



Being Phubbed and Positive Communication: An Indonesian Family-based Dyadic Analysis

Yohanes Budiarto^{1,*} , Rahmah Hastuti¹  and Sandi Kartasasmita¹ 

¹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract:

Aim: This research investigated the impact of being phubbed on positive communication dynamics within family relationships, specifically between parents and adolescents and between parents dyadically.

Background: The experience of being phubbed is becoming an increasing phenomenon as the use of gadgets during face-to-face communication takes place. Most research focuses on how children experience being phubbed by their parents. For this reason, this study answers the gap related to how parents experience being phubbed in communication with their children. This research also examines the experience of being phubbed between fathers and mothers in the same family and its impact on their positive family communication.

Methods: Data were analyzed using the Actor Partner Interdependence Model (APIM), a statistical model for dyadic data in which two individuals affect one another, such as those between parent-adolescent child dyads and husband-wife dyads. The total participants consist of 306 participants from 102 Indonesian families, including 102 father-adolescents, 102 mother-adolescents, and 102 father-mother dyadic pairs. The APIM_MM web-based application was used to test how an individual's predictor influences their outcome and how an individual's predictor influences their partner's outcome (the partner's effect).

Results: The study found that being phubbed (whether experienced by oneself or one's partner) has no statistically significant effect on positive family communication qualities. This held true for the three pairs studied: father and adolescent, mother and adolescent, and father and mother. There were no significant actor or partner effects regarding being phubbed, although positive communication in the dyads indicated some dependency. All members of each dyad had comparable patterns of positive communication, suggesting that some positive interactions occur in return within familial relationships.

Conclusion: This study explored the impact of being phubbed on positive communication within Indonesian family dyads using the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM). Results revealed no significant actor or partner effects of being phubbed on positive communication in father-adolescent, mother-adolescent, or father-mother relationships.

Keywords: Being phubbed, Positive communication, Actor and partner effects, Dyads, Interdependence, Phubbing.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Bentham Open.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC-BY 4.0), a copy of which is available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Jakarta, Indonesia;
E-mail: yohanesb@psi.untar.ac.id

Cite as: Budiarto Y, Hastuti R, Kartasasmita S. Being Phubbed and Positive Communication: An Indonesian Family-based Dyadic Analysis. Open Psychol J, 2025; 18: e18743501369184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/0118743501369184250207094654>



Received: November 23, 2024

Revised: December 31, 2024

Accepted: January 22, 2025

Published: February 13, 2025



Send Orders for Reprints to
reprints@benthamsience.net

1. INTRODUCTION

The family forms the structure of society that most people consider stable, which has a particular place in people's lives as a whole [1]. It is important to note that positive interaction between parents and their adolescent children is necessary to build relationships and help the adolescents' social and psychological growth. Positive parent-child communication is founded on a loving, nurturing relationship, especially on sensitive issues such as sexual and reproductive health [2]. This is more pronounced when there is mother-adolescent interaction, as studies show that adolescents are more willing to talk to their mothers than fathers [3], even when both parents are at home [2]. Discussing emotional and relationship topics – which mothers routinely do because it is often their nurturing role – greatly impacts adolescent wellbeing and decision-making processes [4, 5]. In that context, the function of fathers in communication with adolescents is important, too, although scholars somewhat neglect this fact.

Positive communication between fathers and their adolescent children has been illustrated as one of the factors that enhance protection against certain risk behaviours, including substance use and sexual risk-taking [6, 7]. For example, African American fathers who talk to their adolescent children about health promotion activities help model healthy behaviours among children [7]. Moreover, it has been noted that fathers engage their adolescent children in conversations about social issues, which may enhance coping and emotion regulation abilities [8]. This view shows fathers' significance in acquiring children's views and behaviours, even when society may coercively lead them to engage in risky behaviours [7].

Communication between mothers and adolescents should also be highlighted as a subject of considerable importance. Mothers typically spend more time with their adolescent children and have more emotional interactions with them [9]. This type of imbalance has a positive impact on adolescents' psychological state. Findings suggest that mothers are attentive and caring, and through their communication, adolescents' internalizing problems, such as anxiety and depression, are lessened [10, 11].

On the other hand, it has also been reported that women's inclusion in household chores and conversations boosts adolescents' self-concept and even lowers the stress level, which is usually experienced by the younger generation. A Malaysian study that incorporated questionnaires found a positive link between parents' communication with adolescents and adolescents' self-esteem in the family context, which means that stronger families are associated with stronger self-esteem [12].

Mother and father communication barriers have been shown to include gender and sexuality and also include the cultural background of the communicators [10]. For example, research indicates that mothers usually exert more effort in nurturing their daughters, yet fathers still have an essential position in their sons' socialization and emotional control [5]. For instance, the fact that boys and

girls grew up understanding some aspect of communication could create a lasting impression on how they approach communication on sensitive topics such as SRH and mental health [11, 13]. On top of that, regarding psychosocial aspects, more open, warmer, and supportive relationships have been associated with higher levels of adolescent life satisfaction, which places the burden of effective communication of positive messages on both parents [5, 14].

In addition to communication between parents and adolescents, positive communication between husband and wife is also essential. Communication between spouses is known to be very crucial in promoting marital satisfaction as well as general satisfaction in a relationship [15]. Positive communication promotes individual gratification as well as the greater well-being of the marriage. Openness, understanding, and empathy are critical, as the partners can trust and support each other in their endeavours to handle possible challenges [16, 17]. Positive communication between a husband and wife is one of the most critical determinants of marriage satisfaction and the general satisfaction of relationships [18].

The actor-partner interdependence model analysis is used to buttress the communicative barriers one partner carries and perceives, which can shape the other partner's marital communication [19]. This dependence also speaks to the issues of understanding in the interaction. If a partner is engaged in positive communication, the overall relationship quality will likely improve for both partners [20, 21].

Many families have practically adopted technological advancements in their daily lives. However, this advancement has affected the relationships between married couples, so one cannot say that it has been an absolute blessing. The family's communication quality is undermined when each family member is lulled into problematic smartphone use. The use of modern technology interrupts family interactions. Such interruptions range from a lack of verbal communication during an interaction to a lack of emotional bond and, consequently, a loss of satisfaction in the relationship [22].

Smartphone addiction has a detrimental impact on the relationship between parents and children and on the overall family relationship. Studies showed that increased dependence on mobile screen devices can be associated with decreased levels of communication between parents and children and even their socio-cognitive development. More specifically, children aged four to five years whose parents had used mobile touchscreen devices (MTSD) more than two hours a week showed lower parental interaction and low parental involvement (physical) [23].

Phubbing-snubbing someone in a social situation by looking at your phone instead of paying attention to them has been researched as a common parental behaviour that may affect children. However, the reverse effects (*i.e.*, how children phubbing parents) have not been sufficiently studied. One way to think about family communication dynamics is through the lens of the Actor

Partner Interdependence Model (APIM). This model proposes that phubbing by any family member disrupts the quality of their interactions with the overall family, thus warranting dyadic analysis for better comprehension of these associations.

Most children still experience phubbing at home despite spending more time in school, which negatively influences their social-emotional adjustment [15]. Studies indicated that parental phubbing increases depression among children and adolescents, meaning that the use of mobile phones detracts children from healthy family relations and socialization. The parental use of mobile devices can disrupt aggressive familial interaction, which is equally crucial in preventing emotional growth [24].

Parental phubbing harms relationship satisfaction while it increases child neglect [25]. To be specific, quite some studies report a positive relationship between cyberbullying and mother phubbing among adolescents through the mediation of perceived mother acceptance, indicating that communication with parents is necessary. The research findings show that a mother's phone may cause her adolescents to feel neglected [26].

Parents scornfully ignoring their adolescent children has been shown to lower adolescents' willingness to communicate, negatively affecting their social connections and mental well-being. Parental phubbing, especially among fathers, harms the relationship between a father and his adolescent children, thus affecting adolescent self-regulation and psychological health [27]. The finding concludes that frequent paternal phubbing may lead to emotional disconnection, thereby reducing the chances of parents opening up to their adolescent children [28].

Positive family interactions help alleviate disputes and are important in children's socialization [29]. The children and parents who practice such open communication are more emotionally intelligent and socially competent [30]. Parents can provide values that include empathy, appreciation, and cooperativeness by developing a positive atmosphere where children can comfortably communicate [29]. It includes but is not limited to speaking, embracing reciprocal exchanges to foster understanding and emotional backing, and training all the involved members of the family in relevant techniques for managing disputes [31].

Phubbing creates a reciprocal dynamic for both the phubber and the victim. In parent-child communication, adolescents frequently replicate their parents' phubbing behavior. Parental phubbing may influence adolescents' phubbing of their parents. Adolescents may emulate their parents when online *via* social media, given their parents' extensive phone usage during family gatherings.

Individuals who feel phubbed by significant others are more prone to indulge in phubbing themselves [32]. Research shows that being phubbed by parents has adverse effects on a child's emotional and psychosocial growth, forming a vicious cycle, allowing children subjected to smartphone-induced parental negligence to also engage in phubbing. Parental phubbing establishes a

mobile dependence in adolescents as seeking a parent who is on the mobile phone only motivates the use of the phone more [33]. Adolescents experiencing being phubbed by parents are predicted to become mobile phone addicts. One twisted explanation of this behavior is that neglect causes the desire to seek comfort inside the screens [28].

Psychological data have primarily focused on the individual; however, social and behavioral scientists often engage with interpersonal matters. Close dyadic ties define the most salient context of everyday life because people would rather be seen together than alone. Due to the extensive nature of the dyadic data, researchers can effectively deal with complex research questions [34]. Within the relationship, both parties' contributions may change the outcome somehow. A promising model for examining dyadic data is the actor-partner interdependence model, used when both partners undertake the same measures. An actor effect refers to the effect on a person's outcome score by his/her score on a predictor variable, while a partner effect involves the effect of one person's score on his/her partner's score [35].

So far, studies have focused mainly on how phubbing holds in parent-child paradigms and how the power dynamic tends to be one-directional, from the superior party, parents, to the affected majority party, children. If the trend of reciprocal phubbing continues, which seems to turn into behaviour in family communication, the children may phub their parents.

As such, in the social relationships under focal consideration, the relations between a father and a mother and between parents and their adolescent children may be affected by phubbing, for example, adolescent children being challenged by their parents in their parenting practices [36]. The same model is also utilized in father and mother dyadic pairs. Consequently, within familial dynamics, communication between parents and children may be hindered by being phubbed experiences, affecting adolescent offspring and their parents [37]. The same framework is also utilized for father-mother dyadic couples. The father's effective communication is shaped by his experience of being phubbed and the mother's experience. The mother's effective communication is shaped by her experience of being phubbed and the father's experience of being phubbed.

On the other hand, only a few studies consider the practice of being phubbed in family relations restricted to father-child, mother-child, and parent-parent relationships. Although we found literature on the effect of phubbing on parent-children relationships, no study dealt with being phubbed by adolescent children [38]. The experience of being phubbed in dyadic parent-child interactions and between parents is limited, particularly regarding its impact on positive family communication.

This study applies the APIM approach to explore the experience of being phubbed in communication between family dyadic members: father-adolescent, mother-adolescent, and father-mother. The APIM approach examines partner variations by considering how participants in the

study are interdependent [39, 40] Within the partner phubbing framework, the model differentiates between actor effects 1 (own-effects) and partner effects 2 (effects on one's partner) about their respective positive communication.

2. METHODS

2.1. Participants and Procedure

Before data collection, research participation invitations were sent to parents through schools and faculties in Cirebon and Jakarta. In the meeting with parents, the explanation and purpose of the study were presented in detail so that the decision to participate could be made.

We ensured that family data was not exposed other than for research purposes. Both parents who agreed to participate in the study gave informed consent to the researcher regarding the participation of their adolescent children. The G-Form questionnaire was administered to families who agreed to participate. Thus, participants were obtained based on convenience sampling. The researcher emphasized that participation in this study was for research purposes only and had nothing to do with the school's assessment of the participating students.

The data collection started in the first week in Cirebon and continued in Jakarta. The researcher coordinated with the high school principals there and provided Link G-Forms to the schools to distribute to the students' families.

Each family received three questionnaires for the father, mother, and teenage child. Data collection occurred over two months until the last week of October 2024. The fathers' and mothers' questionnaires were only addressed to their same adolescent child. Likewise, adolescents filled out questionnaires regarding their relationships with their fathers and mothers.

The research was conducted under the evaluation and monitoring of the Institute for Research and Community Service of Tarumanagara University and The Directorate General of Higher Education, Research, and Technology (DGHERT) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (MOECRT) of the Republic of Indonesia. Participation in this study began with obtaining informed consent from each participant in the family and guaranteed confidentiality.

We carefully evaluated the ethical implications of our work and decided not to seek formal approval. Our conclusion was based on the non-invasive nature of research. Our study did not involve any physical treatments, invasive procedures, or the acquisition of sensitive personal data that could be risky for participants. The Institute of Research and Community Service of Universitas Tarumanagara conducts monitoring and evaluation of this project to ensure that the implementation of the research does not deviate from the research plan and timeliness.

The required sample size for dyadic analysis is a minimum of 93 dyads [41]. The study participants comprised 102 adolescents (14-21 years old), 102 fathers, and 102 mothers from the same family. Within a family, data was collected in pairs of the child-father, the child-mother, and

the mother-father. Fathers and mothers were paired with only their same adolescent child. Thus, fathers and mothers evaluated their respective experiences of being phubbed and positive communication with their same adolescent child. Conversely, the adolescent children also evaluated their experience of being phubbed and positive communication experiences with each parent.

A total of 306 participants were included in the study to evaluate the roles of 102 families—fathers, mothers, and adolescent children within dyads. Parents' age was between 49 and 66, $M = 42.9$ ($SD = 5.3$) for mothers and $M = 44.9$ ($SD = 5.7$) for fathers. Adolescent children have a mean age of 18.6 years ($SD = 5.6$) and range from 14 to 20 years. It is worth mentioning that 100% of the couples co-parented their biological children from birth.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Positive Family Communication

Positive family communication scale [42] ascertained positive family communication among parents and their adolescent children using three items on a 5-scale response questionnaire. The three items were rated with 1 indicating Strongly Disagree and 5 indicating Strongly Agree. Items are adapted according to the communication partner. For example, in an adolescent child-father relationship, item 1 for the adolescent child is expressed as "I have lots of good conversations with my father". The second item asked the adolescent child the following: "If you had important concerns about drugs, alcohol, sex, or some other serious issue, would you talk to your father?" Responses had choices ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 = No, 2 = Probably Not, 3 = I am not sure, 4 = Probably Yes, and 5 = Yes. The third item is "How often does your father talk to you about what you do in school? (1 = never to 5 = very often). Specifically, for item 3, when the participant's partner is the adolescent child, the context is the adolescent's school/study context. Thus, communication between the father or mother and the child is related to the child's studies. When the communication partner is the father, then item 3 is aimed at the context of the father's work. Finally, when the communication partner is the mother, item 3 is related to general household conditions.

2.2.2. Being Phubbed

To measure being phubbed, three Being Phubbed subscales were adapted from the Parental Phubbing Scale (PPS) [30]: BP-Mother (BP-M), BP-Father (BP-F), and BP-Adolescent Child. BP-M refers to how adolescents feel about being phubbed by their mothers during communication with their mothers. The BP-F scale measures how adolescents think about being phubbed by their fathers. All items on both scales are the same except referring to the source of phubbing *i.e.*, father or mother. BP-Adolescent Child has the same statements that are related to how the father or mother feels about being phubbed by their adolescent child.

An example of BP-F items is, "During leisure time that we spend together, my father pays more attention to his smartphone than to me"; BP-M: "During leisure time that

we spend together, my mother pays more attention to her smartphone than to me”; and BP-AC: “During leisure time that we spend together, my adolescent child pays more attention to his/her smartphone than to me.” Response categories ranged from “Never” (1), “Rarely” (2), “Sometimes” (3), “often” (4), to “All the Time” (5).

2.3. Data Analysis

This research uses the Actor Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) approach to analyze father-child, mother-child, and father-mother dyadic data (Supplementary data). The research data analysis used the APIM_MM program: Web Programs for Dyadic and Group Data Analysis [43]

Before examining the dyadic effects of being phubbed on each individual's positive communication in the relationships, the data were first restructured into pairwise data through the web application *ItoP* [44]. Before testing the effect of dyad being phubbed on positive communication, a distinguishability analysis was conducted by first restructuring individual data into dyad format with the help of the *ItoD* application [45]. The distinguishability test in the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) is a critical analytical procedure used to assess whether the roles within a dyad (parent-child pairs) can be treated as statistically distinguishable. This test is essential for understanding the dynamics of interdependence in relationships, as it allows researchers to determine if the effects observed in one partner can be attributed differently to each member of the dyad. This included tests for equality of means, variances, and correlations across dyad roles. *Dingy* was used to test distinguishability [46].

The APIM analysis used coefficients and standardized beta estimates to assess the significance of actor effects, which look at how a person's predictor affects their outcome, and partner effects, which look at how a person's predictor affects their partner's outcome. In addition, covariate analysis was also performed to control for the roles within dyads (*e.g.*, adolescent vs. parent, mother vs. father) to assess differences in communication patterns.

3. RESULTS

In this study, we explored the effect of being phubbed (a situation where one is ignored in favour of a phone) on positive communication within a relationship. They aimed to understand how both an individual's own experience of being phubbed (referred to as the “actor”) and their partner's experience of being phubbed (the “partner”) impacted positive communication on the actor's part. The study design treated both members of the dyad (each pair)

as interchangeable, meaning the researchers did not differentiate between the roles of each partner in terms of who the actor or partner is. This approach was applied to 102 dyads, or 306 individuals, with no missing data.

3.1. Distinguishability

The analysis of distinguishability in the context of the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) provides valuable insights into the dynamics between the roles of adolescent and father, adolescent and mother, and mother and father regarding the variables positive communication and being phubbed.

3.1.1. Adolescent-father Dyad

In light of the findings provided, it is evident that the dyads under study are distinguishably identifiable. The analysis of variance indicates that the means and the correlations among the variables in question are significantly different. In particular, the test comparing the means, Model I *versus* Model II, returned the statistically significant result (chi-square(2) 8.17; $p = .017$), which means that the means for the variables differ when comparing the roles of adolescent and father (Table 1). There was also a statistically significant result with the test, which looked at the equality of correlations, Model I *versus* Model III (chi-square(2) = 13.66 $p < 0.000$). This further suggests that the relationships between the variables are different regarding each role. In contrast, the test for equal variances, Model IV *versus* Model V, was not statistically significant (chi-square(2) = 5.05, $p = .080$). In this case, it is possible to suggest that the variances across the dyads are equal. However, the significance of the differences in means and correlations is more than enough to confirm the distinguishable nature of the dyads.

3.1.2. Adolescent-mother Dyad

Three key findings emerged in analyzing the models and comparing various statistical properties. First, the test comparing the means of two models (Model I *versus* Model II) yielded a statistically significant result (chi-square (2) = 17.28, $p < .001$), indicating that the means are unequal. Second, the test assessing the equality of correlations between pairs of variables (Model I *versus* Model III) did not reach statistical significance (chi-square(2) = 3.49, $p = .175$), suggesting that the data support the hypothesis of equal correlations under the assumption of equal variances. Lastly, the test for the

Table 1. Adolescent-father dyad tests of distinguishability.

Model	Equal Means	Equal Variances	Equal Correlations	Chi-square	df	p	RMSEA	SABIC
I	Yes	Yes	Yes	26.294	6	<.001	0.182	38.025
II	No	Yes	Yes	18.120	4	.001	0.186	32.783
III	Yes	Yes	No	12.630	4	.013	0.145	27.293
IV	No	Yes	No	5.051	2	.080	0.122	22.647
V	No	No	No	-	0	-	-	20.529

Table 2. Adolescent-mother dyad tests of distinguishability.

Model	Equal Means	Equal Variances	Equal Correlations	Chi-square	df	p	RMSEA	SABIC
I	Yes	Yes	Yes	29.742	6	<.001	0.197	41.473
II	No	Yes	Yes	12.461	4	.014	0.144	27.124
III	Yes	Yes	No	26.252	4	<.001	0.234	40.915
IV	No	Yes	No	9.430	2	.009	0.191	27.026
V	No	No	No	-	0	-	-	20.529

Table 3. Father-mother dyad tests of distinguishability.

Model	Equal Means	Equal Variances	Equal Correlations	Chi-square	df	p	RMSEA	SABIC
I	Yes	Yes	Yes	9.175	6	.164	0.072	20.906
II	No	Yes	Yes	2.146	4	.709	0.000	16.809
III	Yes	Yes	No	8.474	4	.076	0.105	23.137
IV	No	Yes	No	1.448	2	.485	0.000	19.044
V	No	No	No	-	0	-	-	20.529

equality of variances (Model IV *versus* Model V) was statistically significant (chi-square(2) = 9.43, $p = .009$), providing evidence that the variances are unequal. Despite these findings, all models exhibited poor fit, as indicated by the chi-square test and RMSEA values. Notably, the model demonstrating complete distinguishability had the lowest SABIC value, concluding that the dyad of adolescent-mother is fully distinguishable (Table 2).

3.1.3. Father-mother Dyad

The analysis reveals that the means for each variable are statistically significant, indicating that the means are unequal (chi-square(2) = 7.03, $p = .030$). In contrast, the tests for equal correlations between pairs of variables (chi-square(2) = 0.70, $p = .704$) and equal variances (chi-square(2) = 1.45, $p = .485$) are not statistically significant, suggesting that the correlations and variances are equal (Table 3). The best-fitting model is the Means Unequal Model (Model II), supported by chi-square tests and fit indices like RMSEA and SABIC. Since there is no indication of distinguishability, dyad members can be treated as indistinguishable.

3.2. APIM Analysis

3.2.1. Adolescent-father Dyad

The actor effect of being phubbed on positive communication was -0.102 , and the partner effect was -0.096 . Both effects were non-significant ($p = .271$ and $p = .292$, respectively). Standardized effects were also very small, with the actor effect at -0.077 ($p = 0.008$) and the partner effect at -0.073 ($p = 0.004$), with negligible practical concerns. The k -value, which gives the ratio of partner-to-actor effects, was 0.938. However, the wide confidence (-7.405 to 9.313) prevents us from drawing strong conclusions about the contributions of actor and partner effects relative to each other.

The Role as a covariate, indicating adolescents (1) and fathers (2), significantly affected positive communication (estimate = -0.234 , $p = .027$). This indicates that when

other variables were controlled for, fathers, on average, reported lower positive communication than adolescents. The effect was small at -0.125 (95% confidence interval -0.144 , -0.107). The role covariate distinguishes between the upper dyad (coded as 2) and the lower dyad (coded as 1) based on fathers *versus* adolescents. The negative coefficient indicates that positive communication scores decrease as the Role value increases from adolescent to father.

Several important key findings were noted in the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM), which deals with adolescents and fathers concerning positive communication. Adolescents had a residual standard deviation of 0.890, while fathers recorded a 0.975 residual standard deviation, the data displaying some dispersion. However, the measured R-squares for both partner and actor effects were relatively low, notably $-.037$ for adolescents and $.000$ for fathers, which came out as noticeably decent. The chi-square test result was (1.640, $p = .440$), showing that these R-squared values had no significant statistical meaning, making it possible to conclude that the model has not accounted for a significant proportion of variance in positive communication.

Even so, the partial intraclass correlation related to positive communication while controlling for both actor and partner variables was $.373$ and statistically significant $p < .001$, implying a moderate communication likeness between adolescents and fathers. The intercept of 4.201 was crucial in the analysis since it was also statistically significant, $p < .001$, which is the expected observed value of positive communication when all the predictive factors are at the mean. Adopting the assessment of generalized least squares with correlated errors and the maximum likelihood estimation technique shows that the actor effect of being phubbed was -0.102 ($p = .271$), and the effect for a partner was -0.096 ($p = .292$), which were both non-significant and small. Table 4 presents the adolescent-father dyad information.

It is concluded that, although a significant interdependence of the dyad members' positive communication was found during the study, the effects of being phubbed on

positive communication were not statistically significant. Therefore, more research is needed to investigate more variables that may explain communication in father-adolescent dyads.

3.2.2. Adolescent - mother Dyad

The study examines the effect of being phubbed on positive communication, where they look at the actor's (individual) experience of being phubbed and the partner's (interpersonal) experience of being phubbed among the dyads comprising adolescents and their mothers. The sample consists of 102 dyads, constituting a total of 204 subjects. All proportions are treated as having no missing data and are partially distinguishable, with the adolescents and mothers having different residual variances and intercepts but the same actor and partner effects across the groups. The Role of any participant is accounted for in the analysis, with adolescents' scores set at 1 and mothers at 2.

Actor and partner effects for being phubbed on positive communication show no significant effects. The actor effect was not significant ($\beta = -0.041$, $p = .612$) with a standardized effect of -0.036 ($r = -.038$). Partner effect was also nonsignificant ($\beta = -0.011$, $p = .895$) and had a standardized effect size of -0.010 ($r = -.009$). The Role as a covariate was significantly associated ($\beta = -0.216$, $p = .041$), and $d = -.268$, suggesting a small effect size (Table 5).

For Positive Communication, the partial intraclass correlation was .243 ($p = .014$), indicating that members of the dyad were very similar after controlling for actor and partner variables. It is statistically significant and suggests the partial dyadic effect, indicating that dyad members are positively correlated in their positive communication scores. However, it has to be noted that the variables being phubbed explored here do not account for it.

3.2.3. Father-mother Dyad

Within the father-mother dyad, the model explains 0% of the variance in positive communication ($R^2 = .000$, $\chi^2(2) = 0.562$, $p = .755$), indicating no significant predictive value. The residual standard deviation is 0.842. However, the intraclass correlation for positive communication is .380, indicating father-mother dyad members are similar ($p < .001$). The intercept is significant (4.012, $p < .001$). Neither the actor effect (.053, $p = .486$) nor the partner effect (-.017, $p = .821$) is significant for being phubbed (Table 6). The overall nonindependence correlation is .378, but the model explains almost none (0.18%).

4. DISCUSSION

The results showed that in all dyads, neither the actor effect nor the partner effect showed the effect of being phubbed on the positive communication of each family member. Majorly research agrees that phubbing has cropped up in the technology-reliant world where families exist. Phubbing goes against established communication norms and ethics, which value face-to-face engagement. This behaviour is viewed as a negative outcome of rapid technology improvements, resulting in decreased interpersonal communication quality [47].

Nevertheless, it makes sense that someone constantly disconnected from interactions with others would eventually get to a point where they begin to feel that what is known as phubbing is normal behaviour [48]. Phubbing may be seen today as a universal practice in social settings due to how particular smartphones are now the norm and how mobile distractions posed by parents' phones are not an issue today, signaling a change in communication in this generation [49]. It shows how technology or the expansion of technologies in society predicts the normalization of actions such as phubbing even when they are relationship adversaries. Phubbing also occurs more often among individuals in close relations, meaning the closer the relations are, the more phubbing occurs [50].

Phubbing is apparently an emerging trend among millennials and Generation Z. A sizeable number of people belonging to this demographic cohort report not only partaking in phubbing but also being at the receiving end of it from others. This indicates a tendency for such phubbing behaviour becoming more prevalent in social contexts [51]. Phubbing is being increasingly viewed as a regular course of action that can be practiced in many circumstances, be it family gatherings, business meetings, or social gatherings [52]. Many individuals feel it is acceptable to prioritize their smartphone talks above face-to-face interactions. Social learning and normative influences augment the preexisting concepts related to those mentioned above. Adolescents' continuous exposure to parental phubbing behavior predisposes them to adopt similar behaviors, indicating that these patterns are imparted or acquired within the familial context [53]. Thus, the feeling of being phubbed and the habit of phubbing other family members becomes the new common "communication norm." This is very likely why being phubbed in communication has no impact on positive family communication. While it appears that phubbing and being phubbed are now common in all face-to-face communication, the act of phubbing refrains from being beneficial to one's health and thus wights raises the need to treat it as a pertinent health issue, suggesting that it is neither commonplace nor a desirable action to take in an interaction.

Although the APIM dyadic analysis showed no impact of actor and partner's being phubbed on positive family communication, a consistent finding in each dyad is reciprocal positive communication in each dyad relationship. Positive connections can reduce conflict and preserve a relationship despite negative feelings. This tactic can hide the consequences of being phubbed on communication. Phubbing may cause people to engage more to compensate for their partner's preoccupation, complicating the assessment of how it affects communication [54].

In addition, the context of this research is communication in family relationships, which are very different in dynamics and quality compared to other forms of close relationships. Although often experiencing neglect in communication with parents or children, each family member still sees the family based on the bond of relationship between children and parents. Hope, trust,

Table 4. Effect estimates for the actor-partner interdependence model in father-adolescent dyads.

Variable	Effect	Estimate	95.00 CI Lower	95.00 CI Upper	p-value	Beta	r
Positive Communication	Intercept	4.201	3.305	5.098	<.001	-	-
Being-Phubbed	Actor	-0.102	-0.283	0.079	.271	-0.077	-.055
-	Partner	-0.096	-0.274	0.082	.292	-0.073	-.061
-	k	0.938	-7.405	9.313	-	-	-
Role	-	-0.234	-0.440	-0.028	.027	-0.125	-.125

Table 5. Effect estimates for the actor-partner interdependence model in mother-adolescent dyads.

Variable	Effect	Estimate	95.00 CI Lower	95.00 CI Upper	p-value	Beta	r
Positive Communication	intercept	3.891	3.767	4.014	<.001	-	-
Being-Phubbed	Actor	-0.041	-0.200	0.118	.612	-0.036	-.038
-	Partner	-0.011	-0.171	0.149	.895	-0.010	-.009
-	k	0.261	-11.160	11.005	-	-	-
Role	-	-0.216	-0.420	-0.011	.041	-0.134	-.125

Table 6. Effect estimates for the actor-partner interdependence model in father-mother dyads.

Variable	Effect	Estimate	95.00 CI Lower	95.00 CI Upper	p-value	Beta	r
Positive Communication	Intercept	4.012	3.876	4.147	<.001	-	-
Being Phubbed	Actor	0.053	-0.096	0.202	.486	0.049	.046
-	Partner	-0.017	-0.166	0.132	.821	-0.016	-.015
-	k	-0.325	-10.383	10.140	-	-	-

and support between family members are strongly felt in the family. This is why family members still have positive communication with each other.

The analysis of positive communication within father-adolescent, mother-adolescent, and father-mother dyads revealed that while there is a notable similarity in communication patterns among family members, the specific impact of being phubbed—being ignored due to phone use—was not significant in influencing these interactions. In both the father-adolescent and mother-adolescent dyads, the effects of being phubbed were minimal and did not contribute meaningfully to variations in positive communication. Similarly, the father-mother dyad showed no significant predictive value regarding positive communication.

The research findings showed similar patterns of positive communication relationships in all three pairs of relationships between child-father, child-mother, and father-mother. Each individual in the pair showed similar positive communication practices. When the adolescent children demonstrated positive communication, their fathers and mothers responded positively.

Communication between a father and an adolescent is, in many ways, a two-way street, and such can be seen when a father and adolescent are positively communicating. When a father engages in his adolescent children's affairs and establishes an equally healthy relationship, this encourages communication between the two, which has desirable outcomes on the adolescent's behaviour [55]. The inter-

relationships go hand in hand in facilitating the process of building a sound bond between fathers and adolescents that improves the overall satisfaction of the adolescents with their lives [56].

Through positive talk with fathers, adolescents' psychological health can also be enhanced, and their life satisfaction is expected to be gratified [57]. The bond that forms as a result of communication enables this relationship to be more effective in linking perceived positive father involvement with adolescent well-being. Such a bond improves adolescents' life satisfaction and impacts their ability to develop prosocial behaviors and the quality of their relationships [58]. This interdependence intimates that fathers' effective communication should improve the adolescents' mental health and enhance the fathers' emotional involvement with their adolescent children [59].

One of the basic features of positivity in communication is emotional expressiveness. When mothers provide primary emotional and verbal interactivity and exposition, they promote safety in the adolescents and encourage sharing their parents' thoughts and feelings. These mothers' emotional detachments create an atmosphere where adolescents tend to express themselves. Encouraging communication strategies in parents can prevent their adolescent children from delinquency, suggesting that such children are likely to behave the way their mothers expect them to when they behave positively [60].

With mothers creating a room where conversation is the norm, their adolescent children are most likely to join in discussions actively. This participation is crucial when

dealing with sensitive issues such as a healthy intimate life and relationships; even in cases when parents are hesitant to approach such subject matters, their desire to keep communication with their adolescent children can result in better outcomes as adolescents are likely to be more proactive in such discussions [61]. This mutual participation fosters communication and increases the likelihood of them turning to their mothers for advice and assistance.

Reciprocal listening enhances the ability to understand and connect emotionally, improving the overall quality of communication between husband and wife. Mutual listening cultivates empathy, trust, and the ability to resolve conflicts. With mutual listening, each spouse must focus on their partner, not interject, and restate and ask any questions whenever necessary [62]. This creates a warm and nurturing atmosphere where both couples register and recognize each other's efforts, contributing to a greater sense of emotional closeness and better conflict resolution [63]. In addition, when partners listen to each other actively, this helps to promote understanding because both of them are instructed to look at the situation from the eyes of their spouses, hence avoiding conflicts while enhancing cohesion [64].

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the dynamics of being phubbed and its effect on Indonesian families' positive communication. The results, using the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM), suggest that, consistent with the general pattern of positive communication in all three dyadic relationships (father-adolescent/father-mother/mother-adolescent), being phubbed (from own effects/partner effects) was not associated with positive communication.

The absence of the influence of phubbing in the effect of actors and partners on positive communication indicates that at the same time, contemporary maladaptive behavior in a globalized world does not completely sever family relationships based on hope, trust, and support. When the family interacts positively, it seems to last, thus reducing the negative effects of interruptions or distractions caused by technology.

The results suggest to educators and family counsellors the need to emphasise the significance of maintaining positive interaction patterns in family relationships regardless of technological interference such as phubbing. It is necessary to organise seminars for families to learn the best ways to communicate with one another. Adolescents in schools and parents in the community can be educated about reciprocal communication about the phenomenon of phubbing and its potentially strong negative effects on their emotional bonds. The findings of this study can help parents manage their interactions with their children and partners so that technology does not impede such interactions.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study's limitation is that it is cross-sectional, so it cannot be used to analyze the effects of being phubbed on positive family communication over time. The study only analyzed 102 families of three relationship pairs: child-father, child-mother, and father-mother from two cities. The vastness of Indonesia's territory certainly requires analysis to reach more islands outside Java. Also, the generalizability

of this study is limited to families living in big cities, so it cannot be generalized to Indonesian families in rural areas. In addition, from the age range, the children in the family are in their adolescent years, so the research findings are limited to adolescents only. Therefore, the generalizability of the findings is limited.

While finding that the family communication process is strong enough to withstand major distractions from technology, this study also shows that more studies are needed to identify additional factors that might be affecting the communication dynamic. The present study's participants can be further generalized by recruiting participants from different regions and ages for future studies. Also, longitudinal approaches would qualify to measure the chronic effects of being phubbed on family communications.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

It is hereby acknowledged that all authors have accepted responsibility for the manuscript's content and consented to its submission. They have meticulously reviewed all results and unanimously approved the final version of the manuscript.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APIM = Actor-Partner Interdependence Model

APIM_MM = Actor-Partner Interdependence Model with Multilevel Modeling

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

Not applicable.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS

All human research procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the committee responsible for human experimentation (institutional and national), and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2013.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Before their participation, informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring their voluntary and informed agreement to participate in the study.

STANDARDS OF REPORTING

STROBE guidelines were followed.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

The data is stored in Figshare. Anyone with the following link can view but not edit the data. 10.6084/m9.figshare.27627984

FUNDING

This research was conducted using Directorate General of Higher Education Grants with contract number 0619-Int-KLPPM/UNTAR/VI/2024.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Institute for Research and Community Service of Universitas Tarumanagara, Indonesia facilitated this project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Crockett LJ, Brown J, Russell ST, Shen YL. The meaning of good parent-child relationships for Mexican American adolescents. *J Res Adolesc* 2007; 17(4): 639-68.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00539.x>
- [2] Muhwezi WW, Katahoire AR, Banura C, *et al.* Perceptions and experiences of adolescents, parents and school administrators regarding adolescent-parent communication on sexual and reproductive health issues in urban and rural Uganda. *Reprod Health* 2015; 12(1): 110.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12978-015-0099-3> PMID: 26621129
- [3] Noller P, Callan VJ. Adolescents' perceptions of the nature of their communication with parents. *J Youth Adolesc* 1990; 19(4): 349-62.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01537077> PMID: 24272532
- [4] Bireda AD, Pillay J. Perceived parent-child communication and well-being among Ethiopian adolescents. *Int J Adolesc Youth* 2018; 23(1): 109-17.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2017.1299016>
- [5] Cava MJ, Buelga S, Musitu G. Parental communication and life satisfaction in adolescence. *Span J Psychol* 2014; 17: E98.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2014.107> PMID: 26055552
- [6] Zapf H, Boettcher J, Haukeland Y, Orm S, Coslar S, Fjermestad K. A systematic review of the association between parent-child communication and adolescent mental health. *JCPP Adv* 2024; 4(2): e12205.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcv2.12205> PMID: 38827979
- [7] Boyd DT, Threats M, Winifred O, Nelson LE. The association between African American father-Child relationships and HIV testing. *Am J Men Health* 2020; 14(6): 1557988320982702.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1557988320982702> PMID: 33356797
- [8] Ojala M, Bengtsson H. Young people's coping strategies concerning climate change: Relations to perceived communication with parents and friends and proenvironmental behavior. *Environ Behav* 2019; 51(8): 907-35.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916518763894>
- [9] Fletcher AC, Benito-Gomez M, Blair BL. Adolescent cell phone communications with mothers and fathers: Content, patterns, and preferences. *J Child Fam Stud* 2018; 27(7): 2125-37.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1054-z>
- [10] Luijten CC, van de Bongardt D, Jongerling J, Nieboer AP. Associations between adolescents' internalizing problems and well-being: Is there a buffering role of boys' and girls' relationships with their mothers and fathers? *BMC Public Health* 2021; 21(1): 1871.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11920-4> PMID: 34656101
- [11] Zhang Q, Pan Y, Zhang L, Lu H. Parent-adolescent communication and early adolescent depressive symptoms: The roles of gender and adolescents' age. *Front Psychol* 2021; 12: 647596.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.647596> PMID: 34040561
- [12] V Raja Mohan SB, Dhanapal S, Govindasamy V, Purushothaman Pillay KS. Psychological impact of parent-adolescent communication: A critical analysis. (*IJPHS*) 2022; 11(4): 1210.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.11591/ijphs.v11i4.21461>
- [13] Mbachu CO, Agu IC, Eze I, *et al.* Exploring issues in caregivers and parent communication of sexual and reproductive health matters with adolescents in Ebonyi state, Nigeria. *BMC Public Health* 2020; 20(1): 77.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8058-5> PMID: 31952497
- [14] Rueger SY, Chen P, Jenkins LN, Choe HJ. Effects of perceived support from mothers, fathers, and teachers on depressive symptoms during the transition to middle school. *J Youth Adolesc* 2014; 43(4): 655-70.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0039-x> PMID: 24150539
- [15] Omoboye M, Eneh NE, Titor-Addingi MC. Communication patterns and marital satisfaction: A review of English language discourse in family counseling. *WJARR* 2024; 21(2): 1883-91.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.2.0634>
- [16] Besharat MA, Naghshineh N, Ganji P, Tavalaeayan F. The moderating role of attachment styles on the relationship of alexithymia and fear of intimacy with marital satisfaction. *Int J Psychol Stud* 2014; 6(3)
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v6n3p106>
- [17] Perndorfer C, Soriano EC, Siegel SD, *et al.* "Spousal support and cardiac patients" distress: The moderating role of attachment orientation": Correction to Vilchinsky *et al.* (2010). *J Fam Psychol* 2018; 26(1)
- [18] Girma Shifaw Z. Marital communication as moderators of the relationship between marital conflict resolution and marital satisfaction. *Am J Fam Ther* 2024; 52(3): 249-60.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2022.2089404>
- [19] Bouchard G, Gaudet M, Cloutier G, Martin M. Attachment, relational maintenance behaviors and relationship quality in romantic long-distance relationships: A dyadic perspective *Interpersona* 2023; 17(2): 213-31.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.9771>
- [20] De Netto PM, Quek KF, Golden KJ. Communication, the heart of a relationship: Examining capitalization, accommodation, and self-construal on relationship satisfaction. *Front Psychol* 2021; 12: 767908.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.767908> PMID: 34966329
- [21] Tranc LM, Neagoe A, Neagoe A. The importance of positive language for the quality of interpersonal relationships. *Agora Psycho-Pragmatica* 2018; 12(1)
- [22] McDaniel BT, Radesky JS. Technoference: Parent distraction with technology and associations with child behavior problems. *Child Dev* 2018; 89(1): 100-9.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12822> PMID: 28493400
- [23] Liszkaï-Peres K, Budai Z, Kocsis A, *et al.* Association between the use of mobile touchscreen devices and the quality of parent-child interaction in preschoolers. *Front Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2024; 3: 1330243.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/frcha.2024.1330243>
- [24] Xie X, Xie J. Parental phubbing accelerates depression in late childhood and adolescence: A two-path model. *J Adolesc* 2020; 78(1): 43-52.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.12.004> PMID: 31821961
- [25] Pancani L, Gerosa T, Gui M, Riva P. "Mom, dad, look at me": The development of the parental phubbing scale. *J Soc Pers Relat* 2021; 38(2): 435-58.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407520964866>
- [26] Qu J, Lei L, Wang X, Xie X, Wang P. Mother phubbing and adolescent cyberbullying: The mediating role of perceived mother acceptance and the moderating role of emotional stability. *J Interpers Violence* 2022; 37(11-12): NP9591-612.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260520983905> PMID: 33371780
- [27] Xie X, Tang X, Wu S, Shen X. Mechanisms of maternal and paternal phubbing on adolescents' self-control: The attenuating effect of having a sibling. *Mob Media Commun* 2024; 12(1): 3-22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20501579231158225>
- [28] Ergün N, Göksu İ, Sakız H. Effects of phubbing: Relationships with psychodemographic variables. *Psychol Rep* 2020; 123(5): 1578-613.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033294119889581> PMID: 31752605
- [29] Ackerman RA, Kashy DA, Donnellan MB, Conger RD. Positive-engagement behaviors in observed family interactions: A social relations perspective. *J Fam Psychol* 2011; 25(5): 719-30.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025288> PMID: 21875194
- [30] López-Martínez P, Montero-Montero D, Moreno-Ruiz D, Martínez-Ferrer B. The role of parental communication and emotional intelligence in child-to-parent violence. *Behav Sci* 2019; 9(12): 148.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/bs9120148> PMID: 31835399
- [31] Liu H, Qiu Y, Luo L. Exploring family educational involvement and social skills in Chinese preschoolers: The moderating role of parent-child relationship. *Front Psychol* 2022; 13: 911421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.911421> PMID: 35978768
- [32] Guazzini A, Duradoni M, Capelli A, Meringolo P. An explorative model to assess individuals' phubbing risk. *Future Internet* 2019; 11(1): 21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/fi11010021>
- [33] Liu RD, Wang J, Gu D, *et al.* The effect of parental phubbing on teenager's mobile phone dependency behaviors: The mediation role of subjective norm and dependency intention. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2019; 12: 1059-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S224133> PMID: 31819681
- [34] Reis HT, Collins WA, Berscheid E. The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychol Bull* 2000; 126(6): 844-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.6.844> PMID: 11107879
- [35] Kenny D, Kashy D, Cook W. *The Analysis of Dyadic Data*. New York: The Guilford Press 2006.
- [36] Lv H, Ye W, Chen S, Zhang H, Wang R. The effect of mother phubbing on young children's emotional and behavioral problems: A moderated mediation model of mother-child attachment and parenting stress. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022; 19(24): 16911. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192416911> PMID: 36554791
- [37] Zhang J, Dong C, Jiang Y, Zhang Q, Li H, Li Y. Parental phubbing and child social-emotional adjustment: A meta-analysis of studies conducted in China. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2023; 16: 4267-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S417718> PMID: 37877136
- [38] Xie J, Luo Y, Chen Z. Relationship between partner phubbing and parent-adolescent relationship quality: A family-based study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022; 20(1): 304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20010304> PMID: 36612626
- [39] Stroud CB, Durbin CE, Saigal SD, Knobloch-Fedders LM. Normal and abnormal personality traits are associated with marital satisfaction for both men and women: An actor-partner interdependence model analysis. *J Res Pers* 2010; 44(4): 466-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.05.011>
- [40] Fitzpatrick J, Gareau A, Lafontaine MF, Gaudreau P. How to use the actor-partner interdependence model (APIM) To estimate different dyadic patterns in MPLUS: A step-by-step tutorial. *Quant Methods Psychol* 2016; 12(1): 74-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.12.1.p074>
- [41] Ledermann T, Rudaz M, Wu Q, Cui M. Determine power and sample size for the simple and mediation actor-partner interdependence model. *Fam Relat* 2022; 71(4): 1452-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/fare.12644>
- [42] Hillaker BD, Brophy-Herb HE, Villarruel FA, Haas BE. The contributions of parenting to social competencies and positive values in middle school youth: Positive family communication, maintaining standards, and supportive family relationships. *Fam Relat* 2008; 57(5): 591-601. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00525.x>
- [43] Kenny DA. APIM_MM. Available from: https://davidakenny.shinyapps.io/APIM_MM/ (September 27, 2024).
- [44] Kenny DA. ItoP. Available from: <https://davidakenny.shinyapps.io/ItoP/> (September 27, 2024).
- [45] Kenny DA. ItoD. Available from: <https://davidakenny.shinyapps.io/ItoD/> (September 27, 2024).
- [46] Kenny DA. Dingy. Available from: <https://davidakenny.shinyapps.io/Dingy/> (September 27, 2024).
- [47] Constantin N, Setjadi N. Phubbing, Interpersonal Communication, and Communication Ethics in Society. *Communication Pearl Lens Journal* 2023; 7(2) <http://dx.doi.org/10.51544/jlmk.v7i2.4648>
- [48] Büttner CM, Gloster AT, Greifeneder R. Your phone ruins our lunch: Attitudes, norms, and valuing the interaction predict phone use and phubbing in dyadic social interactions. *Mob Media Commun* 2022; 10(3): 387-405. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20501579211059914>
- [49] Meeus A, Coenen L, Eggermont S, Beullens K. Family technofence: Exploring parent mobile device distraction from children's perspectives. *Mob Media Commun* 2021; 9(3): 584-604. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2050157921991602>
- [50] Al-Saggaf Y, O'Donnell SB. Phubbing: Perceptions, reasons behind, predictors, and impacts. *Hum Behav Emerg Technol* 2019; 1(2): 132-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.137>
- [51] Davey A, Davey S, Raghav S, *et al.* Predictors and consequences of "Phubbing" among adolescents and youth in India: An impact evaluation study. *J Family Community Med* 2018; 25(1): 35-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/jfcm.JFCM_71_17 PMID: 29386960
- [52] Guazzini A, Raimondi T, Biagini B, Bagnoli F, Duradoni M. Phubbing's emotional activations: The association between PANAS and phubbing behavior. *Future Internet* 2021; 13(12): 311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/fi13120311>
- [53] Lai X, Hu C, Ying L, *et al.* Risk and protective factors associated with smartphone addiction and phubbing behavior among college students in China. *Psychol Rep* 2023; 126(5): 2172-90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00332941221084905> PMID: 35412349
- [54] Ang CS, Teo KM, Ong YL, Siak SL. Investigation of a preliminary mixed method of phubbing and social connectedness in adolescents. *Addict Health* 2019; 11(1): 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22122/ahj.v11i1.539> PMID: 31308904
- [55] Bi X, Wang S. Parent-adolescent communication quality and life satisfaction: The mediating roles of autonomy and future orientation. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2021; 14: 1091-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S317389> PMID: 34321937
- [56] Li M, Lan R, Ma P, Gong H. The effect of positive parenting on adolescent life satisfaction: The mediating role of parent-adolescent attachment. *Front Psychol* 2023; 14: 1183546. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1183546> PMID: 37465493
- [57] Trong Dam VA, Do HN, Thi Vu TB, *et al.* Associations between parent-child relationship, self-esteem, and resilience with life satisfaction and mental wellbeing of adolescents. *Front Public Health* 2023; 11: 1012337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1012337> PMID: 36761131
- [58] Batool SS, Lewis CA. Does positive parenting predict pro-social behavior and friendship quality among adolescents? Emotional intelligence as a mediator. *Curr Psychol* 2022; 41(4): 1997-2011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00719-y>
- [59] Ermolaeva MV, Smirnova OV. Characteristics of parental communication as a factor of adolescents' psychological well-being. *PSE* 2020; 25(1): 51-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17759/pse.2020250105>
- [60] Kapetanovic S, Boele S, Skoog T. Parent-adolescent communication and adolescent delinquency: Unraveling within-family processes from between-family differences. *J Youth Adolesc* 2019; 48(9): 1707-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01043-w> PMID: 31161272
- [61] Grossman J, Jenkins L, Richer A. Parents' perspectives on family sexuality communication from middle school to high school. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; 15(1): 107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15010107> PMID: 29320447
- [62] Pasupathi M, Carstensen LL, Levenson RW, Gottman JM. Responsive listening in long-married couples: A psycholinguistic perspective. *J Nonverbal Behav* 1999; 23(2): 173-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021439627043>
- [63] Kaur J, Junnarkar M. Emotional Intelligence and intimacy in relationships. *Int J Indian psychol* 2017; 4(3) <http://dx.doi.org/10.25215/0403.084>
- [64] Yoshikawa K, Kamiya Y. Married couples' perceptions on women's autonomy and subjective well-being in Lao PDR. *Int J Soc Econ* 2019; 46(6): 792-804. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-09-2018-0450>