

Proceedings of the New York State Communication Association

Volume 2012 *Proceedings of the 70th New York State
Communication Association*

Article 10


10-17-2013

The Influence of Technology on Family Dynamics

Alessandra Villegas

Fordham University, avillegas1@fordham.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://docs.rwu.edu/nyscaproceedings>

 Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Media Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Villegas, Alessandra (2013) "The Influence of Technology on Family Dynamics," *Proceedings of the New York State Communication Association*: Vol. 2012, Article 10.

Available at: <http://docs.rwu.edu/nyscaproceedings/vol2012/iss1/10>

This Conference Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Proceedings of the New York State Communication Association by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact mwu@rwu.edu.

The Influence of Technology on Family Dynamics

Alessandra Villegas
Fordham University

A powerful tool, that contemporary society uses not only to entertain but also to communicate and educate, there is an ever-present availability to media access. However, there is an ongoing debate over whether or not the power of this influence and its ubiquitous availability yields positive or negative consequences in different aspects of our lives. One area of concern, in particular, is the dynamics of the American family. With the rapid progression of technological advances it is difficult to observe the influence that these devices are having on the ways in which a family interacts. There is research to support both sides of the argument that media is hindering our family relations or conversely, that it is fostering it. I analyze how this constant immersion in the "media bubble" affects the foundation of a family. To examine the possible influence of media on family relationships, I looked at the effects of computers, the Internet, mobile media, and television on the way a family interacts. It was apparent that media does affect the way a family unit socializes and, as a result, their relationships. Ultimately, the results demonstrated that media, without a doubt, cannot be tucked into a precise group of positive or negative since different media devices serve diverse purposes within family life as well as within individual families.

Introduction

"... [O]ur nation is moving toward full digital inclusion. The number of Americans who are using electronic tools in every aspect of their lives is rapidly increasing," wrote the U.S. Department of Commerce in 2000, reflecting on the results of their report (p. iii). In this report on Americans' Access to Technology Tools, the U.S. Department of Commerce measured and analyzed how Americans were using technological tools and how it might be affecting the Nation. Most of us do not need the results of a nationwide report to recognize that media have become an indispensable component and major influence in our everyday lives. A powerful tool, that contemporary society uses not only to entertain but also to communicate and educate, there is an ever-present availability to media access. However, there is an ongoing debate over whether or not the power of this influence and its ubiquitous availability yields positive or negative consequences in different aspects of our lives.

One area of concern, in particular, is the dynamics of the American family. When I speak of family throughout this paper, I am referring to the structure of a nuclear family. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a nuclear family as: “the basic family group consisting typically of father, mother, and their dependent children, regarded as a social unit.” I mirror the observations of sociologists Zinn and Eitzen when they refer to the family as “a haven, a place of intimacy, love and trust” (Zinn & Eitzen, 2002, p. 7). For purposes of this paper, this is the image of the family that I am referring to. As such, “the family is an agent of socialization and the primary source of influence behind the formation of personality and the growth of a child” (Macionis, 2011, p. 112).

In 2010, more than 77% of all American households had a computer, and 71% had home Internet access service (National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 2011, p. vi-5). The computer is just one of the countless devices that are present in American homes today. With the rapid progression of technological advances, it is difficult to observe the influence that these devices are having on the ways in which a family interacts. There is research to support both sides of the argument that media is hindering our family relations or conversely, that it is fostering it. As some critics point out, “there are those who see computers and the Internet as a positive force that will foster greater communication and better access to education, promote global understanding, and make the world a better place to live” (Rheingold, 1993; Hughes & Hans, 2001, p. 776). Others critics disagree saying, “that computer technology will promote impoverished relationships, isolation of people within families, and distancing between families and the outside world” (Stoll, 1995; Hughes & Hans, 2001, p. 777).

