# INFORMATION PRACTICES RELATIVE TO PARENTAL MEDIATION AND THE FAMILY CONTEXT AMONG PUERTO RICAN AND DOMINICAN TEENS

BY

STEFANI E. GOMEZ

A dissertation submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Communication, Information and Library Studies

Written under the direction of

Marie L. Radford

And approved by

_____

_____

_____

_____

New Brunswick, New Jersey

October, 2017

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Information Practices Relative to Parental Mediation and the Family Context Among Puerto Rican and Dominican Teens

By STEFANI E. GOMEZ

Dissertation Director:
Marie L. Radford

The influx of information communication technologies (ICTs) into the modern family household can create tension between teens' right to access and autonomy and parents' right to mediate their ICT activities that needs to be accommodated within the everyday routines of the family. As a part of their everyday lives teens' must negotiate the sometimes-opposing motivations of their parents, the everyday family routine, and an increasing number of digital devices and information technologies. Though there has been a great deal of research into the methods parents use to mediate and monitor their children's technology use (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008; Clark, 2011), there has been very little investigation into the ways that teens negotiate their parents' practices or how their ICT interactions are related to their family. This dissertation explored these issues through an in-depth look at the families of eight 14-16-year-old Puerto Rican and Dominican teenagers living in the US. To do this it utilized a mixed-methods approach that included surveys, semi-structured in-home family interviews, a teen mapping

activity, and individual interviews with both teenagers and their parent(s) for each family. The resulting data was coded and analyzed according to the constant comparative method and typologies were developed of parental and teen practices. The findings provide a holistic understanding of teens' everyday information practices within the family context. The narratives that parents and teens expressed throughout the interviews situated their practices within their personal contexts and their understanding of reality and seemed to be linked with the combinations of practices they described, as well as the dynamic between them. Overall, the teens generally described abiding by parents' rules and respecting their authority. They did not see their parents' mediation as outside of their parental rights and they attempted to use ICTs within the structure of what they believed their parents considered appropriate and would maintain the balance of their relationship. At the same time, teens described negotiating these constraints in ways that enabled them to pursue their own interests and meet many of the ICT expectations of their peer and academic worlds. The creativity they brought to this task appeared to influence the extension of their personal information ecologies, and consequently their ability to negotiate for their own needs and their access to ICT resources.

**Acknowledgements**

I have been on the other side of this mountain for so long it is hard to believe that I have reached this side, but now that I am I would like to express my gratitude to all of the people that helped me get here. First, I would like to thank my Advisor Dr. Marie L. Radford. I am deeply grateful for your thoughtfulness and encouragement over the years. You made this possible with your guidance, reassurance, and review of what must have seemed like an endless number of drafts.

I would also like to thank my committee members. Dr. Ross J. Todd, your knowledgeable suggestions and your decision to fund me for this last year have made such a difference to my project and to my family. Dr. Denise E. Agosto, your feedback has improved this work and will help me further develop it. Dr. Vikki S. Katz, my work with you sparked my love for interviewing and fostered my interest in families. During a conversation, early on in the dissertation process, you told me that if I managed to do this while my daughters were still young, they would grow up knowing that they could do anything. I have held onto that for the last year and it has helped me focus and persevere.

Thank you to Dr. Marija Dalbello, Dr. Daniel O'Connor, and Dr. Sonja Thomas for encouraging me to pursue a PhD and to the ALA Spectrum fellowship that provided me with generous funding that supported my work for many years.

Thank you to my wonderful friends, Abby and Mylinh, for all these years of friendship and the countless hours of thoughtful conversations. Thank you to my

beautiful and talented sisters, Jennifer and Meggan. Knowing you will always be there makes everything a little bit easier.

Thank you to my mom and dad, Karen and Humberto. Your extra help in those last few weeks, picking up the girls after school, taking them on camping weekends, was crucial. I am grateful that during my childhood you encouraged me to read anything I could get my hands on, but also taught me I could not believe everything I read.

I am deeply appreciative of everything my husband, Rami, has done to make this dissertation possible; the years of support and encouragement and the extra weekend, evening, and bedtime shifts that he took on so willingly with the girls. Thank you, Rami, you are a wonderful father and partner and this accomplishment is as much yours as it is mine. I am also very grateful to his parents, Amale and Marwan, for raising such a generous, patient, and warm son. Amale, also, thank you so much for all the extra household chores you took care of this summer to allow me to focus on my work.

Thank you to my daughters, Frida and Zoya, who were so patient about all the hours I couldn't spend with them over the last year. Your precocious curiosity and generosity of spirit inspire me every day.

Finally, I must express my deep gratitude to the teenagers and families that participated in this project for allowing me into their homes and trusting with me their stories.

**Table of Contents**

## List of Tables

## Chapter 1 : Problem Statement

This dissertation examined the dynamic between parents' mediation practices and 14 to 16 year-old teens' ICT practices in Puerto Rican and Dominican families and explored how this dynamic is embedded in their particular family's technological culture and the broader culture in which they are situated. Havighurst (1972) identified the development of stable relationships with peers, independence from parents, and a personal value system as some of the main developmental tasks of adolescence. Though adolescents' attention is moving from parents to their peers, they still generally live in the family home under the purview of parents' rules, guidelines, and surveillance. While "the home has been considered a private sphere where individuals can regulate their own behavior, this is an adult-centric narrative. For many teens, home is a highly regulated space with rules and norms that are strictly controlled by adults" (boyd, 2007, p.134). Though there has been a great deal of research into the methods parents use to mediate and monitor their children's technology use (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008; Clark, 2011, Yardi & Bruckman, 2011), there has been very little investigation into teens' perspectives of their parents' practices (Mascheroni, 2014) or their response to them.

This is an important area of investigation because the incorporation of information communication technologies (ICTs) into the parent/teen dynamic can make establishing boundaries from parents challenging. ICTs have now been integrated into every aspect of most contemporary youths' lives (Madden, Lenhart, Duggan, Cortesi, & Gasser, 2013) and sharing information has become a mainstay of youth culture (boyd &

Marwick, 2011). Many teens are now calling, Googling, texting, IMing, Tweeting, Facebooking, Youtubing, blogging, Skyping, Instagramming, Snapchatting, music sharing, and gaming (Grinter, Palen, & Eldridge, 2006; Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr, 2010; Lenhart, Duggan, Perrin, Stepler, Rainie, & Parker, 2015; Livingstone & Helsper, 2008) utilizing a variety of devices, such as, mobile phones, smart phones, tablet computers, gaming devices, laptops, and desktop computers (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010). While these ICTs do "create new kinds of opportunities for youth to connect, communicate, and develop their public identities" (Ito, Horst, Bittanti, boyd, Herr-Stephenson, Lange, 2008, p. 10-11) the properties of digital media complicate the nature of privacy (boyd, 2007). Privacy is not so much about withholding information, but about controlling ones' boundaries (Altman, 1975) by managing the information that gets revealed in different contexts (Palen & Dourish, 2003; Petronio, 2002). Teens must reflect on the qualities of digital information, their digital devices, and their environment to negotiate their boundaries with their parents. This entails a complex set of information practices that should be understood.

The dissertation looked specifically at Latino/a teens because they are understudied within LIS and also provide a vantage point for exploring how information practices are embedded within cultural experience. While the literature showed that there were many similarities between Latino/a teens' access and use of technology and their majority-culture counterparts, it also showed important distinctions (Lenhart et al., 2015) that might stem from contextual differences related to their cultural membership and have important implications for their interactions with information.

While research on privacy in relation to teens most often focuses on commercial privacy and keeping teens safe from the risks of the Internet (Marwick, Mugia-Diaz, & Palfrey, 2010), there has recently been a turn to investigations of teens' negotiation of their online social privacy (Vickery, 2015). These researchers have used qualitative methods to explore social privacy from teens' perspectives and have forged an understanding of the practices that teens use to deal with the collapsed contexts of the online space that include structural and social methods of constructing privacy (boyd & Marwick, 2011) and involve strategies, such as strategic information sharing, self-censorship, and social steganography, or in other words, obscuring the meanings of what they post (Marwick & boyd, 2014; Oolo & Siibak, 2013). Within information science (IS) researchers have also found that teens filter the large audience of their social media (SM) "friends" into separate groups and have different customs and habits of communicating with these various groups (Read, Shah, S-O'Brien, & Woolcott, 2012). Teens also have a plethora of reasons why they choose to use different ICTs with different people and groups (Agosto, Abbas, & Naughton, 2012). These studies reveal that teens are aware of the consequences of their information practices on their social contexts and actively take measures with their information and ICTs as a result of this knowledge in order to navigate their social connections and assemble social boundaries. Although much of this research touched on the strategies that teens used in both their communications and their interactions with information to evade their parents' mediation and monitoring, the focus was usually on their practices in general and parents and families were only a marginal concern. Therefore, there was a gap in the

literature concerning how teens respond to parental mediation (PM) and monitoring and how their responsive practices are situated within the structures of their familial context.

To help fill this gap and assemble a holistic picture of how adolescents' ICT practices are embedded within the social context of their families, this study incorporated a sample of eight Latino/a families using a mostly qualitative mixed-methods approach that included surveys, a semi-structured in-home interview with each family as a whole, a household mapping activity with 14 to 16 year-old adolescents, and individual interviews with parents, that helped to mitigate each methods' individual shortcomings (Connaway & Radford, 2017). The research design facilitated the exploration of teen and parental perspectives and how their practices were integrated into the family's everyday culture and routines. The data that was collected initially coded according to a theoretically driven coding scheme developed via findings from a pilot study and the literature review. Because of the nature of the study, the codes were evaluated for their fit with the data in memos throughout the coding process and when needed, adjusted to better fit the data using the Constant Comparative Method (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013; Charmaz, 2014; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Accordingly, the analysis stayed stay open to meanings and practices that become salient in the data.

Though the current study primarily used the term "teen" to refer to youth between the ages of 13-19 that Havighurst (1972) has identified as the adolescent stage

of life development in order to use a term that teens themselves use, this dissertation will use the terms teens, teenagers, adolescents interchangeably. The term "youth" will be used to refer to broader demographic that includes both children, adolescents, and young adults.

Within this study, the strategies that teens used to negotiate their ICT use in the family context were approached from within the everyday life information seeking (ELIS) perspective. ELIS researchers have highlighted the importance of understanding information behavior as it occurs within everyday life (Savolainen, 1995). These researchers promote considering information as a process of construction (as opposed to being a thing that people acquire) (Dervin, 1992), dependent on context (Pettigrew, 1996) and group membership (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000), which can be instigated through random encounters in everyday situations, from any type of media (Williamson, 1998). Informed by this view of information, throughout this dissertation, Savolainen's (2007) term information practices, rather than the more traditional information behaviors, was used to refer to the various activities that teens, their parents, and their families take up with ICTs. Savolainen argued that information practices encompass "activities such as information seeking, searching, and use; in addition, formal and informal communication" (p.124) and can only be understood from within the social structures they are embedded in. Construing information in this way allowed the study to investigate the information, entertainment, and communicative ICT activities whose boundaries are blurred in the modern household environment.

This dissertation contributes to theory development within ELIS through its development of typologies of parental mediation and the ICT practices that were involved in teens' negotiation of their family membership (see Appendix F and G for the full typologies with definitions and examples). These typologies provide a framework for understanding how teens' ICT practices function within the information ecology of the family context. The study builds on work by Agosto and Hughes-Hassel (2006a, 2006b) and has integrated aspects of Chatman's (1991, 1996, 1999, 2000) "small world" theories, Silverstone's (Silverstone, 1991; Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morley, 1992; Silverstone, Morley, Dahlberg, & Livingstone, 1989) work on the domestication of technology and the technological culture of the home, and Nardi and O'Day's (1999) concept of the information ecology. Agosto and Hughes-Hassel's work linking teens' development to their information needs demonstrated that their information needs were integrally related to their developmental stage in life and created an opening for questions about how their need for autonomy from parents and connections with peers (Havighurst, 1972; Petronio, 2002) influence how they interact with information and use ICTs within their family context. Silverstone et al. (1989) conceptualized the family as a "cultural entity," that "occupies its own private space," has an economic system, and "domestic politics," and is essentially a microcosm of society at large (Silverstone et al., 1989, p.7). They argued that the family's mythologies, or the stories that the family tells itself about itself, serve as the backdrop for the family's interactions with technology and help create the social norms about what its members think are appropriate (Silverstone et al., 1989). Silverstone et al. (1992) developed a framework called the

moral economy of the home to explore how families incorporate ICTs into the spaces and routines of the household over time and gain an understanding of how this process is influenced by the family's own meanings, beliefs, and values. Chatman (1996, 1999, 2000), on the other hand, focused on information flows and how individuals' interactions with information were influenced by the worldview and social norms of their group memberships or "small worlds." The individuals in her studies managed and manipulated information to maintain their "small world" membership and to construct boundaries to protect themselves from those they understood to be outsiders. Nardi and O'Day provided a way to understand how "people, practices, values, and technologies" (Nardi & O'Day, p.49) in a locality interact over time to form the routines that make up the domestic information ecologies of teens' family contexts. Integrating characteristics from these theories provided a way of understanding how the physical spaces of the household and the social norms and routines of the family were related to the practices that parents used to mediate and monitor their teenage children's ICT use, and the ways that teens used ICTs to negotiate the flow of information to within the family context in order to maintain their memberships within their family and peer groups.

This study has important implications for the design of literacy curricula and library practices that support the interconnected nature of parent and teen ICT practices. This chapter has introduced the dissertation and presented the problem statement, Chapter 2 will proceed with the literature review and a description of the pilot study's findings and contributions. Next, Chapter 3, will provide an explanation of

the methods and analysis that were used in the study. Chapter 4 is the first of four chapters, Chapters 4-7, presenting the findings from the analysis of the data collection of this dissertation. The findings will then be discussed in Chapter 8, and lastly Chapter 9 will present theoretical discussion, contributions, implications, limitations, and the conclusion.

## Chapter 2 : Literature Review

The literature review considers a broad realm of research that underpins understandings and explorations of teens' boundary negotiations in the family context in relation to ICTs. The complexity of both the technologies themselves, and teens' varied and ubiquitous use of them, made it necessary to weave together research from Library and Information Science (LIS), Human Computer Interaction (HCI), Psychology, Communication, and Cultural and Media Studies to explore teens' ICT Information practices in the family context. The literature review begins by establishing the study's place within everyday life information seeking (ELIS) and discusses the most important theoretical perspectives that inform this dissertation. It then discusses Latino/a teens' ICT practices and issues involved in access, as well as research on teens' information and communicative practices. An overview of what is already known about how teens carve out boundaries online and the shared spaces of the home is provided and the literature review concludes with an examination of research on the parent/teen dynamic involved in teens' privacy, and the methods that parents use to mediate and monitor their teenage children.

### Theoretical Foundation

This study was grounded in the stream of research within LIS dedicated to ELIS. ELIS began as a differentiation from research into work-related information seeking by scholars who wanted to highlight the need to attend to non-work situations (Savolainen,1995). These scholars conceptualized a new way of understanding information and information behaviors that was rooted in how these figured in

individuals' everyday lives (Dervin & Nilan, 1986). In the most popular model of ELIS, Savolainen (1995) utilized Pierre Bourdieu's (1984) concept of *habitus* to discuss how individuals seek out information during the course of their everyday lives. He explained that Bourdieu conceptualized habitus as "a socially and culturally determined system of thinking, perception, and evaluation, internalized by the individual" (p.262-263) and argued that individuals use this system to structure and organize their life so that they are able to maintain their "way of life" and support their "mastery of life." Savolainen maintained that "way of life" referred the various kinds of activities that are a part of the routines of everyday living, while "mastery of life" concerned individuals' ability to keep these routines of life in order and functioning. While Savolainen was most interested in how the individual managed their daily routines, Nardi and O'Day (1999) extend Savolainen's model to examine how small "local environment[s]" maintain normal everyday information routines. They "introduce the concept of the information ecology to focus attention on relationships involving tools and people and their practices" (p.50) and provide a metaphor that researchers can deploy to describe how all of these facets come together in a particular "locality." Jarvelin (2011) applied the concept of an ecology to the individual, calling it the personal information ecology (PIE). He proposed the PIE contains "all the channels, tools, services, documents, or resources that a person can use for information access and organization" (p.20), as well as subjective aspects that shape what individuals understand is available as a resource.

Scholars within ELIS demonstrated that to understand information behavior as it exists within everyday lives it must be understood as a process people undergo to make

sense of their interactions with the world (Dervin, 1992). Researchers used innovative methods to investigate how individual's interactions with information are embedded in their everyday life routines and found that their activities are not always purposeful. Individuals continuously encounter information within their environment, including the people, situations, and mass media they came into contact with, that they had not even been previously aware that they needed (Williamson, 1998). Individual's integration of information was also conceptualized as being dependent on both context and their group membership (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000; Pettigrew, 1996). Work by the above scholars asserting that individuals' information interactions are contextually situated and assembled by individuals during the process of going about their everyday routines, and that their competency in doing this will influence their "mastery of life" (Savolainen, 1995) support the need for an investigation into the types of practices that this might constitute.

Elfreda Chatman's (1996, 1999, 2000) "small world" theories were particularly important to the dissertation. A small world is a "world in which everyday happenings occur with some degree of predictability" (Chatman, 2000, p.3) and stability. In her pioneering work, Chatman integrated theories from sociology and anthropology to look at marginalized populations—elderly women (1991a), university janitors (1991b), and female prisoners (1999)—that had been historically understudied within LIS. These investigations provided her a vantage point to observe that their information behavior was related to their group membership and went far beyond the type of purposeful information seeking that much of LIS research had traditionally investigated and

included active information avoidance and manipulation. She argued that individuals used their information behaviors to support the stability of their small worlds and they determined what information to filter from the “set of socially determined attitudes and norms” (Thompson, 1999, p. 120) within the group. In her later work Chatman developed her theory of normative behavior in order to look more generally at how individuals’ information interaction was influenced by their group membership in their small worlds. Chatman described (Chatman, 2000) “the routine or common events that characterize the everyday reality of people who share a similar cultural space” (p. 10) as normative behavior and theorized that these routines for interacting with information in relation to their group membership were assembled from the group’s worldview, social norms, social types, and information behavior. Social norms are the standards for what is seen as appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Worldview entails a collective idea by the group of what is important and unimportant that helps members orient to reality, information and the group. Social types are the categories of people that are seen as belonging to the group and help members understand their own role within the group. Information behavior involved individuals’ general orientation towards information in the group and referred to "a state in which one may or may not act on the information received" (p. 12) in response to their group membership.

Through Chatman’s (1996) research into the working poor, she also developed a conceptual framework for understanding how small world “insiders” would react to “outsiders,” that consists of deception, risk-taking, secrecy and situational relevance. She found that in this community individuals would be secretive to protect themselves

from "unwanted intrusion" (p. 195) from outsiders and deceptive to present “outsiders” with a picture of reality that was distorted, but presented them as they wanted to be seen. She found that these behaviors were enacted because “insiders” felt that being open with “outsiders” might put them at risk, which she called risk-taking. For this reason, they would also only use new information if it was situationally relevant. This framework hinted at the specific types of strategies that teenagers might use to circumvent their parents’ monitoring and mediation if they felt their “small world” membership in their peer groups to be at risk. Research has shown that teens use differing levels of disclosure to manage the information that their parents find out about them (Cumsille, Darling, & Martinez, 2010; Darling, Cumsille, Caldwell, & Dowdy, 2006; Engels, Finkenauer, & van Kooten, 2006), which supports Chatman’s ideas on the role individuals take in avoiding and manipulating information to present themselves as they wish to be seen in order to sustain their group memberships. However, Chatman’s small world theories are not a perfect fit. Chatman considered the small world to be a closed unit and considerations of teens need to contend with their membership in multiple “small worlds” and how they employ their information practices to protect their membership within all of those groups. Modern teenagers’ worlds are constantly moving and shifting (Marwick & boyd, 2014) and include people from differing offline and online contexts that they are engaged with both in person and online through a host of platforms that are accessed on an assortment of devices. Despite this conceptual limitation other researchers have attempted to use Chatman’s theories to study groups that are steeped in information and whose boundaries are much more

open, such as feminist booksellers and virtual communities (Burnett, Besant, & Chatman, 2001), which suggested that her theories might also be useful with teenagers in relation to their peer groups and families. Both of these groups are centered around social norms that create ICT expectations for teens. Families also often have dense information infrastructures and strong common worldviews. In addition, teens also a very specific "social type" within the family group that influences their position of power and accordingly their ideas of what is appropriate information to integrate and ability to deviate from the family norm.

Agosto and Hughes-Hassell (2006a) built on the foundational ELIS work discussed above to understand how the ELIS of urban, mostly African American, teenagers was connected to their developmental context. They used Havighurst's (1972) developmental model to establish a theoretical model of urban teen development that described seven developmental tasks that are salient to teenagers and guide their interactions with information, including the fostering of the social self, the establishment of an independent emotional self, the nurturing of a reflective self, the adjustment to the physical self, the expression of the creative self, the understanding of the cognitive self, and the recognition and development of the sexual self. They then mapped these tasks onto 28 distinct information needs (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006b) that corresponded with literature involving non-minority teenagers. Agosto and Hughes-Hassell's (2006a, 2006b) work demonstrated the importance of teens' emotional development to the types of information needs they had and argued that "teenagers have similar information needs across socioeconomic, ethnic, cultural, and

geographic boundaries" (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006, p. 1425). However, the extent of topical variation that might be experienced by these urban participants within these broad categories was unclear. For instance, Meyers, et al (2009) discovered that while African American urban tweens had many of the same information needs as their majority culture counterparts they were more likely to discuss needing information on how to cope with bullies, strangers, drug and alcohol users, and unsafe places. Additionally, though Agosto & Hughes-Hassell presented the spectrum of information needs experienced by urban teens and their connection with their development, the authors did not address how these information needs fit into the contextual realities of their lives. This opens up important questions about how teenagers' developmental need for autonomy from their parents and their need to establish a social self will influence how they interact with technology and information and how minority teenagers' practices may be different than non-minority teenagers.

This research drew on the domestication of technology body of theory (Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morley, 1992; Silverstone et al., 1989) in order to conceptualize the information ecology of the family household. Domestication research has explored a range of ICTs that are used in the household (Silverstone et al., 1992), as well as how individual technologies have been incorporated into familial routines. This included the home computer (Lally, 2002, Haddon, 2006; Morrison & Krugman, 2001), television (Silverstone & Haddon, 1996), the Internet (Ward, 2005), and mobile phones (Haddon, 2003; Ling, 2004). Domestication work sets the foundation for this study's premise that each home will have a technological or culture that will structure the roles and the

practices that family members take up around ICTs. Silverstone et al. (1989) proposed that the family technological culture includes "the set of values and activities that define [that] family's systematic relationship to the technologies within its own domestic environment and to those technologies which impinge on that environment" (p. 22). According to Silverstone et al.;

> the media pose a whole set of control problems for the household, problems of regulation and boundary maintenance. These are expressed generally in the broader public through the regular cycle of moral panics around new media or new media content, but on an everyday level, in individual households, they are expressed through decisions to include and exclude media content and to regulate within the household who watches what who listens to and plays with and uses what (p. 20).

Using this framework as a guide the technological culture was understood to provide a foundation for the parent/teen dynamic through the practices parents chose to use to mediate and monitor their teenagers' interactions with ICTs and the information practices teens used to negotiate the family context. Silverstone et al. (1989) argue that family is structured around the patterns of behavior that have become ingrained in the practices and rituals of the family's everyday life. The practices and technology that become incorporated into the routines of the family are grounded in part on the stories that each family tells itself about itself (Silverstone et al.,1989). These family mythologies serve as the backdrop for the family's interactions with technology and create the social norms about what its members think are appropriate for different members, such as that technology is seen as the realm of the males in the household, that teens are seen as knowing more than their parents, or that policing technology is seen as a part of the mother's job. Moreover, they contend that within each family's

story is also a story of how they are different from other families, and these differences can tell us a lot about how culture, ideology, class, race, and ethnicity manifest themselves in the materialities of everyday life (Morely &Silverstone, 1990).

**Latino/a Teens**

Though ELIS researchers highlight the importance of context and culture (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000; Pettigrew, 1996; Williamson, 1998) there is a lack of work exploring Latino/a teens. This is important because research from outside LIS has indicated that Latinos/as often have different ICT usage patterns than their majority-culture counterparts (Katz, 2010; Lombano-Bermudez, 2015; Vickery, 2015). Katz has also shown that lower income and marginalized Latino/a teens' information practices are often drastically different from that of their middle-income peers. Looking at second-generation Latino/Hispanic teenagers in Texas, Lombano-Bermudez demonstrated that they had particular patterns of interacting with ICTs that meant "their participation in new media culture" was often only peripheral (p. viii). Additionally, Latino/a immigrant teens often have language and technical skills that are superior to their parents and the added responsibility of using media to broker their parents' connections to their communities (Katz, 2010, 2014) and responsibilities to monitor and mediate their siblings' media use (Clark, 2009)[1]. Latino/a parents have also

[1] These issues will be covered in more detail in Chapter 4.

been found to have different parenting styles (Guillermo- Ramos et al., 2007; Rodriguez, Donovick, & Crowley, 2009) that influence how their children take up ICTs (Tripp, 2011).

Data from the Pew Internet and American Life Project shows that Latino/a teens are just as likely as their non-minority peers to have smart phones, and to use SM and text messaging, but they also found that Latino/as had less access to desktop computers and game consoles and were much more likely to use Google Plus (Google +, https://plus.google.com), messaging apps, anonymous apps, and video chat (Lenhart et al., 2015). It is important to consider what this information may conceal, beginning with access itself.

**Variations of Access**

Though most researchers have progressed beyond considerations of mere access to sophistication of use, for many individuals and families access is still an issue. While 59% of Hispanic homes have an Internet subscription, this drops to 35% in Spanish dominant homes and 33% when considering homes of those with less than a high school education (Smith, 2015). The lack of a home Internet connection can diminish the quality of teens' participation on the Internet. Jenkins (2006) has argued that the mastery to participate with the new types of social interactions that are enabled by new media activities depends on being able to access the Internet in a more extensive way than is generally possible outside of the home. Furthermore, Pearce and Rice (2008) found that teens that only accessed the Internet from their mobile device engaged in less "capital enhancing" activities.

Beyond the physical inequities in access, there are inequities in ability. Researchers interested in issues of access emphasize the importance of attending to the quality of use (Livingston & Helsper, 2008; Hargittai, 2010) because “differentiated usage patterns among the connected have the potential to contribute to social inequality" (Hargittai, 2010, p.94). Hargittai has called this a second-level divide. Livingstone and Helsper have developed a four-step system for measuring gradations of use: a) basic users use the Internet solely for information seeking, b) moderate users add in games and email, c) broad users add instant messaging (IM) and download music, and d) all-rounders do all of the above, also adding creative uses. Hargittai, E., Connell, S., Klawitter, E. F., and Litt, E. (2014) assert that participating creatively in Internet activities, such as “editing Wikipedia to taking part in online forum discussions, posting reviews and voting on others’ content” (p.1) are far from universal activities and tend to be concentrated in privileged populations of teenagers, such as those with highly educated parents. For instance, Lombano-Bermudez (2015) found that ICTs were helping second generation Latino/a teens integrate, but that they had often not developed their competency. Jenkins (2006) calls this a “participation gap” and highlights the important of focusing on the ways “cultural protocols and practices” (p. 23) contribute to this inequality. Lloyd (2010) has argued that information literacy needs to be understood in terms of “practical understandings (knowing how to do things like searching for information), rules (explicit formulations that direct how a thing is done or what counts) and teleoaffective structures (the overarching purpose, mood or feelings that are linked to tasks).” (p.246).

In addition, having the ability to access the Internet does not mean having equal access. Gonzalez (2016) has highlighted the importance of looking beyond immediate connections to the Internet to the continuity of their connections. In interviews with low-income individuals, participants often spoke of times when their various connections to the Internet broke down and they experienced disruptions. These disruptions had real consequences for their ability to access information, and also negatively influenced how these individuals felt about technology.

**Parents' Place in Teen's Information Practices**

Literature that discusses the boundary negotiation between parents and teens often describes parents' anxiety that their children' technological skill surpasses their own (Erickson, Wisniewski, Xu, Carroll, Rosson, & Perkins, 2015). Todays' teens are often described in popular media as "digital natives," (Prensky, 2001) believed to have vast comprehension of technology and information, and to be more knowledgeable than their parents. This claim has been disputed (Bilal, Erdelez, Beheshti, & Todd, 2012; Hargittai, 2010), and research has shown that parents are still an important presence in teens' information lives (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2005; Foss et al, 2013; Meyers et al., 2009). Foss et al. (2013) found that 61% of the adolescents (14 to 17 year-olds) reported that they were highly influenced by their mothers in their technological interactions, while another 7% mentioned their fathers. These teens said that their mothers regularly worked with them on the computer and provided them with assistance with finding sources, and rules and guidelines for doing searches, and help formulating search terms. Numerous studies also reported that parents were among

teens' most important sources (Meyers et al., 2009; Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2005). However, complicating the parent/teen information dynamic is the fact that parents are also potent information barriers in teens' lives. For example, Meyers et al. report adult authority, oversight and monitoring as hindrances to tweens' (9 to 13 year-olds) information seeking. Moreover, parents have consistently reported monitoring and restricting their adolescents' media use (Yardi & Bruckman, 2011). Looking specifically at Latino/a teens, Tripp (2011) revealed that the anxiety parents felt about technology and the Internet meant that they were often highly restrictive of their children's Internet use, confining their use to school work, and thereby limiting online opportunities. Though adult-driven activities provided teens with ways to learn about the opportunities available online for media production, they often failed to provide teens with interest-driven activities that can help motivate teens to develop more thorough capabilities and discover new interests (Tripp & Herr-Stephenson, 2009; Ito et al., 2008).

**Social Nature of Teens' Information Practices**

Many youth spend an inordinate amount of their day on their devices consuming media and communicating with others. In a recent Pew Research Center study of teens' Internet and technology use, Lenhart et al. (2015) found that 88% have access to a mobile or smart phone, 73% had their own smart phone, 87% have access to a desktop or laptop computer, 58% have access to tablet computers, 81% have access to game consoles, 92% go online daily, 91% use text messaging, 89% use SM, and 71% use multiple SM sites. Teens are using these devices and their access to the Internet to

consume a large quantity of media and communicate with their social groups. Rideout et al. (2010) report that youth spend on average 7 hours and 38 minutes a day consuming media, and because of multitasking actually consume 10 hours and 45 minutes of media during that time and Lenhart et al. (2015) finds that the typical teen sends 30 texts a day. Despite teens' inundation in media and communications their information behavior has generally been defined narrowly as intentionally seeking out specific "useful" information. This definition means that much of the information work that is done by adolescents to maintain their information saturated daily existence has been invisible to research. There has, however, been a developing acknowledgement of how important the social nature of information use is for teens. For instance, in their work on tweens, Meyers et al. (2009) found that the youth in their study usually started a quest to find information by talking with their peers and then continued to assemble information through various other interpersonal interactions until their problem was solved. To do this they used phones, IM, and email but generally preferred talking in person. Teens' information habits are also often shaped by their friends' habits. In their study, Foss et al. (2013) found that though the younger children in their earlier study never spoke of being influenced by their peers 55% of adolescents spoke of their searching and computer habits being influenced by their friends. They also found that for some teens SM and communication sites were their primary activity regardless of whether they were searching for information or not. These teens tended to use the social functions of sites to fulfill any activity they were involved with and would pull the computer and the Internet into most of their offline activities with their friends. Ito et

al. (2008) have described how teens' information practices are both interest and friendship driven and embedded in a "broader social and cultural ecology"(p.6). Taken together, this research makes it apparent that there is a need to reconsider what ELIS researchers consider information and information behaviors in regards to teens because like Foss et al. say, "[s]ocial computer use and use of social networking sites do involve access of information, even if the information pertains not to schoolwork but to popular culture and friends' activities" (Foss et al., 2013, p.185). For instance, Ito and associates have found that much of teens 'making sense' does not consist of directed information-seeking, but of learning while participating with social others in activities like building a profile on Facebook and chatting on IM. From their work, it is evident that teens' information practices are intricately intertwined with their social lives and that this interconnection must be accounted for within any consideration of modern teens' everyday information practices.

**Social Norms and Teens' Communicative Practices**

Within the broader field of LIS there are some interesting studies that consider teens' communicative practices within their various social groups. Researchers have attempted to understand the complex ways teens' communicative information practices are intertwined with their social behaviors. In their exploratory study with 21 high school seniors, Read, Shah, O'Brien, and Woolcott (2012) found teens' stable network were composed of various groups that ranged from very intimate friends to a broad group that included everyone they had met during the course of their lives. The entire social network tended to mimic the makeup of teens' Facebook friends, which generally

included most of the people in all their groups. Read et al. say that "[a]dolescents are increasingly dependent on technically mediated modes of interaction for defining social roles and functioning" (Read et al., 2012, p. 489). The methods teens used to communicate with the various groups within their social network were an important way they expressed their social roles. The use of ICTs both reflected and helped to construct the social norms for interacting with the varied groups to which teens belonged, such as expectations of continuous contact (Clark, 2013), rules around how to choose friends and whom it is socially acceptable to reject (Ito et al., 2008, boyd, 2007), and which ICT should be used when (Agosto et al., 2012). For instance, speaking face-to-face was generally reserved for the most intimate friends (Read et al, 2012), texting was used for a core group of close family and friends (Ishii, 2006), Facebook was used to communicate with broader group of less intimate friends, and email as used for more formal communication with teachers and employers (Agosto et al., 2012). Different communication styles were also used according to differing relationships and groups. Each group had its own domain and “its own clearly articulated style and mode of communication" (p.496) and teens often they often communicated differently with different groups. boyd and Marwick (2011) also found a gendered component in what individual teens felt was appropriate to share online that conformed with traditional notions of femininity and masculinity.

In a qualitative study of six focus groups in which Agosto et al. (2012) sought to understand the social rules that governed why teens chose certain social networks and ICTs to communicate. They found that the teens decided on their ICTs along six factors

that included social factors, relationship factors, self-protection factors, recipient factors, information/communication factors, and systems factors. Within these factors they found that participants used the closeness of the relationship, the size of the audience, the rules, norms and beliefs of their social groups, their need to protect themselves online, their need for privacy, to control the onslaught of communication, the urgency of a communication, the affordances of the ICT, and the technical knowhow and level of access of the recipient, among others, to decide which ICT to use. These findings demonstrate the importance of context and the complexity that goes into their decision making.

Taken together, the extant research discussed above demonstrates that communicative practices are an integral part of the social norms that bind teens' social worlds together and that they provide the means by which teens move between their differing social contexts and attempt to keep them separate. Teens use of all these factors to make their ICT decisions demonstrate they combining their personal goals with an understanding of the features or affordances of the various ICTs they are using and wielding this knowledge to participate in a way that conforms with the social norms of their various groups and helps them to control their personal boundaries. The dissertation sought to build on this work by exploring teens' use of ICTs as boundary facilitating resources more explicitly.

**Conceptualizing teens' boundary negotiations.** Privacy research in relation to teens; privacy generally follows two threads that both focus on the threats that the online environment poses for children (Marwick et al., 2010). The first is about the risks

children face online from corporate entities that use the information they share for their own profit-driven means (Moscardelli & Liston-Heyes, 2004; Youn, 2009). The second concerns how teens' increasing presence online makes them vulnerable to sexual solicitation, contact with unknown others, online harassment, and inappropriate content (Lenhart & Madden, 2007; Palfrey, Sacco, boyd, & Debonis, 2008; Youn, 2009). These fears have set off a "technopanic" about teens and privacy (Marwick, 2008) that stereotypes them as not caring about privacy and serves as a frame for institutional and PM and monitoring (Marwick et al. 2010).

Teens are often seen to be "reckless" with their information online (Notten & Nikken, 2016), but this is an oversimplified understanding of teens' privacy behaviors. Research shows that teens are concerned with privacy. They understand that there are risks to their SM participation (boyd, 2014; Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2011; Clarke, 2009; Moscardelli & Liston-Heyes, 2004) and they do make attempts to safeguard it (Madden, et al., 2013). They are however, sometimes lacking in information (Moscardelli & Liston-Heyes, 2004) and confused about the best ways to protect their privacy (Livingstone, 2008). Teens are also generally more interested in what privacy can accomplish for their lives, than in the abstract concept itself (Marwick et al., 2010). For teens, "privacy is about being in control of their own actions, information, and choices, including the ability to share personal information online and participate in online socializing" (Marwick et al. p. 11) in their everyday lives. This includes the ability to share information with some people and keep it from others.

Altman (1975) conceptualized privacy as a social boundary construction practice. He viewed privacy as a dialectical process in which people have different desired levels of privacy for different settings or contexts and will use different mechanisms to adjust their boundaries to the current situation. "Privacy is, therefore, a changing process whereby people attempt to regulate their openness/closedness to others" (Altman & Chemers, 1980, p.75) in relation to their current context. Building on Altman, Petronio (2002) developed the Communication Privacy Management (CPM) theory to describe the communicative practices that people use to hide, present, and manage the information that others have about them. In the CPM theory managing private information is seen primarily as a boundary regulating process and privacy is defined as the feeling that one has the right to own private information, either personally or collectively; consequently, boundaries mark ownership lines for individuals" (Petronio, 2002, p. 6).

The balance between sharing enough information and revealing too much is particularly precarious in the digital world (Palen & Dourish, 2003) because the properties of digital media mean that "[i]nformation that was once scattered, forgettable, and localized within small local groups is becoming widespread, permanent and searchable" (Marwick, Murgia-Diaz, & Palfrey, 2010. p. 51). However, while the properties of digital media make negotiating privacy difficult (boyd, 2007) individuals still attempt to maintain what Nissenbaum (2004) calls "contextual integrity." Nissenbaum (2004) argued that different contexts have different rules about the information that is appropriate within that realm and how the information can then be

distributed beyond that context that shape individuals' expectations of privacy. She reasoned individuals feel that their privacy has been breached when information is shared (or viewed) outside of the original context in which it was first shared. This understanding of privacy has not generally been taken up by ICT researchers. The failure to understand privacy from teens' perspectives is largely due to the fact that privacy research has been designed by adults (Marwick, et. al, 2010; Agosto & Abbas, 2015) and framed from within adult fears for their children. Recently, however, there has been a turn in privacy research to work that attends to teens' privacy as a social issue, rather than as simply an institutional or safety issue (Vickery, 2015).

**Social privacy strategies.** Social privacy research has most often focused on the strategies teens use to cope with the collapsed contexts of the online environment. Collapsed contexts refer to an individual's online applications, such as Facebook, being populated by people from different life settings, such as parents, friends, and coworkers (Marwick & boyd, 2011). It is in human nature to communicate differently with different people in different contexts (Goffman, 1972), however "[t]echnology complicates our metaphors of space and place, including the belief that audiences are separate from each other" (Marwick & boyd, 2011, p. 2) or that it is even possible to know who is a part of the online audience. Oolo and Siibak (2013) conducted focus groups to investigate how teens perceived their online audiences and found that teens had little idea who was in their audience. Yet, researchers have found teens are uncomfortable with their personal information being accessed by unintended audiences (Agosto & Abbas, 2015) and social privacy researchers have described finding they have

a variety of strategies to cope with unintended audiences and construct privacy in the online space (boyd, 2010; boyd & Marwick, 2011; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Oolo & Siibak, 2013, Siibak & Murumaa, 2011). boyd and Marwick (2011) note that teens' strategies include both social and structural practices and Oolo and Siibak have categorized them as self-censorship, strategic information sharing, and social steganography

Self- censorship, social steganography, and the related "subtweeting" are social strategies that teens use to attempt to communicate with an intended audience and control how they are perceived by people outside of that audience. Oolo and Siibak (2013) indicate that teens often think about whether what they intend to post would be appropriate for "adult acquaintances" and relatives and censor their posts accordingly. Another way that teens deal with the ambiguous "invisible audience" is social steganography. Social steganography entails "encoding" text so that only the intended audience will understand it (boyd, 2010; boyd & Marwick, 2011; ; Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Siibak & Murumaa, 2011). To do this, teens often post quotes and song lyrics that they think only some of their audience has the knowledge to interpret (boyd & Marwick, 2011; Siibak & Murumaa, 2011). Marwick and boyd (2014) note that teens also engage in an extension of this practice that teens themselves refer to as "subtweeting." Subtweeting consists of posts that encode talk about personal drama or conflicts using "obscure references" and pronouns instead of names (p.9). An example they provide of such a post is, "[w]hy do u post pictures on Instagram of yourself in the morning when u look so ratchet" (p.9). Posts like this one are meant to be understood by the person they are about and sometimes by a small group that is in the know, but are also meant to be

unintelligible to outsiders and provide the poster with “plausible deniability” (Marwick & boyd, 2014, p.9).

Some teens also attempt to use structural means to make the audience more manageable and be more strategic about what information gets shared with whom (Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Marwick & boyd, 2014). For instance, the Pew Internet & American Life Project reports that 74% of teens have deleted people from their friends, 58% have blocked people on other sites, 59% have deleted something they posted in the past, 53% have deleted other people’s comments to their page, and 45% have removed a tag from a picture that was a posted of them (Madden et al., 2013). Some teens also separate their Facebook “friends” into groups, which helps them to communicate differently with different groups by avoiding context collapse (Read et al., 2011). Others use their privacy settings to manage who is able to see their posts, though some teens would rather share less than isolate themselves in this way (Oolo & Siibak, 2013). boyd and Marwick (2011) describe how one of their participants even deactivated her account while she was not using it, though they point out that this is an unusual strategy.

One of the most common structural methods teens use to strategically share information with different audiences is the use of different platforms to talk to different groups (boyd & Marwick, 2011; Vickery, 2015). Teens do this to resist the collapsed contexts they need to contend with on sites like Facebook and "reach different audiences, explore different identities, and form different communities" (Vickery, p.289). They have also been found to segregate their conversations because of their

perceptions of the privacy of different platforms (Agosto & Abbas, 2015; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Oolo & Siibak, 2013). Oolo and Siibak (2013) discovered that teens considered certain topics to be too personal to be shared on Facebook, but were often more open in their public blogs since there were less obvious clues as to adult readership. Teens were also found to be especially open on Instant Messenger (IM) since they perceived it to be faster and more intimate.

**Privacy differences.** Vickery has expanded on the findings of other social privacy researchers to look specifically at how economics influences the types of strategies that teens take up. In her study of 18 low-income "non-dominant" teens' privacy in relation to SM and mobile phones, Vickery found that their circumstances led to unique privacy challenges. She calls the participants in her study "non-dominant" because they are mostly non-white and are from "a low-performing, economically challenged, and ethnically diverse high school in central Texas" (p. 284). Non-dominant teens are often monitored differently than middle-class white teens (Kelly, 2003) and are more likely to share bedrooms and devices (Vickery, 2015). Vickery found that mobile phone access among these teens was not about having one or not, but was instead more temporal in that it was about having one right now. To get around the privacy complications associated with sharing devices, many teens erased most of their communications as they happened. Others used alternative devices such as the iPod touch or Nintendo DS to text message. Some teens even chose not to use certain technologies in order to resist the "power, pressures, and expectations that encourage them to be 'always-on'" (p.287) and to disassociate from peers that behaved "inappropriately" online.

**Parents as audience.** There is very little research specifically devoted to social privacy in relation to parents or about how teens feel about their parents' monitoring. Most of the research on social privacy looks at teens across all contexts, of whom parents are only one subsection. This is true even though teens have been shown to be most concerned about privacy in relation to parents and other authority figures (Herring 2008; Ito et al. 2008; Livingstone 2006). The research that does discuss parents generally focuses on how context collapse in certain online spaces pose particular challenges for teens in regards to their parents (boyd, 2014). Parents often use the public nature of social network sites (SNS) to monitor their teenage children and research has found that 80% of the parents on a SNS with a child on a SNS have "friended" their child (Madden, et al., 2012). While Child and Westerman (2013) found in an online survey that most teens accept their parents' Facebook friend requests and generally do not use privacy settings to limit their access, in focus groups, Madden et al. (2012) learned that many teens had mixed feelings about being Facebook "friends" with their parents. Teens conceived of the Internet as a private space in which they could socialize with their peers and resented their parents' efforts to infringe on it (Ito et al., 2008). West, Lewis, and Currie (2009) found that youth believed their parents should not be a part of the public SM audience.). Teens were quick to point out that that their need for privacy was not because they had anything to hide or were doing anything wrong (boyd & Marwick, 2011; Vickery, 2015), they simply wanted "to control the context in which information [was] disclosed and shared" (Vickery, p. 282). Teens felt that when parents monitored their online presence they were ignoring the boundaries

that are implied by different social contexts (boyd, 2014). To teens the issue was "not whether someone can listen in, but whether one should" (boyd, p. 58).

**Privacy in physical space.** Physical space is another important realm for research into how teens use ICTs to construct privacy in the family context. Since most of the social privacy research is focused on teens' online participation, this area has been mostly neglected. However, numerous studies on PM and monitoring have demonstrated that parents regularly use the physical spaces of the household to help them restrict and regulate their children's use of ICTs (e.g., Brush & Inkpen, 2007; Erickson et al., 2015; Yardi & Bruckman, 2011, 2012). This suggested that physical space would conversely be an important component in teens' construction of privacy within the household.

One popular way that teens deal with the need for privacy in their households is by creating individualized spaces for themselves in their bedrooms (Lincoln, 2014; Ling & Thrane, 2001; Livingstone, 2007a; Livingstone & Bovill, 2001). As adolescents get older their bedrooms become more and more like independent personal living spaces (Ling & Thrane, 2001). Livingstone (2007a) says the personal bedroom provides adolescents with somewhere to collect and store personal items, a personal space where they are not under scrutiny, a space in which to enact identity, and a platform from which to interact in their peer culture. However, it is important to note that not all teens' have the privilege of a private bedroom. Vickery (2015) found that the nondominant teens that participated in her study were more likely to share bedrooms than the majority

culture teens that have usually been studied. Sharing bedrooms should change the dynamics around how teens carve out privacy in the home.

Mobile use of technologies problematizes the division between public and private space in the home by providing a means for teenagers to construct individualized spaces in the presence of other family members. In her study of Japanese teenagers' use of mobile phones, Ito (2005) explained how mobile phones helped teens assemble a private space within the public spaces of the home. She described how mobile phones have allowed Japanese teens, who generally have much less personal space in the home than American teens, to escape parental and sibling surveillance, and provide for a semblance of non-physical personal space within the physical space they are sharing with their family. However, while new media create the possibility for family members to have the feeling of private space even while they are physically together (Livingstone, 2007b), they also expose these activities and the information therein to the family members that are present. In order to deal with this visibility, the teens in Ito's (2005) study controlled how their mobile use appeared to their parents by always answering their phones out of earshot of their parents and therefore never inadvertently revealing any information to them. In this way, Ito says, teens could use their mobiles to circumvent parental power without upsetting the power dynamic. Similarly, Grinter and Palen (2002) found that teens could use IM while their parents were in the same physical space by keeping IM windows closed and turning off the notification sound. Like this, teens could use IM to get around both natural and social constraints.

Another way that teens create both physical and nonphysical personal spaces for themselves is by upsetting the expectation that they can always be reached. Ito (2005) said that while mobile phones let youth subvert the power dynamics of institutional constraints, they were also "accompanied by new sets of social expectations and manners" (p. 11). Under the expectation to be "continuously available" to both family and friends, teens had developed communicative practices to escape these expectations, such as the good night text or a text that indicated they would be doing something specific like taking the subway that were then to be understood to others as an indication of unavailability. Grinter and Palen (2002) also related that teens used the technical features of the IM system to make it look as though they were not available when they actually were, in order to help mitigate any hurt feelings that might accrue from a nonresponse. Teens seemed to believe that “availability is implied by presence” and they took actions to create technical boundaries that would not threaten their social relations (Grinter & Palen, p.28).

**Parental Influence and Family Context**

The research discussed in the preceding section provides a solid foundation of findings on teens’ social privacy. This research indicated that teens use ICTs to protect their boundaries and to help maintain their social relationships, but said little about how they do this within the family context. Beyond the complications of securing privacy online, within the family there are the added complications of sharing a culture, a living space, and devices, along with parents and family having the proximity and opportunity to inspect the traces of teens’ activities that are stored in various devices, as well as the

power dynamic that sets up parents as entitled to their children's information. The next section will review literature related to the teen/parent dynamic and PM and monitoring.

**Parent/teen dynamics.** Families have a unique ecosystem of routines, boundaries and rules that structure the way individual members orient themselves to everyday life, one another and technology (Silverstone et al, 1989), that begin to shift when children enter adolescence (Ling & Yttri, 2004). During adolescence, teens begin to need more autonomy from their parents (Havighurst, 1972; Petronio, 2002; Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006) and naturally use the ICTs that have become such a big part of modern youth culture to carve out some independence and connect with their peers (boyd, 2014). Parents, however, have a variety of fears about their children's use of ICTs (Livingstone et al., 2012) and are also often orienting their parenting to a cultural environment in which parenting children's use of media is seen as an indication of how "good" a parent one is (Hoover et al., 2004). Though parents and teens both tend to agree that teens need some degree of privacy, they often disagree about the boundaries of parental monitoring (Cranor, Durity, Marsh, & Ur, 2014). For instance, Cranor et al. found that teens felt that their phones and particularly their text messages should be "off limits," while parents felt that there was no space that should be out of bounds. Smetana et al. (2006) also found that parents consistently felt their children had more of an obligation to disclose information than did their children. These disagreements between teens and their parents about the level of autonomy teens should have or the level of authority parents should have can cause

turbulence in their relationships (Smetana & Asquith, 1994) and spur more secrecy on the part of adolescents (Smetana et al., 2006).

In response to this newfound secrecy in their adolescent children, Petronio (1994) found that parents often attempt to learn more information about their adolescent children in both direct and subversive ways and that children tend to defend against these invasive behaviors in both confrontational and evasive ways. Looking at the open-ended responses of emerging adults, Ledbetter et al (2010) updated Petronio's (1994) typology in light of modern technology and found that modern parents participated in spatial invasions, telephone invasions, computer invasions, and verbal invasions. They also found emerging adults reported defensive behaviors in all of these categories.

While parental monitoring has been associated with positive outcomes (Laird, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2003; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) and less deviant behaviors (DiClemente et al., 2001; Hayes, Smart, Toumbourou, & Sanson, 2004), parental monitoring can also induce teens to share less with parents than they normally would (Hawk, Keijsers, Hale, & Meeus, 2009). Conversely, parental trust and respect for their adolescent children's privacy can often lead to beneficial results. For example, Sorbring and Lunden (2012) found that parents that engaged with their teenage children and also trusted them to behave appropriately online had more insight into their online experiences. Establishing a good relationship with teens may also lead teens to disclose more with parents (Smetana, 2008). Kerr and Stanton (2000) found

that parents' knowledge of who their children associate with, where they are, and what they are doing is largely due to their children's willingness to disclose information about themselves and their activities to their parents rather than their parents' attempts to monitor them.

Other researchers have built on this important finding and uncovered that teens have a broad range of techniques that they use to vary their levels of disclosure to parents, such as voluntarily disclosing, partially disclosing, lying, only disclosing information when specifically asked, and by avoiding disclosure by avoiding the issue (Cumsille, Keijsers & Laird, 2010; Darling, Cumsille, Caldwell, & Dowdy, 2006; Darling, & Martinez, 2010; Engels, Finkenauer, & van Kooten, 2006). These findings highlight the complexity of how teens' need for privacy plays out within the family. Teens do not just hide their information, or close off access, they attempt to manage the access their parents have to them and their information in such a way that they are able to present themselves as they wish to be seen in order to maintain their relationships (Petronio, 2012) and create personal space for themselves. Petronio states that, "[a]t the core of privacy management is the need to be connected to family members while retaining a sense of autonomy apart from those members" (p. 175).

There are a handful of studies that explore the parent/teen boundary negotiation process in relation to technology. Most of these studies explore the issue from the parental perspective (Yardi & Bruckman, 2011; 2012; Yardi, 2012), but there are a few studies that have accounted for both parents' and teens' perspectives

(Ammari, Kumar, Lampe, & Schoenebeck, 2015; Burke, Adamic, & Marciniak, 2013; Child & Westermann, 2013; Cranor et al., 2014; Erickson et al., 2015; Livingstone, Ólafsson, O'Neill, & Donoso, 2012; Sorbring & Lundin, 2012). These have concerned communication between parents and teens on Facebook (Burke et al., 2013), acceptance of parents' friend requests by young adults on Facebook (Child & Westerman, 2013), parental sharing of information about children on teens (Amari, et al., 2015), and the level of insight parents had into their children's Internet activities (Sorbring & Lundin, 2012). Cranor et al. (2014) and Erickson et al. (2015) focused specifically on the parent teen negotiation of privacy. From their interviews with both parents and teens Cranor et al. found they while both agreed that teens had some limited right to privacy they disagreed about the how far this privacy should extend. The authors proposed that much of the "gap" between how parents and teens viewed privacy could be attributed to whether parents viewed their teens' online privacy in the same way that they saw their privacy in physical spaces, with those that viewed them similarly feeling they had more right to infringe on their teens' online environment. Erickson et al. (2015), extended these findings through their use of 12 parent/teen dyads as the unit of analysis. This allowed them to gain a better understanding of "the complex, dialectal boundary negotiation process between parents and teens," as they manifested in particular dyads (p. 4). Erickson et al. found that parents influenced their teens' behaviors, but not in any straightforward way. Teens with parents that had a high degree of control over them were often very accommodating about allowing their parents access, but these teens then also often had less access to technology and more

limited online experiences. Though they found that some teens with very controlling parents rebelled and took “subversive measures” to assert their own autonomy (p.14), the authors note that for the most part the “boundaries were defined but negotiable" (p.6) and would only go to extremes in certain situations. The variations that were uncovered in the parent/teen dynamic may point to an underlying difference in these families’ technological cultures or parenting styles.

**Parenting styles.** In her seminal paper Baumrind (1966) identified three different parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive, to which negligent was later added as a fourth style (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Authoritative parents are understood to have levels of authority and warmth. Authoritarian parents have high levels of authority and low levels of warmth and permissive parents had high levels of warmth and low levels of authority. However, there is little understanding of how these parenting styles apply to Latino/a parents. Latino/a parents have been described both as authoritarian (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Hammer & Turner, 1990) and permissive (Julian, McKenry, & McKelvey, 1994) in the literature. Rodriguez, Donovick, and Crowley (2009) contend that Latino/ parents do not fit into these categories. Halgunseth, Ipsa, and Rudy, (2006) argue that the variations found in Latino/a parenting styles are based on parenting goals that prioritize familial closeness, respect, and the provision of a moral education. Additionally, though the use of an authoritative parenting style has been connected to positive outcomes, researchers have found that the connection between the two did not hold in Latino/a families (Lindahl & Malik, 1999; Park & Bauer, 2002). Rodriguez et al. argue that it is the inclusion of autonomy granting in connection

with parenting styles that has led to inaccuracies in investigations of Latino/a parenting style because Latino/a parents often grant their teens less autonomy. Stewart and Bond (2002) have reasoned that parental dimensions—warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting—are more helpful indicators as they can be applied across cultures.

**Parental mediation (PM).** How parents manage their children's relations with media has been defined more specifically as PM within the communication literature devoted to media effects (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). This research has generally been done in the positivist tradition, with quantitative methods, While researchers are now beginning to consider PM in relation to the Internet (Livingston & Helsper, 2008; Kirwil, 2009; Lee, 2012; Lee & Chae, 2012), video games (Nikken & Janz, 2006; Shin & Huh, 2011; Jiow, Lim, & Lin, 2016), mobile phones (Clark & Sywyj, 2012), smart phones (Mascheroni, 2014) and a range of devices (Yardi & Bruckman, 2011; Yardi & Bruckman, 2012; Ames, Go, Kaye, & Spasojevic; 2011; Clark, 2013), PM has most often been considered in relation to children's television use (e.g., Borzekowski & Robinson, 2007; Lemish, 2008; Nathanson, 1999; Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999), where researchers have traditionally conceived of three types of PM styles: active/instructive, watching and discussing television with children, restrictive, setting rules and guidelines for watching television, and co-viewing, watching television with children (Nathanson, 1999; Valkenburg et al., 1999).

Livingstone and Helsper (2008) show that parents employ similar mediation styles for monitoring their children's online behaviors and identify four types of

mediation strategies based on those developed in television-related research. These strategies are active co-use, which involves sitting with one's children while they use the Internet and engaging them in instructive interactions about their use, as well as three restrictive strategies that include restrictions on who children can interact with, rules restricting use, and restrictions that are enforced using technical tools. They also found that parents engaged in monitoring, which included the ongoing monitoring of the websites that their children visit as well as their online communications (e.g., chat messages and social networking activities). Zaman et al. (2016) assert that parents use supervision in conjunction with deference to grant their children some autonomy over their interactions with ICTs, but also stay involved.

In their study of parenting teens' various technology use, Yardi and Bruckman (2011) also found that parents placed restrictions on the time of day technologies could be used, the frequency with which they could be used, and where they could be used. In her study of the PM of smartphones in Italian homes, Mascheroni (2014), observed that while parents did use technical restrictions, both permissive and authoritarian parents were uncomfortable with the idea of these types of "external constraints" (p. 453). Instead they often attempted to control smartphone use by "limiting time or context of use" (p.450), such as during dinner or homework. Parents also sometimes explicitly barred access to the Internet while outside the home or did this implicitly by using "pay as you go" methods that made communications costlier.

**Differences in PM.** While all families seem to accept that they have a responsibility to parent their children's technology and media use (Hoover, Clark, &

Alters, 2004) there are large variations between families in the adoption of PM practices. A family's structure, economic circumstances, culture, and availability of parents for family interactions play a big part in what types of mediation parents decide to engage in. Mothers as opposed to fathers, more educated parents, parents of younger children, and higher income parents are all more likely to mediate their children's media consumption (Eastin et.al, 2006; Valkenburg et.al., 1999; Warren, 2005). Socio-economic class has a large influence on parents' ability to mediate their children's technology use. For example, Yardi and Bruckman (2012) found that the parental monitoring of African-American families with a low socio-economic status was often constrained by issues such as inflexible work schedules and parental responsibility to shelter, feed, and clothe their children. Furthermore, parents that work longer hours outside the home often do not have as much time to engage in discussions about the television their children are consuming or to enforce regulations on their media consumption (Austin, Knaus, & Meneguelli, 1997; Brown, Childers, Bauman, & Koch, 1990; Warren, Gerke, & Kelly, 2002).

**Socio-economic class, underlying values, and PM.** While socio-economic class often leads to structural differences in parents' ability to mediate their children's technology, there are also differences in the underlying values of families of different socio-economic classes that direct these practices. In studies concerning television, various researchers have found that higher-income families tend to be very concerned with its negative effects, while lower-income families are less anxious about

incorporating it into their everyday lives (Brown et al., 1990; Jordan, 1992; Silverstone et al., 1992).

Ames et al. (2011) have found that this applies to the whole range of ICTs that families incorporate into their homes. Through observations of ten working class and ten middle class families and interviews with the parents of these families, they found that, though both groups had similar technologies, they used them differently and had different family rituals that reflected their differing circumstances and values. The middle-class families placed little focus on content choosing instead to restrict their children's use of all technology, very often referring to it as "screen time." The authors note that these families tended to be "cautious (or guilty) at best and alarmist at worst" (p. 4). Working class families, on the other hand, had more mixed feelings about their children's use of technology and talked about how their children's knowledge of technology would give them an advantage. They tended to see technology as separate from the content and placed more restrictions on specific content. These families were also much less anxious about their children's use of technology and even parenting in general, feeling that parenting did not necessarily need to be stressful.

Similarly, Clark (2013) found that upper-income families had an "ethic of expressive empowerment" and pushed their children to use media mainly for self-development and educational reasons, while lower-income families had "an ethic of respectful connectedness" in which PM was centered around promoting children to use media in ways that were respectful to parents and conducive to family connectedness. She stresses that children inherit their approach to media and technology from their

families, which may have larger ramifications. Lareau (2011) argues that the "cultural repertoire" of parenting practices that are associated with different socio-economic classes are widening the gap between them. She says that social institutions are biased against the relaxed parenting style that is demonstrated by less privileged parents towards the "concerted cultivation" that more privileged parents practice. However, at the same time, the influence of context on teens' ICT use is complicated and it is important to consider the limitations that a regimented media ICT culture, focused on restricting screen time and/or content might create for teens when researchers have found that children benefit from interest-driven ICT activities (Ito et al., 2008; Tripp, 2011).

**Cultural factors and PM.** Cultural factors can also influence how parents approach mediation and monitoring. In her study of PM in different European countries, Kirwil (2009) found that parents from collectivist countries preferred restrictive methods and countries with individualistic cultures tended to prefer social methods of mediation, such as co-use. Furthermore, cultural factors can shape parents' media related concerns for their children. Elias and Lemish (2011), found that Russian immigrant parents were concerned with the influence that the media of their host country would have on their children. Underscoring the significance of the underlying values being important in directing parents' concerns and their resulting mediation practices, in a study of Slovakian parents, Izrael (2014) found that parents' religiousness was a predictor of all types of mediation.

The beliefs that can result from membership in a minority culture might also influence parents' perceptions of risk and the mediation strategies they use. Using unreported data from the EU KIDS ONLINE Project, Bosman, Bayraktar, and d'Heanens (2015), found that parents that perceived that their kids were discriminated against were more worried about their online risk and more likely to take an active stance on mediation to help ensure their safety, such as actively educating their children on what sites were bad and which could be trusted. Additionally, situational factors can influence the way families engage with media and technology which might lead to different mediation strategies. For example, immigrant children, especially girls, are more likely to use media with their parents and families (Louie, 2003). Moreover, children of immigrants and of disadvantaged families also often have additional responsibilities related to media, such as brokering their parents' connections to media (Katz, 2010, 2014) and mediating their siblings use of media and technology (Clark, 2009), which could influence their parents' efforts to mediate their ICT activities.

**Nonrationality of PM.** Many rules and practices about ICTs are developed according to parents' beliefs and intentions, but are then commonly not actually carried into regular practice (Hoover et al., 2004). Most PM research works under the pretense that parents' biggest motivation should be a careful weighing of the benefits of each type of technology and media for children's future. However, Clark (2011) critiques PM research as largely having "overlooked the ways in which parents utilize media for positive familial and developmental goals that may not be directly related to media" (p. 324), as well as the irrational or emotional reasons parents have for their mediation

decisions. Clark (2011; 2013) notes that parents' particular mediation strategies have less to do with the careful weighing of the pros and cons of each method and much more to do with a families' particular culture and the need to find a way to integrate media into the family routine in a way that parents feel benefits the family.

**Parent/teen discrepancies.** The incongruence between parents' intentions and practices can be seen in the discrepancies between what parents and their children report about PM and monitoring. While various researchers have found that a majority of parents say they establish rules for their children's Internet use and monitor their online activities (Lenhart, 2005; Lenhart & Madden, 2007; Wang, Bianchi, & Raley, 2005) only a minority of teenagers believed their online activities were being monitored (Lenhart, 2005; Wang, Bianchi, & Raley, 2005). These inconsistencies between what parents and children report are important because they highlight that in order to get the full picture, research on the parent/teen dynamic surrounding technology needs to address both parental and adolescent perspectives.

While monitoring and mediation have been studied extensively, research has generally concentrated on parents' actions and perceptions. There is a need for research that looks at mediation from both parents and teens' perspectives that pays attention to the methods teens take to circumvent it, the varied technologies they avail to do so, as well as how the technological culture of the home influence those methods.

## Synthesis of What is Known From the Literature

The preceding literature review has discussed relevant research. It brings together scholarship from multiple disciplines and reveals the areas that still need

investigation. This study seeks to explore how teens manage information to negotiate personal space in the family context from the everyday life information seeking perspective. ELIS researchers understand information to be a process by which individuals make sense of their lives and situations (Dervin, 1992). They have found that individuals often seek out information in order to help them sustain the activities that are a routine part of their everyday lives and help them maintain "the order of things" (Savolainen, 1995). Information can be encountered within any situation and any kind of media (Williamson, 1998) and how people interact with it and choose whether to trust and integrate it into their lives can depend on context (Pettigrew, 1996) and group membership (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000).

Scholars of adolescents' ELIS have found that adolescents' information needs are related to their developmental stage and that they seem to be similar "across socioeconomic, ethnic, cultural, and geographic boundaries" (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006, p. 1425). Adolescence is a time when teens are generally attempting to establish autonomy from their parents and turning towards their peers (Havighurst, 1972; Smetana et al., 2006). While teens' information habits are still influenced by their parents, social engagement outside of the domestic context is increasingly important during this time and many of teens' information activities are influenced by this new social orientation (Foss, et al., 2013). Their information activities are very social and youth often interact with a series of peers and interpersonal connections when they are attempting to solve a problem (Meyers, et al., 2009). Likewise, many of their social activities "involve access of information, even if the information pertains not to

schoolwork but to popular culture and friends' activities" (Foss et al., 2013, p.185). For some teens engaging with SM and communication sites are their primary activity regardless of whether they are searching for information or not (Foss et al.). Scholars have suggested that it would help researchers attempt to understand individuals' "information practices" if the boundary between activities that are generally accepted as information related and those that are considered communicative could be avoided (Savolainen, 2006). This would be helpful in a consideration of teens' ELIS because their information activities are intimately interlinked with their social activities (Ito et al., 2008).

There has been a rapid integration of a multitude of devices (Rideout et al., 2010) and platforms into many modern teens' lives (Grinter, Palen, & Eldridge, 2006; Lenhart et al., 2010; Lenhart et al., 2015; Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). The incorporation of ICTs into teens' lives affords them new ways of interacting with people, but it also creates new rules of social etiquette (Ito, 2005), new expectations of availability (Ito, 2005; Ribak, 2009), and information sharing (boyd & Marwick, 2011). Knowledge of the social norms their various groups have adopted and their roles within those groups help teens decide what ICTs to use (Agosto et al., 2012) and understand how to interact (Read, et al., 2012). Teens use different ICTs (Agosto et al, 2012), different styles of communication and talk about different subjects with different people and groups (Read et al., 2012).

Sharing information over ICTs helps many teens make connections and develop their identities (Ito, et al., 2008), but the properties of digital media can make it difficult

to construct social boundaries and privacy (boyd, 2007). Research on teen privacy has usually concentrated on the risks teens face online (Marwick et al., 2010). However, teens are less interested in the abstract dangers of privacy risks than the concrete ways they feel privacy is relevant to their everyday lives (Marwick et al., 2010). Recently there has been a handful of researchers that have dedicated their work to the consideration of teens' privacy from their point of view (boyd, 2010; boyd & Marwick, 2011; Siibak & Murumaa, 2011; Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Vickery, 2015). These researchers have generally concentrated on the social and structural strategies that teens use to negotiate the collapsed contexts of the online space. They have found that teens often censor themselves, attempt to share with only some groups or people, and encode their posts so that only the intended audience can understand them (boyd & Marwick, 2011; Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Marwick & boyd, 2014). In addition, teens use a range of technical strategies such as changing privacy settings, deleting posts (Madden et al., 2013), and using different platforms (boyd & Marwick, 2011; Vickery, 2015). Structural and cultural factors also influence the methods that teens use. Minority and disadvantaged teens often have different privacy challenges than their middle-class and white counter-parts and sometimes use different strategies, such as non-use and erasing traces of communications on shared devices, to construct privacy and resist dominant power structures (Vickery, 2015).

Social privacy researchers have not focused on parents or the family, even though most teens are most concerned with keeping their information private from their parents and other adults (Marwick, et al., 2010) and their information seeking is

understood to be hindered by adult authority, oversight and surveillance (Meyers et al., 2009). Parents have an assortment of fears about their teenage children and their use of ICTs (Tripp, 2011) and they have variety of practices that they use to monitor and mediate their teens' ICT use. These include social methods, such as engaging media with their teenagers and attempting to educate them about their values and the risks of the Internet (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). However, they also include invasive and restrictive methods in which parents make restrictions about who teens can interact with online, how much they can interact (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008), and the time of day, the frequency, and the locations different technologies can be used (Yardi & Bruckman, 2011), as well as the monitoring of teens' search histories and communications (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). Parents methods are influenced by cultural and socio-economic factors (Ames et al., 2011; Yardi & Bruckman, 2011; 2012; Clark, 2013) and how teens interpret their parents' methods have been shown to be influenced by cultural factors (Clark & Sywyj, 2012).

Parents and adolescents often disagree about the extent of teens' right to privacy (Cranor, et al., 2014), which complicates the dynamic surrounding teens' privacy and PM and monitoring, as does the legal context surrounding parents' rights to access children's data and other personal information. Parents range from having high levels of control and complete access to their children's online spaces to very little control and no access and teens range from being very open about their online activities and going to a considerable effort to assert their autonomy or negotiate for it (Erickson et al., 2015). To control what their parents know about them, teens often vary their level of

disclosure (Cumsille, Keijsers & Laird, 2010; Darling, Cumsille, Caldwell, & Dowdy, 2006; Darling, & Martinez, 2010; Engels, Finkenauer, & van Kooten, 2006). This helps them to present themselves to their parents in ways that sustain their relationship with them (Petronio, 2012), but little is known about how the dynamics between parents' mediation and monitoring practices and teens' social privacy practices is mediated by ICTs or how it plays out within the everyday routines of the household.

**Gaps in the Literature**

The preceding section synthesizes what is known about the dynamic between teens' social privacy practices and parents' mediation and monitoring practices. This section turns to the gaps that need to be filled. Adolescents' information needs have been clearly connected with their process of development and it seems that teenagers of different socio-economics, race, ethnicity, and geography have generally the same information needs (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006a; 2006b), but there is little understanding of how teenagers developmental need for autonomy and membership with their peers will influence how they use ICTs to go about seeking information and keeping it private within the family context or how teenage minorities' methods for doing so might be different than their majority culture counterparts. Much of the research on teens' social privacy has tackled it in general and there has been very little investigation focused on how these practices are situated within the domestic context. This is true even though social norms are understood to be a major factor in teens' use of ICTs (Agosto et al., 2012; boyd, 2014) and teens do, for the most part, still live in the family home under the constraints of PM and monitoring. Additionally, while a great

deal is known about the methods that parents use to mediate and monitor their children's technology use, little is known about how teens respond to specific practices or how they correlate with teens' attempts to manage the information their parents learn about them and construct privacy. Also, though, non-dominant youth have been found to have different privacy challenges than majority youth (Vickery, 2015) and cultural and socio-economic factors are understood to influence how families interact around ICTs (Katz, 2010) and the parenting of ICT use (Ames et al., 2011; Yardi & Bruckman, 2012; Clark, 2013; Bosman et al., 2014), there is little research that explores how membership in a minority culture and the PM and monitoring that stem from the underlying values related to their cultural experience might relate to teens' attempts to construct privacy from their parents or family members. Furthermore, there is a particular deficit in the understanding of how teens cope with the monitoring of the traces that their activities and information seeking leave behind in their devices and the shared devices of the home and how teens' attempts to construct privacy are distributed across the various ICTs to which teens have access, even though they are known to use "media holistically, in a way that does not demarcate and delimit" by platform or device (Woodfall & Zezulkove, 2016, p.104). Likewise, there is a dearth of research that attempts to understand the ways physical space figures in teens' attempts to construct social privacy. The dissertation sought to fill these gaps by exploring how Latino/a teens' information practices are a response to PM and monitoring practices, embedded in the physical spaces and technological culture of the home, and expressed through an entire constellation of technologies.

**Pilot Study**

An exploratory study was conducted to look at the mediated lives of low-income, Latino adolescents with immigrant parents (Gomez, Booth, & Katz, 2011). The goal was to explore the ways these under-studied youth actively used technologies for their own purposes and how their activities were different than their majority culture, middle-class counterparts. The research questions were as follows:

RQ 1: How are negotiations of parental monitoring and mediation of children's media connections different in Latino immigrant family contexts?

RQ 2: How are the mediated environments of these young people different from those of their majority culture counterparts?

Since extant research indicates that teens' use of technology is best understood from within the context of the social arrangements of family life (Livingstone, 2002, 2007), the pilot study was designed to investigate how the family context as well as other social settings influenced the kinds of interactions these teens had with technology. To investigate these issues, four focus groups were conducted with 30 adolescents (aged 11-19) in April 2011, in two locations in New Brunswick, NJ. Though only 27 completed the pre-focus group paper survey, all 30 youth participated in the focus groups. Of those who completed the survey, 85 percent were Latino/a, 63 percent had parents who were Spanish dominant or mono-lingual, and 15 percent were African-American.

**Findings**

Key findings from the pilot study were:

- Respondents reported that their parents have similar ICT worries to those majority-culture parents had expressed in prior studies.
- Parental monitoring and mediation were a common experience for the minority culture youth in the study. The monitoring and mediation they experienced echoed many of the findings reported in the literature for their majority culture counterparts.
- Respondents reported having to negotiate their family contexts to construct privacy.
- The physical spaces of the household figured in their attempts to control the information they exposed to their parents.
- They actively participated in their family members' mediation by controlling their own visibility and invisibility.
- They utilized the affordances of the technologies they had access to, as well as their knowledge of their parents' limitations to negotiate their privacy.
- There were gender differences in their privacy expectations.

**Pilot Study Contributions to the Main Study**

The findings from the study indicated that there were important areas of teens' social privacy that merit further investigation. While there is very little research on

teens' methods for constructing social privacy in the family context (Marwick et al., 2010) the pilot study clearly indicated that respondents were enacting privacy-preserving behaviors and that they were related to parents' mediation and monitoring, as well as to underlying family values. Respondents described the strategies they had developed for circumventing PM and monitoring from within the particular constraints—both structural and social—of their family, using the resources they had available. The physical space of the home also figured in their attempts to construct privacy. For some of the youth, physical space was a constraint that needed to be circumnavigated; for others it was a resource, and for some, it was both.

While the focus group and survey methods employed in the pilot study revealed important issues involved in teens' attempts to use ICTs to construct privacy, the study design did not provide any means to assess parental perspectives or data that teens provided about their family lives that were relevant to the participants' practices. By conducting surveys, an in-home family interview, and individual interviews with parents and youth, the dissertation builds on the pilot study's findings by giving the researcher first-hand access to parents, mapping and survey data of the physical space of the home and where ICTs are used in that space, the family's culture, parents' perspectives, and teens' perspectives that should help provide a holistic understanding of the family dynamics in which teens' social privacy practices are situated.

# Chapter 3 : Methods

The following chapter will present the design and rationale for this project. It will begin with the Research Questions. It will then proceed to the participants, setting, recruitment, and the compensation participants received. Next it will present the methods, protocols, and the methodological approach and analysis that were utilized.

## Research Questions

The development of the research questions was based on the literature review and pilot study findings. The design of the main study was then focused around answering the following questions:

RQ 1. How do Latino/a parents mediate their teens' Information Communication Technolgy (ICT) practices?

RQ 2. How do Latino/a teens negotiate their use of ICTs in accordance with the family small world?

RQ 2a. What practices do teens use to negotiate their resources in relation to ICTs in accordance with their family small world?

RQ 2b. What practices do teens use to negotiate their interpersonal relationships in relation to ICTs in accordance with their family small world?

**Introduction**

Addressing the research questions necessitated the use of methods that allow the researcher to discover knowledge regarding the family home, the familial culture and values, parental points of view, teens' points of view, the ICTs that are accessed by family members, where they are used in the home, and how they are integrated into the family's everyday routine. In order to encompass this broad range of interest, this study used a mixed-methods approach that included surveys, in-home family interviews, a mapping activity and individual interviews with teens, and an individual interview with parents. The various methods included in the study each provide a different vantage point for understanding "the reality" that constitutes the family's dynamics and each member's role within it. The parent/teen dynamic in any individual family stems from what they each understand to be the "the reality" or to use Chatman's (1996, 1999, 2000) term, the "small world," of their family.

The mixed-methods approach that was used in this study helped to mitigate each method's individual shortcomings (Connaway & Radford, 2017). For instance, while the surveys establish demographic characteristics of family members and indicate where family members prefer to use them, more data was needed to understand why they use them in certain household spaces. The family interview was designed to provide context for interpreting why technologies are placed where they are in the home, and how they are integrated into the family routine. The family interview was also crafted to provide insight into the relationship between the technological culture of the home and the parent/teen dynamic. Additionally, it allowed the investigator the

opportunity to observe the family members' interactions with one another and gain some first-hand knowledge of the home setting.

The teen mapping activity was adapted from an instrument developed by Katz and Gonzalez (2016). It was intended to provide a sense of the space of the home, where ICT devices are located, and how teens used ICTs in these spaces in relation to other family members. Moreover, it was meant to gather data on teens' subjective understanding of the spaces of their home (Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morely, 1991) and how they use them. Silverstone et al. (1991; 1992) have shown that objects and spaces are integral considerations in the activities surrounding technological use.

The individual interviews with teens and parents were meant to give them each the opportunity to share more freely about their personal practices and perceptions than they might be able to in the group setting of the family interview. The separate teen and parent interviews were designed to complement one another and provide insight into the dynamic in the teen/parent relationship surrounding ICTS. Conducting the interviews in the family home also provided the researcher with the opportunity to get a first-hand sense of the physical space of the house. This was meant to provide context for the researchers' understanding of the survey and interview data and help add to the validity of the study. Additionally, the mixed methods approach provides an "initiation" function (Connaway & Radford, 2017) that allows access to the differences in how mothers and fathers feel about parenting their teen children's ICT use, and the discrepancies between parents' and teens' perspectives and accounts of their practices.

## Method

The following sections describe the specific method, protocols and procedures used to address the above Research Questions.

**Participants.** Morse (1994) identifies six interviews as the minimum number of interviews needed to gain a phenomenological understanding and reach saturation. Reaching saturation requires the researcher to continue "bringing new participants into the study until the data set is complete and data replicates" (Morse, Barratt, Mayan, Olson, & Speirs, 2002, p.16). With the goal to reach saturation in mind, the researcher used convenience and snowball sampling to recruit eight Latino families with at least one teen between the ages of 14 and 16. Latino/a families were chosen because they are understudied within LIS (Jaeger, Bertot, & Franklin, 2010; Subramaniam & Jaeger, 2010) and also provide a vantage point for exploring how ICT practices are embedded within cultural experience. Generalizability was not a goal of this study, rather it was designed to provide an "information rich" (Patton, 2002) data set that would allow the researcher to explore the ways culture intersects with media and technology practices. Various cultural factors have been shown to influence the ICT-related responsibilities teens have in the home (Clark, 2009; Katz, 2010), the types of mediation and monitoring that parents utilize (Kirwel, 2009; Clark, 2013; Vickery, 2015; Yardi & Bruckman, 2012), the methods that teens use to secure their own privacy (Vickery, 2015), and how teens feel about their parents' mediation (Clark & Sywyj, 2012). The study does not focus on Latinos in order to attribute any specific characteristics to Latinos as a culture, but to explore the challenges and assets (Alper, Katz, & Clark, 2016) that the technological

cultures of Latino/a teens' homes contributed to their negotiation of ICTs; and the creative ways that they harnessed the resources of their particular situations to do so.

For the purposes of recruitment, a "family" was defined as the individuals living together in a household and a "Latino family" is defined as having at least one Spanish-speaking parent of Latin American heritage. The requirements for inclusion in the study are:

- Family members live in the same household
- Parent(s) and teens both have access to a camera phone or mobile device
- Families contain at least one Spanish speaking parent of Latino/a background who is able to be interviewed and to provide consent for the family's teen participant(s) to be interviewed
- Families contain at least one teen between the ages of 14-16

The age range was chosen to limit the sample to families with teenagers that were in middle adolescence. Children living in the household in between the ages of 8-13 were allowed to participate in the survey and family interview with parental consent, but they were not interviewed individually. Children under eight were also be allowed to participate in the family interview with parental consent, but were not asked to fill out a survey or interviewed individually.

**Participant recruitment.** Recruitment of families was focused on the city of Allentown within the metropolitan area of the Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania because it is a vibrant center of Latino/ a culture. The Lehigh Valley is a metropolitan area of

Pennsylvania consisting of the cities of Easton (27,052), Bethlehem (75,135), and Allentown (119,104) with a combined population of 221, 291 (Census Bureau, 2014). It has a diverse population with a larger Hispanic demographic than the national average (Census Bureau, 2014). Much of that growth is concentrated in the city of Allentown, where Hispanics went from being 24 percent of the population in 2000 to 43 percent in 2010.

Five out of the eight participating families were recruited from the Allentown Public Library, The Literacy Center, and Casa Guadalupe in the city of Allentown, Pennsylvania. In order to recruit from the organizations discussed above the investigator made connections with the directors of each organization and explained the study and the compensation that participants would receive. In each case the directors were interested in the project and accommodating. Fliers were posted in each organization and the investigator made one short presentation to members of Casa Guadalupe and four presentations, four different times to adult students at The Literacy Center. The presentations were all conducted in Spanish. One family was recruited through the Allentown Public Library, three families came through The Literacy Center and one family was recruited through one of the families recruited from The Literacy Center. Another family was recruited through a personal contact who then suggested the family that had been living with them for the last six months. This family was selected because they met the requirements of the study, but in addition, because of the study's interest in physical space and family boundaries and the exploratory value these two families provided through their shared living arrangement.

**Compensation.** Recognizing that participation in the study required a large time commitment, the researcher provided incentives to compensate for participants' time that included: Pizza on the day of the first visit to family households for participants in the family interview and gift cards for parents and teens on the completion of the individual interviews on the second visit. Teens and parents were compensated based on their completion of the study's activities. Each set of parents or single parent were able to collect up to $40 and each teen was able to collect up to $30. Parents received a $40 gift card after the completion of the parental interview. Teens received $15 towards a gift card for the completion of the mapping activity and an additional $15 after the completion of their individual interview. The schedule for rolling compensation was as follows for families, parents, and teens:

Table 3.1. Participant Compensation Schedule

| **Participants** | **Completed Activities** | **Compensation** |
|---|---|---|
| **Families** | Family Interview | Pizza Meal |
| | **Total Compensation for Family Interview** | **Approx. $30** |
| **Parents** | Joint Parent Interview | $40 |
| | **Total Monetary Compensation Per Set of Parents** | **$40** |
| **Teens** | Mapping Activity | $15 |
| | Individual Teen Interview | $15 |
| | **Total Monetary Compensation Per Individual Teen** | **$30** |

**Research process overview.** A survey of family members and a set of three interviews—one with the family, one with the teenager, and one with the teenagers' parents—were carried out for each family over the course of two visits to each family's

home. The first visit (Phase one) took approximately one and a half hours to two hours and included the administration of the survey and the family interview. The survey was filled out by all the family members eight and older participating in the family interview and took about ten minutes to complete. The family interview included all the family members that were willing and able to participate. Seven out of eight of these interviews were conducted mostly in Spanish with some English. Teens and their siblings often switched back and forth from Spanish to English. One family interview was conducted in English. The second visit (Phase two) included an interview with both parents when possible, and a mapping activity and interview with the participating teen. Each family, parent, and teen interview took approximately one to one and a half hours and were audio recorded and transcribed by the researcher and two additional research assistants trained in transcription services. Seven out of eight of the individual parental interviews were conducted in Spanish and one was conducted in English. All eight individual teen interviews were conducted in English. Immediately or very soon after each interview, the interviewer wrote fieldnotes that encapsulated the investigator's experience and impressions of that interview. These fieldnotes helped the investigator maintain a vivid memory of each experience.

***Phase one.*** On the day of the first visit to each residence the researcher arrived at the family household with pizza and juice. This pizza was meant as an ice breaker and to thank family members for participating in the family interview. The pizza was eaten as the research process commenced in some cases, and, in other cases, the family waited until the completion of the interview. During this visit the researcher introduced

the project, had all the participants sign the proper consent forms (parental, informed consent, and informed assent forms) in English and in Spanish for parents that did not speak English, and provided them with copies for their own records (see Appendix H for sample consent forms). During the explanation of the project, participants were told about their rights as research subjects. They were assured that they could skip any question on the survey or the interview that they did not wish to answer and could terminate the interview at any time. They were also told about how the rolling compensation would allow them to collect some compensation even if they did not complete all of the study's components. Additionally, the specific measures that would be taken to secure their privacy were also clarified at this time. The researcher then administered the survey. Following the survey, the researcher initiated the recording device and conducted the family interview. After the interview, a date was scheduled for the second set of interviews.

*Survey.* Before the family interview, surveys were circulated to all participating family members eight and older in English and in Spanish for those parents more comfortable in Spanish. The survey collected knowledge of the spaces that family members chose to use their devices, in order to gain a sense of how teens used space to demarcate their personal boundaries and assemble privacy. Family members were asked to check off boxes and write in textual data indicating demographic information, the technological devices they used in the home, the household spaces they usually used them, and whether they used them while they were with others in those spaces. Participating teens were asked to indicate the physical spaces in the house where they

typically conducted specific ICT activities and whether they did these activities in the specified spaces by themselves and/or with others. This helped the researcher to gain an understanding of each teenagers' PIE. The surveys took approximately ten minutes to fill out and were designed to get a quick inventory of the ICT devices that were used and the physical locations where they were used (see Appendix B for survey instruments).

*Family interview.* The family interview probed the ways technology had been integrated into the everyday routines, habits, and rituals of the family. It also helped provide a sense of the family dynamic and the underlying values that helped to structure how family members took up technology individually and as a family. The eight family interviews included all the members of the household who were willing and able to participate. These in-home family interviews were used to get a glimpse of the technological culture of the family (Silverstone, et al., 1989). Researchers have noted that in-home interviews are particularly beneficial for studying media within families (Lim, 2008; Ling & Thrane, 2001; Morley, 1992; Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morley, 1991;). Silverstone et al. (1991) have discussed the benefits of conducting an in-home interview with the whole family. They said that the family interview,

> provided an opportunity not just to get a sense of how family members displayed or made visible their knowledge of the various forms ICT-related or non-ICT-related activities in the home, but it provided the first opportunity for them to display in their talk the balance of powers within the family, as between husband and wife, as between parents and children…and a first opportunity for the researchers to gain some sense of the family ideology and values of the social organization of the household (p.213).

The family interview followed a semi-structured format in which the researcher asked open-ended questions and then asked follow-up questions to clarify or pursue relevant subject matter. The family interviews began with asking participants to walk through their daily routine and discuss how technologies were integrated into it, starting from when they woke up and began the day, through to work and school, after school, the evening, and bedtime. As they described their day, the researcher probed into how they used ICTs to partition the day, the spaces of the home in which family members used technology, how they negotiated the joint use of ICTs and physical spaces, technology related family rituals, the rules and restrictions for ICT use, and any conflicts these rules created for the family. The researcher was especially attentive to ICT practices, particularly the practices that parents used to mediate and control their teenagers' ICT use, and the ways that teenagers negotiated their ICT use in accordance with familial values and expectations. (see Appendix C for Family Interview Protocol).

***Phase two.*** The subsequent meeting consisted of both the joint parent interview and the individual teen interview. At the beginning of these interviews the researcher reminded the participants of their right to skip any question and terminate the interview at any time. At their conclusion, the researcher presented parents and teens with the gift cards they had earned according to the rolling compensation schedule.

*Parental interview.* The parental interview was conducted with both parents in dual parent households whenever possible, and with one parent in the single parent household included in the study. The interview with parents were semi-structured. This

gave the interviewer the freedom to pursue clarifications and probe further. This interview was meant to provide insight into parental decisions about incorporating technology into the household and its routines. This included the practices parents used to mediate and monitor their teenage children's ICT use, the values that influenced their practices, and the ways they attempted to use their practices to construct a family that was in line with those values.

A more structured survey was included in this interview asking parents about their mediation practices and the help they received from the teen participants. The survey was delivered orally and included fourteen questions where parents were asked to estimate the frequency of each activity on a four-point Likert scale, where very often meant every day, often meant once a week, once in a while meant once a month, or never. Each of these replies were assigned points as follows with never being zero, once in a while being one, often being two, and very often being three. While this part of the individual parental interview was structured as a survey, the interviewer would proceed with each response in a semi-structured format, asking parents to clarify to expand. Their responses were meant simply to provide supplementary data concerning the context of the participating teens' ICT experiences in the home. (see Appendix D for Phase Two Parent Interview Protocol).

To gain a better understanding of how each parent contributed to the technological culture of the family, the researcher made an effort whenever possible to interview both parents together in the two parent households that were included in the

study. While much of the PM literature professes to focus on parents, mothers are generally questioned more often (Austin et al., 1999; Nathanson, 1999; Nathanson, 2002; Valkenburg et al.,1999; Warren, 2005), even though PM has largely been found to be a gendered activity (Louie, 2003; Liau, Khoo, & Ang, 2008) and mothers and fathers have been shown to have different priorities when it comes to parenting media and technology (Lim, 2008). When it was possible, interviewing parents together helped crystalized each of their separate points-of-view and revealed how their individual beliefs and values had become manifested in the parental ICT mediation that had become a part of the family routine. When only one parent was available to be interviewed, that parent was asked about the differences between their and their spouse's beliefs about technology and habits for mediating their teen's ICT practices.

*Mapping activity.* Teens are increasingly seen as capable of competently reporting on their own activities (Hazel, 1995). This study sought to gain in-depth data about teens ICT experiences in their homes from their perspectives, by using a mapping activity adapted from an instrument developed by Katz and Gonzalez (2016). Maps can be helpful in achieving an ecological understanding of a subject area. Mapping has been found to be a useful method by some investigators for use with teenagers (Banerjee & Lynch, 1977; Moore, 1986), but it has not been extensively utilized. In his heavily cited work, Banerjee & Lynch (1977) found asking teens to draw maps of their local environments to be an effective way to gain knowledge about how they viewed them. Moore (1986) also asked youth to draw their favorite places in their neighborhoods. In this way, he was able to collect what he called "turf maps." However, Travlou, Owens,

Thompson, and Maxwell (2008) argue that when teens draw maps they tend to reiterate cultural understandings and that this method does not access teen's personal perceptions. In contrast, they contend that map reading gives teens the opportunity to talk about their experience of the space and that their accounts will include their preferences, dislikes, how they move though the space and use it, and how social others fit in. For this reason, teens were asked to both make maps of their home spaces and to read and explain their maps to the investigator during their individual interviews. In the mapping activity, participating teens were instructed to make a map of the rooms in their home where they used ICTs. They were asked to include the devices that were located in those rooms, the devices that they utilized in those rooms, and where they and other family members generally situated themselves while in those spaces. Teens were then questioned about their maps within their individual interviews. These questions probed into their and their family's use of the spaces in relation to their use of ICTs. The mapping activity was useful toward understanding how ICTs were related to teens' use and movement through the physical spaces of the home, and how other family members were integrated (see Appendix E for the Mapping Protocol).

*Teen interview.* Many researchers have used interviews to gain information about adolescents' information practices (Ito et al. 2008; Read et al., 2012) and social privacy practices (boyd, 2014; Grinter & Palen, 2002; Ito, 2005; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Vickery, 2015) from their point of view. Individual semi-structured interviews with teens were conducted to assist the researcher to understand the kinds of practices that teens used to negotiate their ICT use in accordance with their familial small worlds. As

discussed above, teens individual interviews began with questions about the map they had drawn of the various physical spaces in the home where ICT devices were located. This study sought to understand teens use of ICTs and the physical spaces of their homes from their perspectives. Participating teens were then asked about their routines, their ICT habits, their preferences about where they use ICTs, how they go about sharing the ICT devices and the physical spaces of the home, how they negotiated the collapsed context of social media, and about their experience of their parents' ICT mediation. They were also questioned about the underlying feelings and meanings that make up the context of their experiences using ICTs in accordance with the small world of their families.

Within the semi-structured individual interview given to teens were four short structured surveys that included 14 questions about their parents' mediation practices, 16 questions about their practices managing their parents' mediation and assisting their parents and siblings, nine questions about different locations they might use ICTs, and 12 questions about their participation in certain ICT activities. For each question teens were asked to estimate the frequency of each activity on a four-point Likert scale, where "very often" meant every day, "often" meant once a week, "once in a while" meant once a month, and "never" was never. Each of these replies were assigned one point with never being zero, once in a while being one, often being two, and very often being three. While this part of the individual teen interview was structured as a survey on a scale, the interviewer would often proceed with each response in a semi-structured format, asking teens to clarify, to expand, or for an example. These questions are meant

to collect an inventory of various factors that might influence teens' information ecologies and the extension of their personal ICT spheres of interaction. They were meant to help provide descriptive data concerning the context of the ICT experiences of the teens in the sample and make basic comparisons (see Appendix D for the Teen Interview Protocol).

**Ethical Issues**

In any research dealing with human subjects it is important that ethical considerations be taken seriously. This becomes especially true when the study involves working with vulnerable populations. To minimize risks, the proposed study complied with all Rutgers University IRB human subject protocols and received approval from the Institutional Review Board. The researcher, as well as the additional assistants that assisted with transcribing interviews, completed the additional required CITI human subject protection training. IRB compliance involved providing participants with parental consent forms, informed consent forms, and assent forms that included a description of the project, participants' rights as research subjects, contact information for the researcher, the researcher's advisor, the review board, and the specific measures that would be taken to insure participants' privacy. They were then provided with a copy for their records.

While this study is primarily interested in teenagers between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, as noted above, the participants' siblings were able to participate with parental consent.

Participants' privacy was protected by securing the audio recordings of the interviews on a password protected computer and their transcripts in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home. All parental consent, consent, and assent forms are being kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home. Participants are being kept confidential and pseudonyms and numbers, such as Teen 1, were used in the transcripts and analysis, and will also be used in any published reports or conference proceedings. A linking list connecting participants' names with their pseudonyms and numbers was not kept. After ten years the interview recording will be deleted.

Participants were told at both the initial meeting and then reminded again prior to their individual interviews that they could skip any question and stop the interview at any time without needing to provide any explanation. As noted above, the study had a rolling compensation and participants would be able to collect some recompense even if they did not complete all the study's components.

Additionally, as this study is focused on PM, including parental monitoring, and privacy information practices within the family, the possible dangers to having privacy breached by other family members needed to be addressed. The research process was carefully considered and designed in order to minimize any risks to family members. This included not asking teens about their personal methods of seeking out privacy or parents about their methods for monitoring their teenagers' ICT use during the family interview when the whole family was present. Such inquiries were reserved for the separate interviews with parents and teens. Both the parent and teen individual

interviews were conducted in as private a setting as possible, and the content of teen interviews was not reviewed with parents or vice versa. Assurance that the interviews would not be shared was included in the parental consent, consent and assent forms and explained during the initial description of the project. When a secluded location for the interview could not be secured for either interview, the researcher took lack of privacy into consideration when asking questions, avoiding any question about personal practices that might not be known to the opposite party.

While the interview questions were not meant to cause any distress, there is always the possibility that a participant might become upset or reveal some deep personal problem. If this happened the researcher had a contingency plan to attempt to diffuse the emotional response and ask participants if they wanted to terminate the interview. Furthermore, if it had been deemed appropriate, the researcher would have provided subjects with a referral to a counselor to whom it would be convenient for them to access and a list of counselors in the area was provided in all the consent forms. This was not necessary, as no distress was evident.

**Data Collection**

The researcher collected various types of data that were then analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The units of analysis were the responses from each teen, parents, the parent/ teen dyad, and the family. The interviews were analyzed for what they contributed to knowledge of parent and teen practices, but were also understood as a part of a trio of familial texts that each provided a partial view of

individual and family practices. The surveys that participants eight and older completed collected general demographic information and data about the household locations in which they used various ICT devices. This included checking boxes and providing short answer free response data. Additionally, one short survey concerning parents' mediation of teens' ICT activities and the assistance teens provide them was given to parents as a part of the individual parental interview. Parents were instructed to respond as to the frequency of certain practices on a four point Likert scale. Four short surveys were also included within the teen interviews. Teens' responses of frequency were also structured as a four-point Likert scale that would demonstrate their impression of the frequency of some basic PM activities, their practices to evade mediation, their use of ICT devices in some select locations outside of the home, and their participation in some basic ICT activities.

Responses to the surveys were analyzed with descriptive statistics and used to supplement the qualitative data. The small sample size precludes making any generalizations from the data in the surveys to the greater population. The responses by parents and teens to these oral survey questions in their individual interviews were meant to impart a fuller description of each teens' PIE. These also provided basic data to make comparisons among teens and families.

The mapping contribution by teen participants was used to help elicit and direct interviews with teens and provide context for their accounts. Teens were asked a number of questions in their individual interviews about the maps that they had drawn

and their responses were coded as a part of their interviews. Teens' maps in conjunction with their responses to the questions in their individual interviews related to the maps, supplied valuable information concerning the spatialization of ICT devices and how they and their families used the physical spaces of the home.

The interviews with families, parents and teens provided the foundation for this study. These interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed by the researcher and two research assistants trained in transcription. The fieldnotes that the researcher took immediately or soon after each interview served to provide a record of the interviewers' experience and initial impressions. All the interviews were transcribed verbatim as Wengraff (2001) suggests. The transcriptions were then organized and coded by the principal researcher using NVivo qualitative coding software. The amount of text that was coded was determined according to meaning and some blocks of text were coded in multiple categories.

**Analysis**

Constructivist analysis helped the researcher approach the data with an eye to the performative nature of participants' statements. Constructivists believe that people use their accounts to position themselves in relation to others and present themselves as they wish to be seen. They "do not approach the research participants statements as 'raw data' that might be unproblematically analyzed so as to get us close to 'the truth,' but as conditional statements made in a particular context and which of necessity require interpretation (Hoover et al., 2004, p.30). While this study is very interested in

specific ICT practices, it also considered how participants were using their accounts of their practices to construct their own and their family's identities in relation to one another. The analysis concentrated more on how participants saw their world, their actions, and their practices than in the truth value of their statements. For this reason, the analysis focused on participants' perspectives, practices and language forms. The words, phrases, and expressions that constituted individuals' language forms, "condense[d] meanings" and revealed the context from which a participant was speaking (Connaway & Radford, 2017) and how they were attempting to position themselves in relation to their family members and the broader culture. Grounded theorists refer to these kind of participant terms as *in vivo codes* (Charmaz, 2014). Charmaz notes that "[u]npacking such terms gives you an opportunity not only to understand implicit meanings and actions but also to make comparisons between data" (p.134) and that these types of language forms will "anchor your analysis in your research participants' worlds" (p.135).

With these considerations in mind, a three phase analysis was conducted. The first phase began while the first six interviews from the first two participating families were being collected. During this phase, the investigater organized and coded the first six interviews using NVivo qualitative coding software according to a theoretically driven coding scheme developed based on findings from the pilot study and the literature review. NVivo was used to organize the data and to conduct queries. While the coding scheme developed by the author had been designed to elucidate on themes and practices present in the research, the exploratory nature of this study portended the

importance of staying open to meanings, practices, and themes that became apparent in the data and were not represented in the initial codebook. At this time and throughout the process, the investigator wrote approximately 100 "memos" that commented on how well phenomena fit into the categories and made comparisons to correspondingly coded data in other interviews (Campbell, et al. 2013; Charmaz, 2014). This way of comparing codes with data was meant to allow the researcher to spot significant overlapping themes between data, identify the most useful codes, and identify gaps in the coding scheme in order to adapt the codebook to better fit the data.

In the second phase of data analysis, the investigator coded six additional transcripts according to Taylor and Bogdan's (1998) constant comparative method. This method involves the simultaneous coding and analysis of data. The transcripts were repeatedly read and the participants' words, phrases, and activities were assessed for patterns pertaining to teens and parents' ICT practices and the dynamic between them. As patterns began to emerge related to parents' ICT mediation practices and teens' family small world ICT practices the initial codebook was altered and expanded to produce a codebook typology for each of these major themes. (see Appendix F and G for the adjusted typology codebooks.). All 24 interviews were then coded in NVivo according to these codebooks and more fine-grained classifications emerged as subthemes and categories of those themes.

In the third phase of analysis the survey data was assembled to present the participant demographics and supplement the interviews. In addition, demographic data from the surveys, the teen mapping activity, fieldnotes, audio recordings, and

transcripts from all the interviews were used to construct a portrait of each household participating in the study and an inventory of the ICT devices in each home. (see Table 4.6 in Chapter 4 for an inventory of houshold technologies by household)

Data contiued to be collected throughout the research process until the researcher had completed 3 interviews with all 8 participant families. The three-phase approach used in this study enabled the researcher to construct a "multidimensional" understanding of the data, using both emic and etic data (Connaway & Radford, 2017). The initial theoretically driven coding scheme contributed etic data by providing an analytic framework that connected the raw data to the "conceptual categories" of the varied disciplines discussed in the literature, while the interviews and maps elicited for the study provided emic data that was used to understand the participants' cultures through their eyes and expand the analysis beyond what is already established within the research literature. By continuing to make adjustments to the codebook and analysis throughout the research process according to Taylor and Bogdan's (1998) constant comparative method, the investigator was able to develop an analysis that expanded the initial conceptual categories into a new theoretical framework. (see Tables 5.1 and 6.1 for PM Practices and Teen Family Small World ICT Practices typologies and Appendices F and G for the typology codebooks with definitions and examples).

This chapter has presented the methods and analysis that were used for this project. The following four chapters, Chapters 4-7, present the findings, beginning in Chapter 4 with the participant demographics and portraits of each family.

# Chapter 4 : Demographics and Family Portraits

## Introduction and Organization of Findings Chapters

Chapters 4-7 describe the results of the data collection and demonstrate the interpretation that the investigator has determined from the evidence provided by the participants' surveys, maps, and interviews. The process of collecting data was designed to provide the investigator with information about the dynamic between teens and their parents in relation to Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) within the family context and answer the Research Questions (see page x). Because of the large amount of qualitative findings resulting from analysis, there are four chapters devoted to findings: Chapters 4-7. The contents of each chapter are briefly described below.

**Overview of Chapter 4.** Chapter 4 begins with the participant demographics and the similarities and variations among the eight Latino/a families that participated in the study. After this, a portrait of each family is provided. These portraits are derived from the surveys, fieldnotes, and interviews, as described in Chapter 3, and they are presented to provide a picture of the situation of each family and how the dynamic between teens and their parents functioned within the small world of their families.

**Overview of Chapter 5.** Chapter 5 addresses parental ICT mediation practices. It begins with a presentation of the parental mediation typology that was developed from analysis of the fieldnotes, audio recording and transcripts of the family, parent, and teen interviews. Parents were found to mediate their teens' ICT interactions through restrictive mediation, active mediation, control over ICT devices, parental monitoring,

the provision of privacy, and social media. The results for the major qualitative themes and subthemes will be explicated and illustrated with quotations, as appropriate.

**Overview of Chapter 6.** Chapter 6 presents findings related to RQ 2a concerning teens' family small world ICT practices in relation to their resources. Chapter 6 beings with a full typology of teens' ICT practices. The typology is separated into two overarching themes that relate to RQ 2a and RQ 2b—negotiation of resources and negotiation of interpersonal relationships—and are presented in Chapters 6 and 7. The findings for the typology and the resulting chapters were derived from the teen surveys, mapping activity, and family, parent, and teen interviews. Chapter 6 adresses teens' negotiation of their resources. As a part of their membership in the family small world, teens needed to manage the resources that were available to them in the home, including the use of ICT devices, physical space, ICT content and interactions, and Internet access.

**Overview of Chapter 7.** Chapter 7 presents the findings of RQ 2b concerning teens' negotiation of their interpersonal relationships in relation to ICTs and their family small world. The major qualitative themes of the typology related to teens' negotiation of their relationships are parental authority, social worlds, mental states, and social media.

This section has presented an overview Chapters 4-7. These chapters will present the results for the major qualitative themes that were discovered in the data relating to RQ 1 and RQ 2, RQ 2a, RQ 2b and will be illustrated with quotations, as

appropriate to exemplify these themes. The next section will begin the presentation of the findings by describing the participant demographics and providing short portrait of each family.

**Demographics and Family Descriptions**

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 3.8 million 14-16-year-old Hispanic/Latino teens within a community 56.6 million Hispanic/Latino in the U.S. that make-up 17.6 % of the total population (Census Bureau, 2015). However, these statistics do not represent the diversity within the Latino/a community. Latino/as hail from many countries, racial categories, economic groups, cultural affiliations and have very different historical experiences in the U.S. (Weaver, Umaña-Taylor, Hans, J. D., & Malia, 2001), but they are often studied as if they are a homogenous group. Research investigating Latino/as has primarily focused on low-income Mexican families with results being generalized to the entire population (Zambrana, 2011). However, investigations are needed (such as the present dissertation) that include other populations in order to accurately represent the diversity within the Latino/a community, and to avoid misrepresenting their experiences.

This dissertation focuses on the families of eight, first generation 14-16-year-olds living in the northeast that have migrated from Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic across a variety of socio-economic and educational categories. Puerto Rican and Dominicans are underrepresented in research on Latino/as (Zambrana, 2011), despite being within the top five most populous Latin-American communities in the U.S. (Lopez

& Dockterman, 2011). Investigations that represent the diversity of the Latino/a community in relation to information use and competence are essential because information competence has been shown to be related to demographics in complicated ways. Low income does not directly lead to less access. Less access does not directly correlate with low levels of ICT competence levels, and having parents with higher education does not directly correspond with higher competence levels (Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008). While it is known that parents that are more educated and technologically proficient can provide their children with more support (Facer et al., 2003; Seiter, 2008), it is unclear how these factors influence their children's ICT competence or the dynamics that develop around ICTs in these homes.

It is also important to situate the participating families in relation to the experiences of the Latino/a community as a whole in the U.S., as variations can have a large bearing on how they acculturate into majority culture, as well as parenting and teens' likelihood of complying with their parents. Findings by Gomez, Booth, and Katz (2011) suggest that Latino/a teens showed more deference to their parents because of their understanding of their parents' vulnerabilities, such as low English and technical proficiency. Parents' vulnerabilities and the roles teens take up in the home around ICTs may be quite different, depending on their migration process. Latino/as from different regions have very dissimilar experiences of immigration. For instance, many Cubans migrated to the U.S as political refugees and were generally fairly affluent when they came, while Mexicans have usually migrated for economic reasons (Weaver et al., 2001) and are more likely to be or have undocumented family members making their

situations more precarious. In contrast, by virtue of being U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans have more flexibility and freedom of mobility than other groups. Dominicans also have a high rate of immigration and many cultural similarities to Puerto Ricans (Durand, Telles, & Flashman, 2006), which may make their immigration experience easier. Variations can also exist between the regions of the U.S. to which Latino/as choose to migrate. For example, Puerto Ricans living in the South and West have had more success improving their economic status than those in the Northeast (Marzan, 2009). Issues like these will affect the education individuals achieve, employment they will be able to find, the money that will be available for tech purchases, and the confidence parents will have to participate in their communities, which will all contribute to the specific ICT culture that develops in their families.

This section as situated the participants within a cultural context. The next section will present the demographic results.

**Demographic Results.** As described in Chapter 3, Methods eight families with a total of 30 individuals participated. Table 4.1 summarizes participant demographics for each family, including the children's ages, their country of origin, years in mainland U.S., annual combined income, parental education, and the number of members in each family. To protect the anonymity of the participants, pseudonyms are used in the table, and the portrait section of the dissertation and numbers are used in the findings and discussion sections, for example, Teen 3 represents the participating teen from family 3 and Mom 5 represents the Mom from family 5. Numbers are used within the main

portion of the findings in order to discuss individual family members, and to maintain the connection of each individual to their corresponding family. Table 4.2 summarizes the participants by type. Table 4.3 summarizes the teen participants by age. Table 4.4 summarizes the gender of participants and Table 4.5 summarizes the number and type of interviews.

Table 4.1. Participant Demographics by Family
(names are changed to protect participants' anonymity)

| Families | Country of Origin | Years in Mainland U.S. | Annual Combined Income | Parental Education | # of Family Member Participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Family 1: Cardona family; Maria, Lina (14), and Juan (9); Lina's father did not participate. | Dominican Republic | 12 | NA | Father NA; Mother graduated from high school | 3 |
| Family 2: Mendoza Family; Andrea, Eduardo, Isa (14), Yenny(11), Marivella (10), Alisa(9), Leticia (7), | Dominican Republic | Father 12; Family 6 | $20,000-$40,000 | Father did some high school; mother graduated from college | 7 |
| Family 3: The Mendez Family; Martina, Jose, and Jorge (16), plus five younger siblings that did not participate. | Puerto Rico | NA, but Jorge was born in mainland U.S. | $40,000-$60,000 | Father graduated from high school; mother did some high school | 3 |
| Family 4: The Lopez family; Yolanda and Felipe (16). | Puerto Rico | 2 | < $20,000 | Mother did some college | 2 |
| Family 5: The Gonzalez Family; Marta, Carlos (14), Tina (20), Mindy (7); Carlos's step brother and step father did not participate. | Dominican Republic by way of Puerto Rico | 6 | $20,000-$40,000 | Father NA; Mother did some high school | 4 |
| Family 6: The Perez Family; Diego, Mateo (15), and Mia (7); Mateo's mother and older sister did not participate. | Dominican Republic | 11 | < $20,000 | Father graduated from high school; mother NA | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Family 7: The Baldez family; Carla, Hernan, Lisa (15), and Camila (11) | Dominican Republic | 8 | $40,000-$60,000 | Father has PhD; Mother has a Master's Degree | 4 |
| Family 8: The Mejia Family; Thialgo, Guadalupe, Angel (19), and Victoria (20) | Dominican Republic | 7 | $60,000-$80,000 | Father has Master's Degree, Mother did some college | 4 |
| Total number of participants | | | | | 30 |

Table 4.2. Summary of Interview Participants by Type

| **Participants** | |
|---|---|
| Total number of participants | 30 |
| Number of 14-16 yr old participants | 8 |
| Number of teens' sibling participants | 10 |
| Number of parent participants | 12 |

Table 4.3. Summary of Interview Participants by Age

| **Number of Teen Participants by Age** | |
|---|---|
| Number of 14-year-olds | 4(50%)* |
| Number of 15-year-olds | 2(25%)* |
| Number of 16-year-olds | 2 (25%)* |
| *Percentage indicates the percent of the participating 14-16-year-old teens in the sample | |

Table 4.4. Summary of Participant Genders

| **Number of Participants by Gender** | |
|---|---|
| Male parent participants | 5 (41%)* |
| Female parent participants | 7 (58%)* |
| Male 14-16-year-old teens | 4 (50%)** |
| Female 14-16-year-old teens | 4 (50 %)** |
| Male teen siblings | 2 (20%)*** |
| Female teen siblings | 8 (80 %)*** |
| * Percentage of parent participants<br>**Percentage of the participating 14-16-year-old teens<br>*** Percentage of teens' sibling participants | |

Table 4.5. Summary of Interviews by Type

| **Number of Interviews by Type** | |
|---|---|
| Total number of family, parent, and teen interviews | 24 |
| Number of family interviews | 8 |
| Number of parent interviews | 8 |
| Number of teen interviews | 8 |
| Interviews conducted in English | 10 (42%)* |
| Interviews conducted in Spanish | 14 (58%)* |

**Inventory of devices.** To aid the analysis of teens' negotiation of ICT devices in accordance with the family small world an inventory of ICT devices that were present in the participants' households at the time of the interviews was assembled using data from the surveys, the mapping activity, and all interviews. The collected inventory revealed that all teens had access to at least two devices in their households, though there was a large range in the quantity of ICT devices that different families owned. Table 4.6 shows the devices available in each of the families' households. There was a significant range in the quantity of devices between households with families 2 and 4 having less than five devices and family 3 having twenty. The household mean was approximately eleven devices.

Analysis of the data demonstrated that the number of devices in each household did not directly correspond to teens' ICT use in the home. There were large differences in teens' use of the different devices present in the home for a variety of reasons. Table 4.6 shows the devices available in the home, the devices that were personal to the participating teens, and those that teens had access to. Access in this sense means, refers to the devices in the home that teens used. The table shows that the number of devices that teens used was different than the number that were available in the home.

Table 4.6. Devices per Family, per Teen, and Home Access per Teen

| Families | TVs | Laptops | Desktop computers | Tablets | Gaming systems | Smartphones | Total Devices |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Family 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Teen 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Access | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Family 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Teen 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Access | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Family 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 20 |
| Teen 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Access | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 11 |
| Family 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Teen 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Access | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Family 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| Teen 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Access | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Family 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| Teen 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Access | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Family 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 17 |
| Teen 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Access | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Family 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 17 |
| Teen 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Access | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | **5** |

**Variations among families.** The eight families met certain standards to be selected to participate (as described in Chapter 4), but beyond these qualifiers there was a large amount of variation within the sample. As seen in Table 4.6, six (75%) of the participating families came to the U.S. from the Dominican Republic, although one came by way of Puerto Rico, and two families (25%) were from Puerto Rico. The families ranged from 2-12 years in the U.S.. The parents from family 3 did not provide the

number of years each had been in the U.S., but Teen 3 was born in the U.S. He was the only teenager in the sample that was born in the U.S. and he had the only parents that were completely fluent in English. The median of time in the U.S. for the remainder of the parents that participated was 7.5 years and the mean was 7.9 years. There was also variation in English fluency, socio-economic means, and education, as described below.

***English language fluency.*** The parents in the sample varied in their level of English proficiency in a way that is difficult to quantify. The parents of Teen 3 spoke English, but they had both mostly been raised on mainland U. S. All of the rest of the parents were more comfortable speaking Spanish. The mothers from Family 1, 2, and 7 understood some English. The mother of Family 4 and the fathers from 7 and 8 understood English and could make themselves understood in English, but were much more proficient in Spanish. Many of the parents sometimes peppered their Spanish responses with English phrases or words. All of the teens in the study spoke English very well. Teen 4 was the least comfortable, but still fairly proficient.

***Occupation and socio-economics.*** The mother and father from family 7 and the father from family 8 had professional jobs (2 families, 25%). Though they only worked part time, they used computers regularly in their jobs. The other parents had less fluency with ICTs, except for the father from family 3 who was a gamer. Most of the parents in the sample worked in low wage blue collar jobs. Two mothers worked in child care (F1 and 8), one was school bus driver (F2), and one worked at a big box store (F4). There was one mother that was unemployed (F5). Additionally, there was one

father that worked maintenance (family 6), one that was a laid-off fork-lift operator (F3), and one that was on disability (F2).

The mother from Family 1 did not provide the annual combined income for her family, and the rest of the families ranged from less than $20,000 for families 4 and 6 to $60,000-$80,000 in family 8. Two families (25%) had an annual combined income less than $20,000, two families (25%) had an annual combined income of $20,000-40,000, two families (25%) had an annual combined income of $40,000-$60,000, and one family (12.5 %) had an annual combined income of $60,000-$80,000. The number of family members is important to this quantity, as there were a number of large families in the sample. The families ranged from 2- 8 members, with a median of 4 members and a mean of 4.8 members (see Table 4.1, above).

***Education.*** The parents also varied quite a bit in their level of formal education. Of the 12 parents that participated, three (25%) parents had completed some high school, three (25%) had graduated from high school, two (17%) had completed some college, one (8%) had graduated from college, and three (25%) had graduate degrees.

As revealed in the interviews the level of formal education parents achieved had some connection with parents' comfort level with ICTs, with those with more formal education (P7 and 8) generally being more comfortable with ICT use. These parents also had jobs that were more information intense, one working in IT. However, the father from Family 3, who had graduated from high school, was very adept with technology and the mother from Family 1, also a high school graduate, did all of the ICT related

roles, such as research, installation, and maintenance, in her family and was fairly comfortable.

**Family Portraits**

In the following section portraits of each of the eight families have been assembled to provide an introduction to the Information Communication Technology (ICT) culture and dynamic between teens and their parents in each home. The portraits are summaries of the families' circumstances during the time of the data collection. They have been assembled through the various forms of data collected during the study including: demographic data from the surveys, the teen mapping activity, and the fieldnotes, audio recordings, and transcripts from the family, parent and teen interviews (see Chapter 3). The survey data provided information concerning the number of family members living in the household, the age of the children, parental occupation, the country of origin, and the number of years they had been in mainland US. Fieldnotes from the interviews provided information from the observations that the investigator made at the time of the interviews. This information concerned the appearance of the participants and the family home, their English language proficiency, their personalities and idiosyncrasies, and the dynamic between family members. The mapping activity provided data about ICT device location and the family members' use of physical spaces. Finally, the interviews provided contextual information about the family, and data concerning parents and teens' beliefs and practices in relation to ICTs.

**Family 1: The Cardona family.** The Cardona family was a family of four: Maria (approximately 36), Lina (daughter, 14), Juan (son, 9), and a father that did not

participate. This was one of the two families wherein the mother demonstrated the highest degree of monitoring and level of control over her teenager. In this case, Maria's parenting was also the best example of what Lareau (2011) calls concerted cultivation, in which parents cultivate their children by enrolling them in activities conceived to enhance their development and future. Maria was invested in getting her teen daughter, Lina, into an elite college on a scholarship and kept her busy with extracurricular activities that she thought would help her daughter achieve this goal. She had supplied her daughter with numerous ICT devices and encouraged her to explore the Internet, but she also maintained a high-level of control by demanding passwords be shared, randomly taking her daughter's devices so that she would not learn to depend on them, and by monitoring her daughter's Internet history and all her communications with her peers.

Her daughter, Lina was reticent and answered all of the investigators questions as briefly as possible. She only perked up when discussing how she had fashioned to present herself on Instagram to display her talents and achievements. The dynamic between Maria and Lina around ICTs indicated in the interviews suggested that Lina negotiated the expectations and constraints of her family's small world by limiting her interactions with her peers in order to comply with her mothers' expectations and thereby restricting her own information ecology.

**Family 2: Mendoza family.** The Mendoza was a large family of seven: Andrea (mother, 36), Eduardo (father, approximately 42), Isa (daughter, 14), Yenny (daughter,

11), Marivella (daughter, 10), Alisa (daughter, 9), and Leticia (daughter, 7). They were a friendly, warm, and close-knit Dominican family with strong family small world boundaries that are facilitated by their group understanding of themselves as different from outsiders. Andrea and Eduardo had limited English proficiency and technical skills. As the oldest sibling, Isa was frequently responsible for brokering her parents' ICT interactions and assisting them with technical issues. Andrea and Eduardo had a negative view of technology and were hesitant to incorporate new ICTs into the household, fearing the dangers they believe the Internet posed to their daughters and the disruption it might cause to their familial culture. However, they did believe that access to some technology was a necessity and had both acquired a smartphone and a laptop for their daughters to share for educational use, that Eduardo's younger brother helped them maintain.

Though Isa's parents each had their own smart phone they were ambivalent about acquiring one for her. Isa was the only teen in the study without her own smart phone. She would have liked to have had one, but she had also internalized her family's motto to "be different" and was very accepting of their views and decision. She had a multitude of creative ways to negotiate the constraints to her access that her family small world imposed on her and had a tendency to frame all of her constraints from a positive angle. In this way, she was able to fulfill most of the expectations from her various social worlds and maintain the equilibrium of her membership in her family small world.

**Family 3: The Mendez family.** The Mendez family had eight members that included Martina (mother, 34), Jose (stepfather, approximately 33), Jorge (eldest son, 16), and five younger siblings that did not participate. They were one of two Puerto Rican families participating in the study and Jorge was the only teen in the study that was born in mainland US. The family lived on the south side of Allentown; an area that is considered dangerous by Lehigh Valley natives. Martina and Jose strived to protect Jorge and their other children from the neighborhood, estranged family, and a world that they believed was unpredictable and dangerous and had forbidden them to leave the home (unaccompanied by one of them) beyond school and an after-school program. In order to keep their children occupied and divert their attention from the physical outside world, they had provided them with an abundance of ICT devices and applications.

Jose was laid off at the time of the interviews and Martina worked long hours in food service to support the family. Jorge was often responsible for his siblings and when they discussed caregiving his inclusion in the parental unit was implicit. Martina and Jose tightly controlled and monitored their younger children's interactions with ICTs, but had decided that Jorge had earned their trust. They no longer actively monitored him and allowed him privacy and autonomy over his own ICT use. Jose was a gamer and had encouraged Jorge's gaming since he was very young, even teaching him how to read using video games. Jorge's affinity for gaming had inspired him to be a video game designer and he and his parents viewed his gaming as a gateway to a professional career. Jorge had internalized his parents' beliefs about the neighborhood and accepted

his parents' reluctance to allow him to socialize outside the household. Instead he had turned to his gaming to fulfill his need for social connection and his teammates had become his best friends.

**Family 4: The Lopez family.** The Lopez family was a single-parent household with two members: Yolanda (mother, approximately 42) and Felipe (son, 16). They were the second Puerto Rican family in the study and had been in the area for two years. A lack of resources that had been exacerbated by his mother's ICT mediation made Felipe's personal information ecology (PIE) the most constrained teenager within the study's families. Both Yolanda and Felipe had smart phones, but there were no other ICT devices in the home. Moreover, Yolanda had intentionally limited his data in order to limit and control his access to the Internet in response to finding pornography on Felipe's phone that went against her strong religious beliefs. The limitation of data on his smart phone led Felipe to prioritize his data use for social media and limit activities such as searching for information. Yolanda had also taken away his video games and made him delete the games on his phone that he played online with his friends.

Although Yolanda used an authoritarian parenting style (Baumrind, 1967) with Felipe, they were very close and he was very open with her. They spent a lot of time together and he disclosed information about his actions and communications and when she asked. He accepted his mother's restrictions, knowing there would be consequences, such as the removal of his phone, if he opposed her. To meet the ICT expectations of his academic small world in accordance with his family small world,

Felipe had developed a routine utilizing the school's computers. However, in other areas he managed his ICT interactions in a way that had led him to limit his personal information ecology, including his ability to make social connections and conform to peer expectations.

**Family 5: The Gonzalez family.** The Gonzalez family was a large blended family of six consisting of Marta (mother, approximately 38), Carlos (son, 14), Tina (daughter, 20), Mindy (daughter, 7), and two remaining family members that were not able to participate in the study. The family went from the Dominican Republic to Puerto Rico fifteen years ago and had been in mainland U.S. in the Lehigh Valley for the last six years. Marta was not proficient in English and had limited technical knowledge. Carlos and his older sister did the research, installation, and maintenance of the family ICT devices. They also often provided technical assistance and some mediation of their younger sister.

Marta had an easy relaxed parenting style and she and her husband had provided their children with their own devices. Carlos had his own smart phone and laptop. He was an avid gamer and referred to himself as addicted. He played League of Legends with his friends over Skype on his laptop from his hub space in the living room, where the family often congregates. In the past Marta had attempted to limit what she felt was excessive gaming, but she had decided that it was more important to preserve family harmony. Instead she chose to prioritize the completion of his academic and family responsibilities. If he did not fulfill those responsibilities she would threaten to

take his devices. She said this practice was usually successful. Carlos admitted to pushing back on her attempts to regulate his gaming, but was a very good student, generally respectful, and made sure he had done all his homework and chores before he started gaming for the evening.

**Family 6: The Perez family.** The Perez family was a family of five, but only Diego (father, approximately 34), Mateo (son, 15), and Mia (daughter, 5), were present for the interviews. The family came to the U.S. from the Dominican Republic eleven years ago. Diego worked second shift in maintenance during the week and his wife worked in another state every weekend. Neither parent was proficient in English or technically inclined. Mateo regularly brokered his parents' connections with ICTs. He also served as the resident technology expert and was responsible for the ICT research, installation, and maintenance. He had used YouTube and Reddit to learn about technology and was very knowledgeable about the technical aspects of computers, and even boasted that he knew how to build them. Mateo's interview was the longest interview in the sample. Mateo was eager to discuss his habits and took pains to differentiate himself from his parents. His father's interview was the shortest in the sample. He seemed uncomfortable and surprised that the investigator wanted to know more about his son's ICT use than his.

Everyone in the Perez family spent most of their time in the living room when they were home, but they were independently focused, each doing their own thing. The house was small and there was very little private space. His parents shared a bedroom

with his younger sister and his bedroom was a walkthrough that was used to get to the downstairs bathroom. Mateo's parents placed the desktop computer in the living room in order to supervise their children's interactions with ICTs and consequently did not feel the need to put many limitations on their ICT use. Though his parents believed they knew what he was doing on the computer, Mateo said that they had no knowledge of his activities. This was partially because he minimized pages and changed his ICT activity according to the context, but mostly because he felt secure that they did not know what he was doing, due to their limited English skills and their lack of attention.

**Family 7: The Baldez family.** The Baldez family was a family of four consisting of Carla (mother, approximately 36), Hernan (father, approximately 42), Lisa (daughter, 15), and Camila (daughter, 11). They came to the Lehigh Valley six years ago from the Dominican Republic for work. They have a medium sized, three bedrooms, unattached home in a in fairly affluent part of town that they were currently sharing with the Mejia family, the eighth family in the study. The Baldez and Mejia families were the only families in the study cohabitating with another family. The mothers of both families (Carla & Guadalupe) were sisters. Lisa shared a bedroom with her younger sister and cousin, but lamented the loss of her personal space in the home. Carla and Hernan were the only parents in the study that both had graduate degrees and worked in white collar jobs, each working part-time as a mental health counselor. Carla, Hernan, and Lisa each had their own smart phone and Camila had her own tablet. There was also a range of other devices in the home. Lisa's parents used technology often in their work and for entertainment. Carla spoke little English and both parents were more comfortable in

Spanish. Lisa helped mediate her younger sister's ICT interactions and occasional helped her mother with technical and brokering tasks. Her father was fairly technologically adept and responsible for most of the technical tasks in the household.

Lisa's parents had given Lisa more freedom to make her own choices as she had gotten older. She and her parents had a balance of trust that was based on Lisa being open about her ICT activities and their providing her with the autonomy to control her own ICT interactions. If they asked to see her phone or accounts she disclosed them, but they did not often ask. Lisa shared her mother's Instagram account and was friends with her mother on Snapchat. Carla had instructed Lisa to take down posts she found inappropriate on a few occasions, which Lisa had found irritating. Lisa often censored and obscured her posts to make them more appropriate for her mother to read, but she also posted to her mother's account in ways that directly engaged her mother in an affectionate way.

**Family 8: The Mejia family.** The Mejia family was a family of four that included Thialgo (father, approximately 40), Guadalupe (mother, approximately 40), Angel (son, 19), and Lisa (daughter, 14). They came to the Lehigh Valley from the Dominican Republic seven years ago for an IT job Thialgo acquired at a mental health facility in the area. They were currently living with Guadalupe's sister's family, the Baldez family, and had been staying with them for approximately six months. Thialgo had a graduate degree and worked part-time in IT and Guadalupe worked fulltime in a day care. The Mejia family was shy and Thialgo was often the one to respond to the investigators

questions. He spoke slowly and methodically. Victoria was the most restrained teen in the study. She answered briefly, often only nodding or shaking her head.

All four Mejia family members had their own smartphone and Angel had a TV and a gaming device in his room. There was also a range of other ICT devices in the home. Victoria shared a room with her cousins, Lisa and Camila. Thialgo viewed ICTs as tools and their use as a skill. Guadalupe was a bit more uneasy with technology, but let her husband lead as the expert in the family. They believed that ICT mediation was best handled through discussion and guidance and allowed their children autonomy to make their own ICT choices. They believed that they could not control their teenagers when they were not present and that the most effective way to influence them was by sharing their beliefs and allowing them to decide for themselves. The only rule that they consistently enforced was bedtime.

**Overview of families.** This section has presented a portrait of each of the eight families in the study. The portraits provide a holistic overview of the context of each family and how the various issues that are discussed later in this chapter by research question fit in. Each family had its own ICT culture of routine practices that was situated within the particular circumstances of their personal context in combination with their family narratives and underlying beliefs. Differing parenting styles and ICT mediation practices led to dynamics that varied widely across the families. Broad demographic similarities appeared to produce very different results depending on the families' particular circumstances, narratives, and parents' beliefs about parenting and

technology. For instance, in the two homes with the smallest annual income (F4 and F6), Teen 6 had almost complete autonomy to interact with ICTs, access to ten ICT devices in the home, but very little privacy. Teen 4, on the other hand, only had access to two devices, limited data on his smart phone, extreme restrictions on his content, but a good deal of physical privacy. The differences between these participants' experiences were both structural and cultural. Teen 6 lived in a tiny home with his family of five and his parents had a permissive style of parenting based on a family narrative of individualism that may have been related to their dependence on their children's language and technical assistance. Teen 4 lived alone with his mom and had his own room, but his mother believed in the importance of parental control and authority, which was not challenged by a need for her son's assistance as she understood English and the only technology they had to maintain was their personal smart phones. What was constant across the families, however, was that the adolescents negotiated their own practices within what was acceptable to their parents and that family stability was prioritized by both parents and teens. In families where parents provided more autonomy, their teenagers also pushed their boundaries more. At the same time, in these homes parents also negotiated their own practices more to accommodate their children's autonomy. Even within those families where parents were described as exhibiting more controlling practices, they had a tendency to adjust to their teens' strongly expressed priorities. For example, despite having a controlling parenting style, Mom 4 had completely stopped posting to SM about her son per his insistent request. Similarly, the adolescents adjusted to strongly felt parental priorities

even if they disagreed with the underlying premise or beliefs and they were often able to do this with a level of proficiency that allowed them to stay within their families' social norms, but also extend their connections and practices beyond that world. The following chapter, Chapter 5, will explore the findings related to RQ1 concerning parents' ICT mediation practices that were determined from the collected data.

## Chapter 5 : Findings for Research Question (RQ) 1

This chapter will present findings for RQ 1 which asked: How do Latino/a parents mediate their teens' ICT interactions? Data from the family, parent, and teen interviews revealed that Latino/a parents had a number of parental practices that influenced how teens interact with ICTs. As stated in Chapter 4, the investigator commenced the analysis with a codebook based on the literature review and a pilot study that was then adapted through analysis of the qualitative data using the Constant Comparative Method (Charmaz, 2014; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This process involved the construction of a typology of parents' ICT mediation practices that is presented in Parental ICT Mediation Practices Table 5.1, below that delineates major theme, subthemes, and categories. The second column in the table indicates the quantity of families categorized within that theme from the family, parent, and/or teen interviews in which they participated. The third column in the table represents the total number of statements from all of the qualitative interviews that were categorized within the indicated category. The full typology with definitions and examples can be found in Appendix F.

Table 5.1. Parental ICT Mediation Typology

| Parental Mediation (PM) Practices (Major Theme) | # Families | # of Codes |
|---|---|---|
| | **8** | **488** |
| **Directive narratives** | **8** | **134** |
| Parent narratives | 7 | 62 |
| Family narratives | 8 | 38 |
| Teen narratives | 8 | 34 |
| **Restrictive mediation** | **8** | **99** |
| Restrictions | 8 | 62 |
| Rules | 8 | 37 |
| **Active** | **8** | **64** |
| Discussions about use | 8 | 29 |
| Help or understanding | 6 | 13 |
| Active co-use | 4 | 9 |
| Encourage exploration | 5 | 7 |
| Alternative Activities | 2 | 6 |
| **Devices** | **8** | **70** |
| Choices about devices | 8 | 41 |
| Removal of device as a threat or punishment | 8 | 29 |
| **Parental monitoring** | **8** | **59** |
| Supervision | 4 | 34 |
| Check device or internet history | 7 | 15 |
| Verbal enquiries | 5 | 10 |
| **Privacy** | **6** | **32** |
| Autonomy | 5 | 17 |
| Independence | 5 | 9 |
| Privacy in physical space | 2 | 3 |
| Privacy for devices and accounts | 3 | 3 |
| **Social media (SM)** | **7** | **30** |
| Monitor and judge on SM | 7 | 17 |
| Parents' posts | 6 | 9 |
| Parents’ extended network | 4 | 4 |

**Major Theme: Parental Mediation (PM)**

PM has traditionally been conceptualized as the practices that parents use to prevent the negative effects of media, specifically television (e.g., Borzekowski &

Robinson, 2007; Lemish, 2008; Nathanson, 1999; Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999). Clark (2011) has critiqued this focus as idealistic and called for research that includes a more realistic consideration of ICT parenting practices. This research answers her call by interpreting PM as the parental practices that influence their teenagers' ICT interactions. This helped the research address the entanglement of parenting practices with PM practices. With this conceptualization in mind, and the data from the family, individual parent, and teen interviews was coded for mediation practices 488 times. Units of data were sometimes coded more than once to represent different aspects of the typology. The most prevalent subthemes identified in the data were as follows: directive narratives (134 times), restrictive mediation (99 times), active mediation (70 times), parental monitoring (59 times), privacy provision (32 times), and SM (30 times). As part of their *restrictive mediation* parents made *rules and restrictions* for their teens' ICT use that provided the general framework for what was appropriate and inappropriate. For example, in the family interview Mom 2 described making her children stop using ICTs at bedtime. She said, "when the time comes for sleep, that is at 9 pm, be they sleepy or not they have to sleep" (M2, FI, trans). [23] Parents also employed

---

[2] Abbreviations are used to identify participants' family role, the number of the family in which they were identified with in Chapter 4, and the type of interview the quotation is derived from. M stands for mom, D stands for dad, and T stands for teen. M2, FI from the first quotation in this chapter identifies the quotation as a statement Teen 2's mother made in their family interview.

[3] All illustrative quotations were in English unless marked as translated. All translations are presented verbatim, without corrections for grammar, but filler words (such as ah, like, um), meaningless word repetitions, and interviewer responses are omitted to promote readability. Translations were all made by the investigator.

*active mediation* techniques where they engaged directly with their teens about their ICT use. Mom 1 explained, "I always need to remind her that if it was photo…that she is only half clothed, that stays forever" (M1, PI, trans). Parents' mediation of ICT technologies usually included the *removal of the teens' devices* as a threat or a punishment. For instance, speaking of his father, Teen 6 said, "one day I missed school, and then he came, and he just took it" (T6, TI). Parents also *monitored* teens' use of their ICT interactions. Speaking of her daughter's smart phone, Mom 1, said, "I check where she was, even the history, I check that, where she has entered" (M1, PI, trans). Parents often balanced their monitoring with the purposeful provision of *privacy*. Teen 7's mother explained, "we don't impose too much, she has her privacy" (M7, PI, trans). However, the ubiquitous presence of SM in modern lives complicated the division between what was private and public and created a situation ripe for PM. About monitoring her son's SM participation, Teen 3's mother said, "if he posts something then I'll see it" (M3, PI). Lastly, participants' accounts often included statements related to their identities and priorities that were connected to parents' mediation practices and the dynamic that had developed around ICTs in the family. These types of statements are referred to within the study as directive narratives. For instance, Mom 1 described how she was, "the one that takes care of everything" (M1, PI, trans). She saw herself as the family administrator and had taken on this role in relation to ICTs as well. Results for the major qualitative subthemes that were discovered in the data relating to RQ 1 are presented below in order of frequency of occurrence, except for results related to the directive narratives subtheme, which will be presented last. Illustrative

quotations, as appropriate, from the data are used to exemplify these subthemes. The major findings for RQ 1 are listed at the end of this chapter.

**Subtheme: Restrictive mediation.** Analysis of family, parent, and teen interviews demonstrated that parents' rules and restrictions were significant to how their teens' used ICTs and coded 99 times from the data. These rules and restrictions constituted the formal structure for the ICT interactions that were understood as appropriate in teens' households. Rules and restriction were very similar, but were understood slightly differently within the study. Statements were categorized as restrictions when they described a constraint parents had that directly concerned teens' ICT use. Statements were categorized as rules if they described a practice that constrained teens' ICT use indirectly by affecting their parameters for ICT use. These rules and restrictions varied by family, but emerged as significant constraints on teens ICT interactions and will be discussed below.

***Category: Restrictions.*** Parents had practices concerning the ICTs teens could interact with and how they could interact with them (coded 62 times). There were 4 categories of this type of direct ICT constraint including restrictions on access (21 times), interactions (18 times), content (17 times), and screen time (6 times). There was a large range in how parents described what these restrictions meant in their household. For instance, seven out of eight of the teens' parents discussed restrictions on content. For some parents, this included anything that was understood as unladylike (P2), for others it meant X-rated content (Parents of Teen 3), but for most it was somewhere in

between and could be quite vague. When asked about rules, Teen 5 mentioned that he was, “not to look at inappropriate stuff in my room” (T5, Teen interview), but had trouble defining what exactly that meant. Teen 1’s mother was the only parent that described using technical restrictions, such as a content filter, to help limit her daughter’s exposure to violent and sexual content.

Parents and teens also mentioned restrictions concerning how they interacted online. These included restrictions on competitive behavior, sharing personal information, posting provocative photos, interacting with strangers, and online bullying. Dad 3 said, “[j]ust don't be cyberbullying” (D3, FI). While many of parents’ restrictions had no mechanism for enforcement in place, restrictions on access were enforced by tangible actions, such as not buying a personal device for their teen (P2), restricting access to personal ICT devices (P1, 2, and 4), controlling the amount of data that could be accessed (P4), and controlling how the Internet could be accessed (P4). For example, Teen 4’s mother limited the amount of data available on her son’s smart phone in order to “have more control over what he can use” (M4, PI, trans). Her actions produced specific restrictions on Teen 4’s ICT use. Teen 4 illustrated this point, by saying, “I don't have, like, enough data to watch Netflix, so we watch it together” (T4, TI).

***Category: Rules.*** It was inferred from the interviews that parents put rules into place to keep teens healthy and safe, but they also provided structure and constraints

for teens' interactions with ICTs (see Major Findings 1.2)[4]. The most prevalent rules (coded 37 times) that were described in the data concerned bedtimes, (17 times), completion of responsibilities before ICT use (16 times), and the prohibition of socializing outside the home (4 times). The most common rule described in the interviews was bedtime with either parents or teens in 7 out of 8 families (all except F7) mentioning such a rule. For example, Teen 6 said, "when they go to bed they tell me…now turn it off, you have to go to bed for school" (T6, FI, trans). Like other rules, bedtime rules were usually only indirectly related to ICT use, but they influenced teens' use when they were implemented (see Major Finding 1.3).

**Subtheme: Active mediation.** Active mediation of teen ICT use was a common theme that was coded in 64 statements. Parents of all eight teens were reported as using at least one of the five categories of active PM revealed in the data. Categories included: discussion of teens' ICT use (29 times), the provision of help and understanding (13 times), and active co-use 9 times), the encouragement of exploration (7 times), and alternative suggestions or activities (6 times),

***Category: Discussion.*** Discussion was the most frequent form of parental ICT mediation. Statements were coded from either parents or teens 29 times from all eight families. Parents described having discussions with their teens concerning information

[4] The Major Findings are presented in list form at the end of the chapter. When each finding is introduced into the text of the findings its number will be stated, such as (see Major Finding 1.3).

literacy (P2, 4, and 7), online safety (P1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8), rules and restrictions (P4, and 8), teens' transgressions (P1, 3, 4, 7, and 8), and their beliefs and values (P1, 2, 4, and 8). Parents used this method to instruct, explain, and enculturate. Sometimes this meant parents initiated discussions with teens that directly concerned teens' use of ICTs. For example, teen 8's mother described how she told her daughter "when you enter Facebook, don't give your name or your address because there are a lot of people that will do you harm" (M8, PI, trans). However, parents also discussed imploring their teens to use ICTs in ways that correlated with their beliefs that only indirectly related to ICTs, but directly impacted teens' use. For example, Dad 8 described speaking with his teenage children about using ICTs differently on Saturdays. He said, "from sundown on Friday to sunset on Saturday, to rest, we are more immersed in what is the spiritual part and the religious part…it is part of our beliefs and we try to teach them" (D8, PI, trans). PM discussions could be responsive as well. Mom 7 disclosed how, "one day [Isa] received a text…that she didn't have in her contacts…and right away she came running to us and said, 'mami, I don't know this person and it bothers me" (M7, PI, trans). They used their daughter's initiation to begin a discussion about ICT communication safety. As all of these statements indicate, parents used discussions as they felt they were needed in the moment.

***Category: Help.*** Parents' provision of teens with help or understanding in relation to ICTs was noteworthy within the interviews and was described 13 times by parents and/or teens in five families (F2, 3, 4, 7, and 8). Parents described themselves or were described assisting teens with technical issues (P3, 7, and 8), the development

of Internet search strategies (P2, 4, 7 and 8), understanding information online (P2 and 7), and school work (P2, 3, 7, and 8). For example, Dad 7 said he helped his daughter, "when she has some doubt over information, that is, or how to do an information search, and that type of thing, or to do homework" (D7, PI, trans). The provision of help was gendered with mothers providing help with information and school work (T2, 3, and 4), and fathers assisting with gaming and technical issues (T3, 7, and 8). Teen 3, explained, "my dad with gaming and my mom, she, education" (T3, TI). The help parents provided was skewed towards fathers in general with eight of the 13 statements of parental assistance being about help from fathers.

***Category: Exploration.*** Parents' encouragement of exploration using ICTs emerged in data analysis as an important category of active mediation. Parents of five teens (P1, 2, 4, 5, and 6) described or were described as encouraging their teens to go online and explore 7 times. For example, teen 2 said, "[y]eah, she's [her mother] like, go to YouTube and find useful videos of what they're teaching you in school to keep yourself, cause I'm not a big numbers person, but she wants me to" (T2, TI). Like teen 2's description many of the statements referred to encouragement of a specific pursuit, often education, rather than teens' personal interests and most were only general prescriptions. Mom 4 said, "once a month, sometimes I tell him to look up information about certain things" (M4, PI).

***Category: Alternative suggestions or activities.*** Six times, parents and/or teens of three families (F1, 5, and 8) said that scheduling or suggestions of alternative

activities was used to distract teens from the use of ICTs. Parents of Teen 5 and 8 spoke about attempting to get teens to read as an alternative. Mom 5 said, "always when I go out to the store and I see a book I bring him a book, because before he liked to read" (M5, PI, trans). Mom 1, on the other hand, described keeping her kids busy as an alternative to making formal ICT rules. She said, "they don't watch as much television. I always look for activities, even Saturdays, Sunday, we're always in the street (M1, PI).

**Subtheme: Devices.** PM in relation to material ICT devices was a prominent subtheme that all of the parents described or were described using by their teen children 70 times in the interviews. Two categories quickly emerged as most noteworthy to teens' use of ICTs: parents' choice of technologies (41 times) and the use of removal as a threat or punishment (29 times).

***Category: Parents' choice of devices.*** Parents of all of the teens, except for teen 2, had bought or allowed them to buy (T5) their own smart phone at the mean age of 12. Parents usually cited communication and coordination as their motivation. For example, Teen 1's mother said she had bought her daughter her first phone, "for if I got worried that she was late, so she could call me or whatever" (M1, PI, trans). Teen 2's parents' hesitation to purchase her a phone, on the other hand, was a conscious act to restrict her ICT use. Parents of half the teens (P1, 3, 5, and 7) had also bought their teens other personal devices in addition to their smart phones, such as laptops (T1 and 5), tablets (T1 and 7), and gaming devices (T3 and 7) that extended their access. (see Table 4.6 in Chapter 4 for summary of household devices)

***Category: Removal as threat or punishment.*** Second, all of the parents described or were described using the removal of teens' personal devices to compel teens to comply with their wishes (see Major Finding 1.4). Removal was done as both a threat (P3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) and a punishment (P2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8). Parents said removal was very effective in obtaining their teens' compliance. For example, in the family interview, Mom 5 said, "I am going to hit you [her son] where it hurts, the technology, I am going to take it from you" (M5, FI, trans). She said making this threat "puts him right, right way" (M5, PI, trans). Sometimes parents used device removal "only as a threat," (D8, PI, trans), but many times parents also used it to punish their teens. In the parental interview, Mom 4 said, "we took it away because we found him, that he was going into pornography" (M4, PI, trans). Often the punishment then functioned as a reminder to teens that parents would follow through with their threat if they did not submit. When Teen 4 was asked if he obeyed his mother, he said, "yeah cause if I don't she going to take my phone so" (T4, TI). Parents used these practices in relation to controlling teens' ICT use, but they also used them as resource for their parenting in general. For instance, Teen 7, said that sometimes her parents took her phone, "'cause my attitude gets a little out of hand" (T7, TI). In these ways, parents' use of device removal as a threat and as a punishment were effective mediation and parenting practices that often worked in congruence.

**Subtheme: Parental monitoring.** Analysis of all the interviews demonstrated that parental ICT monitoring was a prominent theme. Parents of all eight teens were found to use some type of monitoring 58 times. Additionally, three categories of

monitoring practices emerged from parents' and teens' discussions: supervision (34 times), checking devices and ICT interaction histories (15 times), and verbal enquiries (10 times).

***Category: Supervision.*** Supervision involved being alert to teens' ICT activities while in physical space and sharing space. For example, teen 2's mother said, "I had [the computer] in the living room, because the number one rule was that each person that was going to use the computer, I had to be watching what they were doing" (M2, PI, trans).

***Category: Verbal enquiries.*** Verbal enquiries entailed asking teens questions about their ICT use, such as what they were doing and who they were talking to. Teen 8's mother said, "there are things that I ask them, 'what are you watching'" (M8, PI, trans).

***Category: Checking devices and online interactions.*** Less often, parents checked teens' devices and interactions online. Teen 1's mother explained," I don't ask her who she's talking to or anything, I just see the page that they were using, Kik, or Messenger, or WhatsApp, when they talk what she says to see if they talk in good terms, how she presents herself, if she knows how to defend herself from any questions her friends ask" (M1, PI, trans). Only one other mother mentioned covert monitoring (M5). Most monitoring was done with teens' knowledge and was infrequent. For instance, Dad 8 said, "it is very rare that we do it, but sometimes, simply to make sure there is nothing for us to be worried about" (D8, PI, trans). Parents wanted to substantiate that

there was nothing to be concerned about. They also hoped teens would control their own ICT use if they knew their parents might check their interactions (see Major Finding 1.5). For example, mom 3 believed that her son would comply with his bedtime because "my husband could find out if he's still playing, who he's talking to (M3, PI). However, this type of monitoring was rarely practiced and was often discussed in conjunction with teens' need for privacy (see Major Finding 1.6). When Mom 5 was asked if she checked her son's phone she said, "yes, regularly during the morning is when I most check it, with that sound you ask, 'wait what sounds so much?'…they're messages, they are regularly messages from his friends from school that are texting him. I see that they are friends, friends. I don't like checking, I like that he have his privacy" (M3, PI, trans). Her statement demonstrates the balance between monitoring and the provision of privacy that parents said that they attempted to achieve.

**Subtheme: Privacy.** The provision of privacy by parents to their teens emerged as a significant theme in the interviews and was coded from the data 32 times by the parents of six teens (P3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8). Four categories of privacy were identified: *autonomy* (17 times), *independence* (9 times), *privacy in physical space* (3 times), and *device and account privacy* (3 times). Most parents (P3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) believed that their teens needed more privacy as they got older and they wanted to provide it, but still be a good parent. For half the parents (P3, 5, 7, and 8) privacy was described specifically as a parenting strategy. They believed that allowing their teens personal space would lead their children to be more open and disclose more information. Dad 7 explained "if we put a lot of pressure on her, she's not going to do things in front of us, so then, we won't

know what she is doing. Putting lot of restrictions will push her away from us. So, she will have, so we will have, trust in her and she in us" (D7, PI, trans).

***Category: Autonomy.*** Parents described providing their teens with privacy by granting teens more *autonomy* to control their own ICT content and interactions as they got older. For example, Dad 7 said, "before we were really on top of her to control the amount of time, but now she has the capacity, to dedicate time to homework, and the other to do something recreational like using technology" (D7, PI, trans).

***Category: Independence.*** Parents often gave their children more *independence* to be separate from them and/or purposefully did not seek out information about their personal lives. Mom 3 said "[a]s a teenager, yeah, give them their space, you know? Sometimes they don't–he's at that stage where he doesn't wanna do mommy things no more" (M3, PI).

***Category: Physical space.*** Parents of two teens (P3 and 4) also referred to allowing their teens to be by themselves in *physical space*. Mom 4 disclosed, "I know that he needs time to be alone and I let him shut the door" (M4, PI, trans).

***Category: Device and internet privacy.*** Parents sometimes made a point of granting teens privacy on their *devices and Internet accounts*. Teen 3's mother explained, "I never looked at it…I know that's giving him reasons not to trust me" (M3, PI).

**Subtheme: Social media (SM).** Data analysis of transcripts from all of the interviews revealed that SM was a significant part of both parents and teens' lives and required a high degree of boundary negotiation (coded 30 times). Most of the parents were friends or followed their teens on SM (P1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8). Table 5.2 indicates the SM sites where parents were their teens' friends or followers. These friendships caused a host of structural and social complications for teens' use of SM through parental monitoring and judgements (17 times), parents' posts (9 times), and parents' social networks (4 times). Findings related to these categories are presented below in order of topical progression, beginning with parents' posts and ending with parents' social network and will be illustrated with appropriate quotations from the data.

Table 5.2. Parent/Teen Use of Social Media

| Participants | SM Websites |
|---|---|
| Teen 1 | Instagram |
| Teen 2 | None |
| Teen 3 | Facebook, Twitter, Instagram |
| Teen 4 | Instagram |
| Teen 5 | Facebook |
| Teen 6 | Facebook |
| Teen 7 | Instagram, Snapchat |
| Teen 8 | Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram |

***Category: Parents' posts.*** Most of the parents were SM participants (M1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8; D6 and 8) and discussed posting about their teens. Dad 8 said they posted

about “things that we do together with them, for example, we go to a park and we put it so that our family in the Dominican Republic can see that we’re there” (D8, PI, trans). Three mothers (M1, 3, and 7) posted often, sometimes daily. Teen 3 said his mother posted about him, “all the time, whenever we’re doing something or she’s just posting a general post like ‘hanging out with the kids, have the best day everyone,’ and all that stuff” (T3, TI). Parents seemed to see their SM accounts as their personal space. Teen 7’s mother defended her right to publish posts about her daughter by explaining her SM accounts were her personal space to connect with the friends and family that she had left behind in the Dominican Republic. She said, “I have all my family there, far from here, and my friends, far from here, and they can all see each other” (M7, FI, trans). Parents did not usually ask their teens’ permission to post about them and teens 2, 3, and 7, said they usually found out about their mother’s posts after the fact. Teen 2 said, “she [her mother] follows a lot of family and a lot of family don’t get to see me, so, and sometimes I don’t even know she posted it, until she tells me, ‘oh your aunt said this,’ and I'm like ‘what?’ And she's like, ‘oh this’” (T2, TI)! Parents also did not seem to consider the image that their teens wanted to project to their own peers and the most common complaint teens (T1, 3, 4, and 7) made about the posts their parents published about them was that they were unflattering. For example, Teen 7 said, “she was posting some ugly throwbacks of me. There's this thing called the glow up, it was before, I had a baby face, I was not looking well, I did not have my eyebrows” (T7, TI).

***Category: Monitor and judge teens’ posts.*** Being friends with teens meant parents were also able to monitor their teens’ SM activities. This monitoring sometimes

occurred simply as a result of being friends with teens, but parents also described purposefully monitoring SM activities. Teen 1's mother explained that, "[b]ecause they're girls, if she puts some photo that they think is pretty, but for someone, they will not know if she is well-mannered. Me that, I keep that in mind to check" (M1, PI, trans). Nearly every parent (except in F6) was concerned with how teens presented themselves on SM and teens' posts were sometimes an area of contention between teens and their parents. Though, in the surveys, none of the teens and only two of the teens' parents (T2 and 7) reported parents asking teens to take SM posts down, data from both parents and teens collected from the family, parent, and teen interviews demonstrated that one teen (T7) and four teens' parents (P1, 3, 7, and 8) provided accounts of this practice. This type of mediation was uncommon, but the accounts were often vivid. For example, Mom 7 related the following: "this once, she was coming home on the bus, and with her classmate and her, they were filming all of what a girl, talking obscenities on the bus, she was angry with someone and wanted to hit her, and she posted it and I corrected her. I told her not that kind of thing" (M7, PI, trans). Parents' accounts provided context for teens' need to negotiate their boundaries with their parents on SM.

***Category: Parents' extended network of friends and family.*** Data from the parent and teen interviews indicated that parents extended SM networks influenced their ideas about what was appropriate for their children to post. Though only two teens (T3 and 7) touched on this aspect of managing their participation with SM, half the parents' accounts (P1, 3, 7, and 8) revealed that a common impetus for their

requests that teens remove posts from SM was their circle of friends and family. Dad 8 said, “sometimes I have told her, ‘mami mira [Spanish colloquialism that means, “look sweetheart”], this that you put up, someone told me that isn’t, that it’s not ok, that a Christian girl or someone of your age post this,’” (D8, PI, trans). Parents’ accounts exposed that parents’ friends and family extended the reach of parents’ SM monitoring and the social norms teens needed to accommodate and that teens were often ill-equipped to negotiate the intricacies of the additional context. Mom 8 explained, “she does not understand much of what she says in Spanish, and she put it because they do not know what it is…and I said, ‘No, what happens is that here it is used in English in another way,’” (M8, PI, trans). Teens’ negotiation of the extra layer of context their parents’ friends and family added meant that they also sometimes needed to negotiate the intricacies of parents’ personal relationships. Mom 3 explained, “when it comes to family and certain people that unfortunately we don’t talk to right now because of certain situations, and…they're not friends with me, but they're friends with my son…I just tell him don’t comment on it. Don’t like it, or don’t comment because by you liking it, that's like, you might as well leave a comment (M3, PI). Her statement reveals she expected her son to restrict his participation on Facebook with people to whom he had a different relationship than she did.

**Subtheme: Directive narratives.** Data analysis from all interviews revealed that the narratives that participants used to talk about themselves to the investigator were related to the domestic ICT structure. One hundred and thirty-four directive narratives were identified in the interviews. Directive narratives are used within this study to

indicate orienting statements that were found within the participants' accounts that characterized the familiy, as well as individual members' priorities and identities at the time of the interviews. This study builds on the findings of Silverstone and colleagues (1989, see Chapter 3), to demonstrate that family narratives helped to direct the dynamic that existed in the participants' households surrounding ICTs. The directive narratives that were derived from the data could be subdivided into parent (62 times), family (38 times), and teen narratives (34 times). Findings related to these categories will be presented below in order of topical progression, starting with family narratives and ending with teen narratives and a discussion of polyphony (Bakhtin, 1980). The categories will be illustrated with appropriate quotation from the interviews.

***Category: Family directive narratives.*** Family directive narratives were defined as accounts or statements that participants told that expressed an idea or engaged with an idea of who they were and what they thought as a family (38 times). For example, Dad 8 said,

> we are Seventh Day Adventists, so, on Saturdays, in general, we don't use our telephones in the same way that we use them during the week…we can watch movies, for example, but…something that has to do with being a Christian, histories of biblical figures, even if it's cartoons, or live action, or documentaries about animals. That is what they watch, if they watch something else we always bring it to their attention (D8, PI, trans).

Dad 8's narrative of their being Seventh Day Adventists was woven into his explanation for the family's ICT practices, providing a context for who they were as a family, the practices that were connected with that identity, and the roles that various members played out within the context (see Major Finding 1.7). Half of the families' directive

statements were like a family motto that strongly established their identity as a family (F2, 3, 4, and 8), while in other families they provided an underlying directive for how the family approached ICTs (F1, 5, 6 and 7). The difference between these two types of family narratives can be illustrated by contrasting family 2 with family 6. Family 2 had an overall view of themselves as "different" that was taken up by the entire family. In the family interview, Dad 2 said, "[n]o perfecta, but be a different" (D2, FI, trans). This mantra provided the family members with a structure for how they were meant to interpret their own practices in relation to outsiders. This combined with another family mantra about their "old fashioned" (M2, FI, trans) relationship to technology and seemed to direct how they interacted with ICTs. The family members expressed their perceived difference with pride. Teen 2's younger sister, Yenny, explained about how their family was with technology, "so we're not really a big fan...we don't use it as much, we're not an addict with it" (S2, FI). Her statement reproduces the family narrative, positions it in relation to outsiders, and demonstrates that it has been internalized by family members and become a distinct part of how they see themselves as a group. In contrast, Family 6's narrative was subtler, but also correlated with how they approached ICTs as a family. Dad 6 explained, "we are independent, each one" (D6, FI, trans). Members of Family 6 tended to interact independently with ICTs despite spending most of their time together in the living room. In his interview, Teen 6 expounded, saying, "my parents they give us, they give me–my sister they don't care 'cause she's like an adult, but they give me and her, my little sister, a lot of freedom I think" (T6, TI).

***Category: Parental directive narratives.*** Directive narratives were also a prominent category in parents' explanations of their practices and seven of the teens' parents (P1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) were coded as asserting parental narratives 62 times in the family and parent interviews. Parents' accounts or statements were classified as parental narratives if they were used to establish a personal and/or a parental identity or engaged with an idea of who they were. Most of the parents had a tendency of circling back to similar themes within their interviews that distilled an underlying philosophy of how they saw themselves as parents and/or as individuals in relation to ICTs. For example, Dad 8 explained various times that he and his wife mediated their children's ICT use "[s]imply by talking with them, advising them" (D8, PI, trans). His duplication of statements like this one seemed to exhibit a desire for the investigator to perceive them as being democratic parents that prioritized discussion, individual choice, and consensus. He expanded, "[w]e don't obligate them, we simply explain what we believe and we give them the option to choose" (D8, PI, trans).

Parents occasionally also made identity statements about their own relationship with ICTs. For instance, Mom 7 said, "I'm addicted, he's not" (M7, PI, trans) in reference to her use of Instagram in relation to her husband. In contrast, her husband, Dad 7, declared, "I'm not a fan" (D7, PI, trans) to elucidate how he did and did not engage with digital culture. Teen 7's parents' diverging narratives revealed how they saw themselves and pointed to the different ways they engaged with their daughter around ICTs. Her father did not want his daughter to be easily influenced by her interactions with culture on ICTs. He explained how he tried to prevent this. He said, "I talk to her a lot about the

phenomenon of the fan, that is, for me that, for me people that are fans, are, that is, I call them dough people, and I don't want my daughters to be dough people" (D7, PI, trans). In contrast, Teen 7's mother's main engagement with her daughter around ICTs was through SM. Describing how she shared her Instagram account with her daughter, Mom 7 said, "she grabs my phone, she herself publishes on mine, that is, I let her do what she wants" (M7, PI, trans). The narratives exemplified by Teen 7's parents demonstrated the way parents' personal narratives related to how they individually parented their children's ICT use.

In the analysis of the individual parental interviews, parents' beliefs about parenting and technology were found to be a significant part of their accounts of their ICT mediation and monitoring (see Major Finding 1.8). The parenting beliefs that were expressed by parents in the data concerned their beliefs about their right to information about their teens, how information should flow between teens and parents, how much authority they should assert over their teenagers, and their underlying beliefs about technology. Parents' beliefs about parenting and technology combined with their directive narratives in interesting ways to help produce the collection of varied ICT mediation practices that they used. They did not lead directly to certain practices, but were interpreted and combined by parents in distinctive ways. For instance, Mom 4 expressed a strong belief in the need for parental monitoring and control of her son's activities. She explained that she was, "trying to, adjust his mind so that he thinks like me, like what I have learned is right. That the things that God does not like, that one doesn't want to practice them" (M4, PI, trans). She had combined her belief in

authoritarian parenting (see Baumrind, 1967) with her narrative of being a Christian mother. She expanded, “I use the Bible a lot to give him guidance, about what God thinks, because I’m not there 24 hours of the day. But God, he knows, is observing 24 hours a day” (M4, PI, trans). In this way, Teen 4’s mother was attempting to get her son to interact appropriately with ICTs when she was not around by convincing him that someone, God, was always watching.

***Category: Teens’ directive narratives.*** In the analysis teens’ personal narratives were identified as playing a significant role in the overall structure of the family. All 8 teens presented personal narratives a combined 34 times in the family and teen interviews. These narratives exemplified teens’ personal identity and priorities and provided an inside perspective to their relationship with technology. For example, Teen 6, communicated that unlike his technically ignorant family, he was knowledgeable about technology. He said, “I learned like throughout the years. I was interested in electronics, since little, like, when I got a toy…like the Sunday, I got a toy I remember the same day I opened it, and I was little, and they were talking to me, ‘like now put it back together’” (T6, TI). In this statement Teen 6 established himself as conversant in technology and provided an origin myth to explain how he had first become interested in the subject. Some teens provided narratives that were less individualized and instead reiterated the dynamic they had with their parents around ICTs. For instance, when Teen 7 was asked if she participated in any ICT activities that her parents did not know about she said, “I’m an innocent child” and later explained that “you should trust them, and they trust you” (T7, TI). Teens’ personal narratives provided a counter narrative to

their parents' or family narratives and the dynamic between them contributed to the technological culture of the family that was a part of the context of PM.

*Polyphony.* