-.466**	.150	-.097	.049		
Openness	.060	-.086	-.054	.020	-.203*	-.020	-.023	

Relationship Commitment as a predictor of phubbing behavior

To determine if relationship commitment predicted phubbing behavior, we conducted multiple regression. A significant regression equation was found $F=39.679$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .537 and adjusted R^2 of .288. See Table 2 for detail.

Relationship Satisfaction as a predictor of phubbing behavior

Relationship satisfaction predicted phubbing behavior significantly with $F=100.08$, $p<.001$. As per the regression equation R^2 is .505 which means 50.5% of the variance in phubbing behavior is accounted for by the relationship satisfaction in married individuals. See Table 3 for detail.

Personality Traits as a predictor of phubbing behavior

Conscientiousness and Neuroticism significantly predicts phubbing behavior. As per the regression equation for conscientiousness, $F=17.706$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .153 and adjusted R^2 of .144. The values indicate that 15.3% of the variance in phubbing behavior is accounted for by Conscientiousnes (Personality trait). See Table 4 for detail. For Neuroticism, $F=55.441$, $p<.001$, with R^2 of .361 and adjusted R^2 of .355. 36.1% of the variance in phubbing behavior is accounted for by Neuroticism (Personality trait). See Table 5 for detail.

DISCUSSION

The present study aims at exploring the factors that predicts phubbing behavior in married individuals. On the basis of review of literature around phubbing behavior in married individuals, factors that are taken into consideration in the present study are relationship satisfaction, relationship commitment, and personality traits. The subjects of the study are young adults who are married for minimum 3 years. Following is the detailed interpretation of the variables through correlation analysis to reveal the associations between these variables. Subsequently, regression analysis was conducted to assess whether relationship commitment, relationship satisfaction and personality traits predict phubbing behavior in married individuals.

Table 2 Linear Regression with Phubbing behavior as the Criterion Variable

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	β		
(Constant)	116.259	10.79		10.774	<.001
RC	-4.195	.666	-.537	-6.299	<.001

RC: Relationship Commitment,

Dependent variable: Phubbing behavior

(NOTE: Fit for Model $R^2 = .537$, Adjusted $R^2 = .288$, $F = 39.679$, $p < .001$)

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

According to H2, relationship commitment has an impact on phubbing behavior. As per the results relationship commitment significantly predicts phubbing behavior in married individuals. The coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.288, which means that approximately 28.8% of the variance in the dependent variable (phubbing) can be explained by the predictor variable (relationship commitment). The t-value of relationship commitment is -6.299, which is highly significant (p<.001). This indicates that the relation between relationship commitment and phubbing behavior is statistically significant. There are no empirical evidences from past researches to support the relationship. The possible explanation of the impact of relationship commitment on phubbing behavior can be, low commitment to their relationship may be less invested in maintaining meaningful interactions with their partners. Consequently, they may be more prone to turning to their phones as a distraction. Low commitment is associated with communication issues and lack of emotional connection, allowing individuals to retreat into their digital devices rather than engaging in meaningful communication with their partners. Lower levels of relationship commitment are often associated with lesser investment in the relationship and a lesser desire to prioritize the partner's needs and feelings. Individuals who are less committed to their relationship may be less motivated to engage in attentive and present communication with their partner, thereby increasing the likelihood of engaging in phubbing behavior. If they value their partner and relationships, they will pay more attention to their partner by actively engaging in interactions with frequent non-verbal behaviors (Sun & Yoon, 2023). Viewing relationship between relationship commitment and phubbing is necessary as there is absence of sufficient empirical evidences around these variables.

Table 3 Linear Regression with Phubbing Behavior as the Criterion Variable

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	β		
(Constant)	171.884	12.342		13.927	<.001
RS	-5.225	.522	-.711	-10.004	<.001

RS: Relationship Satisfaction

Dependent variable: Phubbing behavior

(NOTE: Fit for Model R² = .505, Adjusted R² = .500, F = 100.080, p<.001)

According to H2, relationship satisfaction has an impact on phubbing behavior. Results indicates that relationship satisfaction significantly predicts phubbing behavior in married individuals with p<.001. R² value is .505, indicating that approximately 50.5% of the variance in phubbing behavior is accounted for by the predictor variable that is relationship satisfaction. The t-value is -10.004, shows high significance in prediction of phubbing through relationship satisfaction (p<.001). Overall, regression analysis provides evidence that relationship satisfaction is a significant predictor of phubbing behavior, higher levels of relationship satisfaction associated with lower levels of phubbing behavior. Individuals experiencing low relationship satisfaction may use phubbing behavior as a form of compensation for unmet needs within the relationship (Wei et al., 2019; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2013). Results support the previous study which concluded that individuals who reported higher levels of phubbing behavior also reported lower levels of relationship satisfaction (McDaniel & Coyne, 2015). Negative communication patterns such as, criticism, defensiveness, contempt, and stonewalling are strong indicators of low relationship satisfaction (Gottman & Levenson, 1992). One possible explanation of the results is that individuals who are not satisfied with their relationship may feel less fulfilled and connected to their partners, increasing the need or inclination to engage in phubbing behavior. They are more likely to seek distractions or escape from their relationship through excessive phone use (Wei et al., 2019).