I am interested in analyzing how this constant immersion in the “media bubble” affects the foundation of a family. Following the research of Hughes and Hans (2001) on the effects of computers and the Internet on families, I am broadening this research to include mobile media and television, to examine the possible influence of media on family relationships. I begin with an overview of children’s interaction with specific technologies—mobile media, television and online media—including the time spent with each medium. A brief examination of how parents use media and their views on media in the home environment will follow. I look at the importance of media during mealtime and family television viewing and the possible effects on socializing as a result. Throughout the paper, I am guided by the following questions regarding the influence of technology on the family as a social unit: Is the context of the family threatened as a result of the media-saturated environment? Has the increase in technology in recent years led to a change in the way family members interact with one another? If so, to what degree is the use of these devices fostering or hindering family communication

and socialization? Overall, are media shaping the way the family interacts or is it family interactions that shape the way media is used?

Overview of Children's Interaction with Media

8- to 18-year-olds spend an average of 7 ½ hours a day, seven days a week with media (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 1). This is not surprising since almost all of our day-to-day activities involve using some form of media. Whether we are texting on our cell phones, chatting over Facebook, or watching our favorite TV shows, we are continuously interacting with media. This goes for children as well, if not more so. As the authors of the *Generation M²* study point out, “a key reason young people spend more time consuming media these days is that there are ever-expanding opportunities for them to do so – more TVs and computers in their homes, bedrooms and cars, and more media-ready cell phones and iPods in their pockets” (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 9). Media plays an integral role in the lives of children and, consequently, in family life; one might even say that media is a necessity in the culture we live in. The amount of time that both children and adults spend using media devices is an indicator of the role that media plays in family life.

Mobile Media:

66% of all 8- to 18-year-olds own their own cell phone, making the image of a teenager with a cell phone in hand almost “iconic” in our society (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 18). On average, 8- to 18-year-olds spend 33 minutes talking on a cell phone, and about an hour and a half sending and receiving text messages daily (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 18). This is just the time spent using the basic functions of a cell phone, which is rarely the case. It does not include the countless other abilities modern mobile devices provide, including listening to music, playing games, or surfing the Internet. The development of mobile media has provided endless opportunities for the use of media in any place or at any time, making it that much easier for children to spend time consuming media (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 18).

Television:

With the proliferation of new ways to consume TV content, this medium continues to be the leading choice for young people to spend their time with, averaging a total of four and a half hours a day (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, pp. 11-15). It is interesting that despite the development of numerous new media technologies, television consumption continues to be the favorite media activity and the medium they spend the most time with (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, pp. 11-15). With all of the possibilities that go along with the computer and the Internet, why would the TV dominate their media diets? It could have something

to do with the number of TVs in the home or the consumption habits of their parents.

The number of TVs in the home has increased over the past ten years, with 71% of 8- to 18-year-olds containing TVs in their bedrooms (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 16). In a study in which researchers were exploring how to reduce children's TV time, they found that 98% of families had a television in their living room, 63% had a television in a child's room, and 46% had a television in an eating space (Jordan, Hersey, McDivitt, Heitzler, 2006, p. e1304). That almost amounts to a television in every room of the house. It is clear that the number of TVs in a household and where the TVs are located could have potential for significantly impacting the media use of a family and possibly shaping the ways in which they socialize.

Another possible contributing factor to the popularity of television among young people is the consumption habits of their parents. Just under half of all 8- to 18-year-olds say they live in a home where the television is left on most of the time and 64% say the TV is usually on during meals (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 35). The *Generation M²* study recognizes that:

Parents make numerous decisions about their children's media environment: how many TVs, computers and video games they buy for the home; whether their kids have cell phones and iPods; whether there are TVs and video game players in their children's bedrooms; whether the TV is usually on during meals or as daily background; and whether they establish any rules about their children's media use. All of these decisions, put together, create a media environment for young people. (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 35)

It is feasible to propose that a key component of children's media practices could be observed and mimicked by the media habits and the example their parents set.

By pointing out these features I am not implying that they are neither good nor bad, they are simply observations about how the family interacts around this specific medium. Television viewing could have the potential for being both an independent and asocial activity or, on the contrary, a communal act. The question then becomes, what factors influence whether TV viewing is an independent or communal activity?

Online Media

Hughes and Hans (2001) found that families with children are more likely to have computers and Internet access than those without children. This is a sound finding

considering that the computer is a major attraction for young people and there are several aspects that could contribute to the amount of time they spend with this medium. On average, the amount of time 8- to 18-year-olds spend using the computer daily is about an hour and a half, excluding school work (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 3). The proliferation of what is available on the Internet, such as television content, social networks, gaming sites and YouTube, all add to the appeal of computers and, when coupled with the increasing access to them, contribute to the amount of time they spend online (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 3). In the *Generation M²* study, they established that 64% of 8- to 18-year-olds use the computer for entertainment purposes with the three most popular activities being social networking sites, computer games, and watching videos (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010, p. 20).

Similar to television, computers and the Internet also have potential for promoting independence and singularity or being used as a means of socializing and connecting. One could argue that although Facebook is considered “entertainment” it is also a means of social and communal activity. For example, if an individual’s parent or sibling was on a business trip or studying abroad, they would still be able to sustain that relationship through the social networking site via comments, pictures and instant messages.

Overall, what this information indicates is that children and adolescents spend a considerable amount of time each day interacting with mobile devices, television and online media due to the development of new ways to consume and access this media. There are also a number of different motivations for why children use each medium, such as communication and entertainment. In the process of analyzing each medium’s functions, it was observed that the medium could often have two outcomes: to serve as a device for independent, singular activities or as a socializing, communal mechanism. This finding requires us to take into consideration not only the use of a medium but also how it is being used and what it is being used for. However, this minor information only helps us to understand the beginning of how these devices shape the relationships and interactions within the household and what affect they have on the family dynamics. In order to further understand these questions, I look into the ways parents use media.

Media in the Home:

How Parents Use Media:

“Oh, it’s just a phenomenal babysitter. If everybody in the house needs to be doing things, it’s just fabulous,” comments one mother, demonstrating just one of the many functions media serves within the home environment (Strasburger, Wilson, Jordan, 2009, p. 499). There has been an emphasis on how children use

media, but little discussion of the ways in which media are employed by parents. Though it might be a difficult idea to grasp, parents are just people too and, like the rest of society, media are a fundamental component in their day-to-day lives. Technology may have a slightly different role in the lives of parents though, as a resource they can draw on to fulfill certain responsibilities that come along with parenthood. In a study focused on reducing children's television viewing, the authors point out some of the key ways parents employ media in the home as a safe and affordable distraction or as a habit of their heavy television viewing patterns (Jordan, Hersey, McDivitt, Heitzler, 2006, p. e1303). One of the primary findings in another presentation was how, "parents believe that media are important elements to keeping the family close and the system running smoothly" (Jordan, 2006, p. 20). The ways that parents use media may have a substantial effect on the structure and dynamics of the family, as well as an influence on the relationship with their children.

A concern expressed by many, is the notion that parents are using media as a "babysitter." If you have gone out to eat at a restaurant in the past couple of years, the chances are pretty high that you have witnessed a parent handing over an iPhone to the toddler having a tantrum in the middle of dinner. As the example above demonstrates, it is becoming an increasingly common practice for parents to use media to babysit their children. With all of the resources available at their fingertips, why would parents not take advantage of this technology? There have been countless reports and articles in the mainstream media disputing the notion of parents using media devices such as, televisions, iPhones and iPads, as their babysitters. There is research dating as far back as the 1960s examining parents' use of the television as a distraction for children. Hess and Goldman report that according to mothers with young children, babysitting is one of the most important functions of television (1962, pp. 411-426). Another study concluded that household chores were the primary motivation mothers used television as a babysitter (Gantz, 1982, p. 1). On average, mothers claim to use the television as a babysitter for at least one hour a day (Gantz & Masland, 1987).

While a majority of these studies focus on the risks that are associated with extended periods of unsupervised television viewing or interacting with media, I am concerned with the amount of time they are *not* spending engaged with family members and how this is affecting their relationships and means of communication. Gadberry's study found results that imply the use of the television medium may affect parental socialization practices, given that television viewing reduces the need for parental interaction or involvement with children (1974). This assessment places the responsibility on parents to be actively concerned with their children's media exchanges and initiate conversation with them. Another study reported that consequences, as a result of

using television as a babysitter, may be determined by how parents follow up on television viewing (Gantz & Masland, 1987, p. 530-536).

The main discovery this information provides is that if parents are going to use media devices to “babysit” or distract their children, it is important for them to follow up this media interaction by engaging in conversation with their kids. The unintended effects could be damaging to the manner in which they communicate with their children and hinder the development of their family relationships.

Family Interactions with Media:

Media at Mealtime:

Eating together at mealtime provides opportunities for the family to communicate with one another. In sharing stories, ideas, thoughts and feelings strong and meaningful relationships are formed. Eating together as a family has several critical benefits for a child’s development including: physical, social, emotional, academic, behavioral and for overall development of family connections (Bowen, 1998). Current research suggests that there are many aspects of family mealtimes that are correlated to children's health and wellbeing (Fiese, Foley & Spagnola, 2006). Doherty says it is a place where a family can establish traditions, share experiences and feelings (1999). One study’s conclusions suggested that family meals may be a useful mechanism for enhancing family togetherness (Fulkerson, Neumark-Sztainer & Story, 2006). Satter points out some of the major advantages of family meals, identifying that one benefit of eating meals together is the effect on strengthening family bonds; another is family meals provide a daily time for the whole family to be together; and ultimately for younger children, having routine family meals can provide a sense of security and a feeling of belonging in the family (1987). The conclusions of another study state that, “previous research has supported the link between coherent accounts of family events and trustworthiness of relationships” (Fiese, Foley & Spagnola, 2006, p. 67). It is clear from much discourse on the topic, that mealtime is a critical aspect of family life and for the development of a strong family foundation.

Rideout, Foehr and Roberts found that many young people, 64% of all 8- to 18-year-olds, live in homes where the TV is usually on during meals (2010, p. 17). Fiese, Schwartz and the Society for Research in Child Development examine the role of family interaction and the effects of having the television on during mealtimes (2008, p. 1). Their findings conclude that watching TV at mealtime is a distraction and makes it difficult for family members to engage in conversation, therefore resulting in the prevention of important family connections that are made at mealtime (Fiese, Schwartz & Society for Research in Child, 2008, pp. 7-8). Another study on the topic suggests, “Similar to TV, all of the gadgets and

gizmos we have these days can be a distraction from what really matters at mealtime. Leaving these things in another room will allow the whole family to participate in mealtime conversation and receive the benefits of a meaningful family meal” (Scoville, p. 2; The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 2009).

There is no doubt that family mealtime is essential for forming strong family connections, bonds and relationships, ultimately creating a healthy family unit. It is a time for both parents and children to share with one another and impacts important aspects of child development. Having the TV on during the meal or the presence of any other media devices at the table is a distraction for everyone and hinders effective communication between family members. With all of the vital benefits that result from families sharing a meal together, having media present during this ritual could be a detrimental effect on the development of a family system.

Family Television Viewing:

A typical family spends a great deal of time around a television set, for which it is important to examine the potential effects it could be having on socialization. The average time spent viewing TV in 2009 was 4.5 hours (Nielsen Media Research, 2009). There has been a great deal of discourse surrounding the numerous functions the television can serve, social functions in particular, in the context of family life. Lull proposes that, “the social environment in the family home is a major contributor to differential uses of the medium by individuals” (1980, p. 1). In other words, the way the television is used in the home depends on the dynamics of the family. This is an interesting take on the matter given that most studies examine the influence of the medium on the family, not the other way around.

Several studies examine whether family television viewing is a solitary activity or conversely a shared and communal activity. Television has become so entrenched in modern families’ day-to-day routines that there has to be some kind of impact, right? If this is the case, is it strengthening or damaging family relationships? Is it bringing the family together or sending them their separate ways? Some studies have argued that television reinforces sociability and social bonds (Beniger, 1987). However, others have research indicating that television watching reduces social involvement (Brody, 1990).

A study done by Saxbe, Graesch and Alvik, observed that television was most frequently watched in common areas of the home with both parents and at least one child, with the exception of those children who had TVs in their bedroom, in which case they were more likely to watch TV alone and in non-common areas

(2011). The families involved in this study did demonstrate that children's and parent's television viewing were different; parents regarded TV viewing as a family activity while children were more likely to watch TV alone in their rooms, indicating that parents engage with TV as a social activity whereas children are more likely to regard it as a solitary activity (Saxbe, Graesch & Alvik, 2011). This is an interesting observation taking into consideration that in the previous section I discussed the ways in which parents employ media, in many cases TV, as a form of distraction for their children. Could a child's inclination to use television as an independent activity be an unintended consequence of their parent's decision to use media as a babysitter?

The outcome of this study found that television appeared to fulfill a social function and provide a platform for family togetherness (Saxbe, Graesch & Alvik, 2011). Despite not regarding TV viewing to be socially isolating, it was implied that the quality of interactions were affected by the medium (Saxbe, Graesch & Alvik, 2011).

Another study found similar results, suggesting that families who enjoy spending time together will be more inclined to watch television together, in which case the time they spend watching TV together may reinforce and enhance family solidarity (Kubey, 1990). This appears to be a sound argument, where the act of watching television is a way that the family chooses to spend their time together as a form of shared social interaction. In this case it is hard to dispute the claim that the medium itself is supporting family relationships and having a positive impact on the context of the family insofar that is being used as a social agent. However, it is important to recognize that prior to using television viewing as a family activity, the family had previously enjoyed spending time together and suggested a close familial relationship.

Despite finding TV viewing to be a more passive family experience, Kubey reported that individuals who watched more television spent more time with their families (1990). Other critics disagree pointing out that the quality of social interaction among TV viewers is low even though in most cases TV watching takes place among others (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, Scherlis, 1998).

Television viewing as a family can be regarded as a communal activity with the potential of enhancing family relationships in cases where the family is already considered a close unit. The experience can also play a role in bringing the family together and positively influencing the time family members spend with each other. However, it is noted across various studies that the qualities of the interactions initiated by television watching are affected by the medium. Though

it may be regarded as a minor one, family television viewing does fulfill a social function and to a certain extent promote interaction.

The Effects of Media on Family Socialization:

Media can be used in a variety of different ways and for many purposes – entertainment, communication and, as we discovered in the preceding section, social interaction. A vast majority of individuals use media devices as a means of communicating or connecting with others. As I have pointed out before, it is important to recognize how and what media is used for, as it can be an important resource for upholding family relationships and a platform for socialization with physically distant family members. Throughout the process of examining each medium and the role it plays within the context of family life, it has been observed that many technologies, specifically the computer and Internet, can create a paradox. The medium may, in fact, be a social device used to connect and communicate but is also linked with hindering social involvement with those in close physical proximity.

In the Home:

In a study of the psychological and social impact of the Internet on involvement and well being, although the Internet was used primarily for communication, a relationship was found between greater use of the Internet and declines in communication between family members within the household (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, Scherlis, 1998). The results of this study have evidence to suggest that computers linked to the Internet result in the reduction of family communication and face-to-face social interaction (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, Scherlis, 1998). Similar to these conclusions, another study found that children were generally independent in their use of the computer and little social conversation was reported between them and their parents (Orleans & Laney, 2000). In *Silicon Snake Oil: Second Thoughts on the Information Highway* it is noted that some analysts have argued that the Internet socially isolates people and cuts off genuine social relationships (Stoll, 1995). These beliefs about the computer and the Internet as alienating devices have been explored and openly disputed on a number of occasions as the medium, and its ubiquitous accessibility, has dramatically expanded.

The opposing views of several critics are just as certain that the Internet can be a source of support for family relationships. In their research, Orleans and Laney did not find that computer use resulted in individual isolation or social decay (2000). Mickelson believes that the Internet can foster relationships between

family members and social networks through online support groups dealing with family-related issues, among them divorce (1997). Others advise families to structure more family activities around computers given they can promote family interaction (Kraut, Sherlis, Mukhopadhyay, Manning, & Kiesler, 1996). Hughes and Hans found that several family life educators and therapists have begun to explore ways the Internet can be employed for helping families (2001).

This information does not prove that computers and the Internet, or any other medium, *directly* affects family relationships within the home, in a positive or negative way. There may be a strong correlation but there is no causation. It does however make one wonder: if studies done in 1998, where technology and devices do not compare with those of our modern world, found that the Internet was distracting people from spending time with their families, what effects are new media devices, with all of their bells and whistles, having on our family relationships now?

Outside of the Home:

In their report in 2000 analyzing the way Americans were using technological tools, the U.S. Department of Commerce found that among home Internet users, 96.6% of women and 93.6% of men reported using the Internet to communicate with friends and family (2000). This is not surprising since communication is one of the greatest attributes of media. In another report, interviews revealed that many participants kept up with physically distant parents or siblings, and were able to correspond with children when they went off to college (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, Scherlis, 1998). This affirms that media can have a positive effect on family relationships outside of the home, providing the platform to uphold the fabric of family bonds. However, their research concludes with observations that acknowledge, “The Internet is a social technology used for communication with individuals and groups, but it is associated with declines in social involvement and the psychological well-being that goes with social involvement” (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, Scherlis, 1998, p. 1029).

Others predict that the Internet will create better social relationships due to the lack of constraints on place and time (Katz & Aspden, 1997). In a survey performed by Katz and Aspden, results indicate that the vast majority of users reported that time spent with family members in face-to-face contact had not changed since they started using the Internet (1997). Furthermore, they have data to suggest that the Internet is becoming a medium that facilitates contact with family members (Katz & Aspden, 1997).

It is apparent that media does, in fact, have an effect on the way a family system socializes and in turn their relationships. However, this effect can neither be deemed as positive or negative. There are features that allow for a medium to foster familial bonds and relationships by creating the perpetual ability for people to connect, shattering the constraints of place and time. On the contrary, media also impacts in person family contact, hindering face-to-face interactions and social involvement. Although, there is research that suggests otherwise, claiming there is no effect on in-person contact. These findings illustrate that media, without a doubt, cannot be tucked into a definitive category of good or bad.

Conclusions:

With the development of new technologies things will always be lost while simultaneously new things are gained. “Our media-saturated social worlds influence family relationships and dynamics. Traditional evenings spent together eating around the family table and telling stories are now long gone,” wrote Elisa Pigeron, in her investigation of family socialization strategies and children’s media involvement (2009, p. 56). She is correct in her claim that the media we interact with on a daily basis does influence family relationships and dynamics. But, as Hughes and Hans point out, “we have limited evidence about the ways in which these communication technologies are altering family relationships” (2001, p. 790).

In this analysis it was observed that a medium could often have two outcomes: to serve as a device for independent activities or as a mechanism for socializing and communication. This finding asks us to take into consideration not only the use of a medium but also how it is being used and what it is being used for. The importance of parents following up their child’s unsupervised media interaction by engaging in conversation with them was also revealed. It was noted that the unintended effects could be damaging to the manner in which parents communicate with their children and possibly hinder the development of their family relationships.

Another negative finding was that media present during the ritual of family mealtime could have detrimental effects on the development of a family system. There are key benefits that result from families sharing a meal together, along with important aspects of child development, and with media devices present it distracts family members from engaging in healthy conversations that ultimately form strong relationships. It was discovered that communal television viewing as a family is regarded as fulfilling a social function, therefore having a positive impact on family development. The experience has potential for bringing the

family together and positively influencing the time a family spends with each other, despite the poor quality of interactions between family members.

It was apparent that media does affect the way a family unit socializes and, as a result, their relationships. Without boundaries of time and place, features of technological devices allow individuals to foster familial bonds and relationships by creating the perpetual ability to connect with others. While this is one of the best aspects of media, it also has potential for negatively impacting in person family contact, hindering face-to-face interactions and social involvement. Overall, the results demonstrated that media, without a doubt, cannot be tucked into a precise group of positive or negative since different media devices serve diverse purposes within family life as well as within individual families.

As a result of my findings, the following questions have emerged: Will the dynamics of a family change and evolve with the growth of technology? What will be lost and gained in terms of family dynamics as result of technological developments?

There may in fact be no way of answering these questions because people do not just react to technology, they actively shape its uses and influence (Fischer, 1992). Hughes and Hans conclude their study by stating that, “we are unlikely in the short run to understand the implications of new technologies and that these changes deserve study and analysis” (2001, p. 790). Following the reasoning of Hughes and Hans, I believe with the rapid evolution of media technologies it is necessary to constantly evaluate and examine these devices and their connotations.

Life is a series of cycles that are continuously changing; the moon, the seasons and stages of life all have cycles. Similarly, media has cycles where things are perpetually being created, developed, and then sometimes left behind, changing the fabric of society and the ways in which we live. What has been revealed is that change does not always have to be taken as solely good or bad, but instead, has the ability to open new doors, bring about new discoveries and create opportunities that no one could have ever imagined. Sometimes these changes are for the better and sometimes they are for the worse; but the thing about change, is you cannot stop it. It is impossible to predict what the future holds when it comes to technology and its effects on the way we live, but seeing as it is inevitable, we might as well embrace what the cycles of technology have to offer us.

References

Beniger, J. R. (1987). Personalization of mass media and the growth of pseudo-community. *Communication Research*, 14, 352–371.

- Bowen, E. (1998). Keep it fun! Keep it simple! Just keep it! *Family Mealtime*, WLG 129. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Extension Service. Retrieved from <http://www.wvu.edu>.
- Brody, G. H. (1990, April). Effects of television viewing on family interactions: An observational study. *Family Relations*, 29, 216–220.
- Doherty, W. J. (1999). *The intentional family: Simple rituals to strengthen family ties*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Fiese, B. H., Foley, K. P., & Spagnola, M. (2006). Routine and ritual elements in family mealtimes: Contexts for child well-being and family identity. *New Directions For Child & Adolescent Development*, 2006(111), 67-89. doi: 10.1002/cad.155.
- Fiese, B. H., Schwartz, M., & Society for Research in Child, D. (2008). Reclaiming the family table: Mealtimes and child health and wellbeing. *Social Policy Report* 22(4). Ann Arbor, MI: Society For Research In Child Development.
- Fischer, C. S. (1992). *America calling: A social history of the telephone to 1940*. Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Fulkerson, J., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Story, M. (2006). Adolescent and parent views of family meals. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 106(4), 526-532.
- Gadberry, S. (1974). Television as baby-sitter: A field comparison of preschoolers' behavior during playtime and during television viewing. *Child Development*, 45(4), 1132-1136. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.ep12117078.
- Gantz, W. (1982). Television the surrogate parent: Uses and correlates of television as babysitter.
- Gantz, W., & Masland, J. (1986). Television as babysitter. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63(3), 530-36.
- Hess, R. D., & Goldman, H. (1962). Parents' views of the effect of television on their children. *Child Development*, 33(2), 411-426. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1126454>
- Hughes, R., & Hans, J. D. (2001). Computers, the Internet, and families - A review of the role new technology plays in family life. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(6), 776-790.

- Jordan, A. B. (2006). Family context and children's media use. *National Institute of Child Health & Human Development*. Retrieved from http://www.nichd.nih.gov/about/meetings/2006/electronicmediaconf/jordan_abstract.cfm
- Jordan, A., Hersey, J., McDivitt, J., & Heitzler, C. (2006). Reducing children's television viewing time: a qualitative study of parents and their children. *Pediatrics*, *118*(5), e1303 e1310.
- Katz, J. E., & Aspden, P. (1997). A nation of strangers? *Communications Of The ACM*, *40*(12), 81-86.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, *53*(9), 1017-1031.
- Kraut, R., Scherlis, W., Mukhopadhyay, T., Manning, J., & Kiesler, S. (1996). The HomeNet field trial of residential Internet services. *Communications Of The ACM*, *39*(12), 55-63.
- Kubey, R. (1990). Television and the quality of family life. *Communication Quarterly*, *38*(4), 312-324.
- Lull, J. (1980). Family communication patterns and the social uses of television. *Communication Research*, *7*(3), 319.
- Lyttle, J., & Baugh, E. (2008). *The importance of family dinners*. Gainesville, FL: Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida. FY1054. Retrieved from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/fy1054>.
- Macionis, J. (2011). *Sociology (Canadian)* (7th ed.). Toronto, Canada: Pearson Education. Retrieved from <http://www.textbooks.com>.
- Mickelson, K. D. (1997). Seeking social support: Parents in electronic support groups. In S. Kiesler, S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Culture of the Internet* (pp. 157-178). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (2011). *Exploring the digital nation: Computer and Internet use at home* [Online]. Retrieved from http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring_the_digital_nation_computer_and_Internet_use_at_home_11092011.pdf

- Nielsen Media Research. (2009). Three screen report: Television, Internet and mobile usage in the U.S.: Nielsen's three screen report. Retrieved from <http://www.nielsonmedia.com>
- Orleans, M., & Laney, M. (2000). Children's computer use in the home : Isolation or sociation? *Social Science Computer Review*, 18(1), 56-72.
- Nuclear family. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary online dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com>.
- Pigeron, E. (2009). "*Here's the deal*": *Socialization into morality through negotiations of media time use*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Marriott, Chicago, IL, 1-37.
- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Rideout, V. (2007). *Parents, children & media*. Menlo Park, CA: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.kff.org/entmedia/upload/7638.pdf>
- Rideout, V., Foehr, U., & Roberts, D. (2010). *Generation M2: Media in the lives of 8- to 18-year-olds: A Kaiser Family Foundation study*. Menlo Park, CA: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.kff.org/entmedia/upload/8010.pdf>
- Satter, E. (1987). *How to get your kid to eat: But not too much*. Berkeley, CA: Bull Publishing Company.
- Saxbe, D., Graesch, A., & Alvik, M. (2011). Television as a social or solo activity: Understanding families' everyday television viewing patterns. *Communication Research Reports*, 28(2), 180-189. doi: 10.1080/08824096.2011.566104.
- Stoll, C. (1995). *Silicon snake oil: Second thoughts on the information highway*. New York: Doubleday.
- The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) (2009, Sept.). *The importance of family dinners V*. Retrieved from <http://www.casacolumbia.org/download.aspx?path=/UploadedFiles/ufymohw3.pdf>
- The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) (2011, Sept.). *The importance of family dinners VII*. Retrieved from <http://>

www.casacolumbia.org/download.aspx?path=/UploadedFiles/b25fhksc.pdf

U.S. Department of Commerce. (2000). *Falling through the net: Toward digital inclusion* [Online]. Retrieved from <http://search.ntia.doc.gov/pdf/ftn00.pdf>

Zinn, M., & Eitzen, D. (2002). *Diversity in families* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.