Table 4 Linear Regression with Phubbing Behavior as the Criterion Variable

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	β		
(Constant)	-13.765	15.807		-.871	.386
Conscientiousness	8.019	1.906	.391	4.208	<.001

Dependent variable: Phubbing behavior

(NOTE: Fit for Model R2 = .153, Adjusted R2 = .144, F = 17.706, p <.001)

The coefficient for the predictor variable “Conscientiousness” is 6.982, with a beta value of 0.341. This indicates a moderate positive relationship between conscientiousness and phubbing behavior. The t-value (4.615) is highly significant (p<.001). Conscientiousness is characterized by traits such as organization, self-discipline, and responsibility. Individuals high in conscientiousness are typically diligent and goal-oriented, striving for efficiency and task completion. However, in the context of phubbing behavior, conscientiousness individuals may experience a conflict between their desire for productivity and their susceptibility to technological distractions. They may engage in phubbing behavior as a means of briefly escaping from the pressures of their responsibilities or seeking external stimuli. The positive relation between conscientiousness and phubbing behavior suggests that conscientious individuals may experience a tension between their desire for productivity and their susceptibility to technological interruptions. Despite their best intentions to stay focused and attentive, conscientious individual may be drawn to their smartphones and other electronic devices as they seek to manage multiple tasks, stay informed, or maintain a sense of productivity throughout the day (Andreassen et al.,2010). Another possible explanation may be that high conscientiousness lead to rigidity and inflexibility in thinking and behavior (Judge & Llies, 2002). Moreover, the results suggest that highly conscientious individuals may struggle to resist the urge to check their phones or engage in digital distractions, even in situations where it may be inappropriate or detrimental to interpersonal interactions.

Table 5 Linear Regression with Phubbing Behavior as the Criterion Variable

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	β		
(Constant)	-8.029	8.485		-.946	.346
Neuroticism	9.460	1.270	.601	7.446	<.001

Dependent variable: Phubbing behavior

(NOTE: Fit for Model R2 = .361, Adjusted R2 = .355, F = 55.441, p <.001)

The coefficient for the predictor variable (Neuroticism) is 8.937, with a beta value of 0.568. This indicates a strong positive relationship between neuroticism and phubbing behavior. The t-value (7.712) is highly significant (p<.001). Neuroticism is characterized by tendencies towards negative emotions, such as anxiety, worry, and mood instability. Individuals high in neuroticism often experience heightened stress and emotional reactivity in response to daily challenges. In the context of phubbing behavior, neurotic individuals may turn to their smartphones as a coping mechanism or means of distraction from their inner turmoil or relationship conflict (Park et al., 2013). Additionally, the heightened emotional arousal and sensitivity associated with neuroticism may exacerbate the frequency and intensity of phubbing behavior, as individuals struggle to regulate their impulses and manage their emotional states effectively (Montag et al., 2014).

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

The strong positive correlation between neuroticism and phubbing behavior suggests that neurotic individuals may turn to digital devices as a source of solace or escape when confronted with emotional distress or relationship dissatisfaction. Moreover, neurotic individuals may also exhibit heightened sensitivity to perceived social cues of threats in their environment, making them susceptible to Fear of Missing Out (FOMO). Individuals high in neuroticism were more likely to use their smartphones to cope with stress and negative emotions (Elhai et al., 2017). This perceptual state of vigilance and hyper arousal may exacerbate phubbing behavior within marital relationships, as neurotic individuals struggle to regulate their impulses and maintain present-focused engagement with their spouses.

The regression analysis suggest that Conscientiousness and Neuroticism have the strongest associations with phubbing behavior among the Big Five personality traits, while Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness have minimal or negligible effects.

Limitations

The present study only focusses on the perspective of an individual within the couple, because of the unavailability of both the partners at same time. There could have been several other possible factors which might have contributed to the phubbing behavior.

Future Research

The present study focused on exploring the predicting factors of phubbing behavior in married individuals, therefore future researches can cater on investigating the consequences or impact of phubbing behavior. Further researches can be conducted exploring phubbing as a mediator or navigating factor in marital relationships. Strategies can be designed so as to alleviate phubbing and foster well-being in relationships. Researches should be done in technology advanced societies to analyze whether the causes and impact of phubbing behavior are same as compared to the less technologically advanced societies. Future researches should focus on efforts to mitigate phubbing and promote mindful, attentive communication within marriages that are crucial for preserving and enhancing relationship satisfaction, commitment and overall relationship well-being.

CONCLUSION

Relationship commitment, relationship satisfaction and personality traits predicts phubbing behavior in married individuals. The study has been instrumental in highlighting the causes of phubbing behavior in married individuals. The most significant contribution of this study has been to identify the predicting factors of phubbing behavior and later draw interventions to enhance positive marital relationships.

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>
- Andreassen, C. S., Hetland, J., & Pallesen, S. (2010). The relationship between 'workaholism', basic needs satisfaction at work and personality. *European Journal of Personality: Published for the European Association of Personality Psychology*, 24(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.737>
- Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: Affective, cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 27(9), 1190-1203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201279011>

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

- Chotpitayasunondh, V., & Douglas, K. M. (2018). Measuring Phone Snubbing Behavior: Development and Validation of the Generic Scale of Phubbing (GSP) and the Generic Scale of Being Phubbed (GSBP). *Computers in Human Behavior*, 88, pp. 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.06.020>
- Dwyer, R. J., Kushlev, K., & Dunn, E. W. (2018). Smartphone use undermines enjoyment of face-to-face social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 78, 233-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.10.007>
- Eisenberg, N., Vaughan, J. U. L. I. E., & Hofer, C. (2009). Temperament, self-regulation, and peer social competence. *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups*, 473-489.
- Elhai, J. D., Dvorak, R. D., Levine, J. C., & Hall, B. J. (2017). Problematic smartphone use: A conceptual overview and systematic review of relations with anxiety and depression psychopathology. *Journal of affective disorders*, 207, 251-259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2016.08.030>
- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: behavior, physiology, and health. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 63(2), 221. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.63.2.221>
- Haigh, A. (2012). Stop Phubbing. <http://www.stopphubbing.com>
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93-98.
- Hong, W., Liu, R. D., Ding, Y., Jiang, S., Yang, X., & Sheng, X. (2021). Academic procrastination precedes problematic mobile phone use in Chinese adolescents: A longitudinal mediation model of distraction cognitions. *Addictive Behaviors*, 121, 106993.
- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 797. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(1), 81. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*. Guilford Press.
- 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. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ppm0000065>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Miller-Ott, A., & Kelly, L. (2015). The presence of cell phones in romantic partner face-to-face interactions: An expectancy violation theory approach. *Southern Communication Journal*, 80(4), 253-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2015.1055371>
- Montag, C., Błazzkiewicz, K., Lachmann, B., Andone, I., Sariyska, R., Trendafilov, B., ... & Markowitz, A. (2014). Correlating personality and actual phone usage. *Journal of Individual Differences*. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000139>
- Murray, C. E., & Campbell, E. C. (2015). The pleasures and perils of technology in intimate relationships. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 14(2), 116-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332691.2014.953651>
- Park, J., Kitayama, S., Karasawa, M., Curhan, K., Markus, H. R., Kawakami, N., ... & Ryff, C. D. (2013). Clarifying the links between social support and health: Culture, stress, and neuroticism matter. *Journal of health psychology*, 18(2), 226-235. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2749>

Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals

- Peleg, O. (2008). The relation between differentiation of self and marital satisfaction: What can be learned from married people over the course of life?. *The American journal of family therapy*, 36(5), 388-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180701804634>
- Pollmann, M. M., Norman, T. J., & Crockett, E. E. (2021). A daily-diary study on the effects of face-to-face communication, texting, and their interplay on understanding and relationship satisfaction. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 3, 100088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100088>
- 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>
- Rammstedt, B. & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10 item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 203-212.
- 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>
- Rodriguez, L. M., Coy, A., & Hadden, B. W. (2021). The attachment dynamic: Dyadic patterns of anxiety and avoidance in relationship functioning. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 38(3), 971-994.
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The investment model scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, 5, 357-391.
- Schumm, W. R., Paff-Bergen, L. A., Hatch, R. C., Obiorah, F. C., Copeland, J. M., Meens, L. D., & Bugaihis, M. A. (1986). Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 381-387.
- Slotter, E. B., Finkel, E. J., DeWall, C. N., Pond Jr, R. S., Lambert, N. M., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Putting the brakes on aggression toward a romantic partner: the inhibitory influence of relationship commitment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 102(2), 291.
- Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 54, 595-608
- Sun, J., & Yoon, D. (2023). Not My Fault to Phub Friends! Individual, Social, and Technological Influences on Phubbing and Its Consequences.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic Books.
- Utami, M., Anam, M. K., & Noorrizki, R. D. (2020). The Relationship Between Phubbing and Romantic Relationship Satisfaction: A Literature Review. *KnE Social Sciences*, 370-385. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i15.8226>

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Jain, H. & Tyagi, A. (2024). Together but Alone: Exploring the Predictors of Phubbing Behaviour in Married Individuals. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(3), 562-570. DIP:18.01.054.20241203, DOI:10.25215/1203.054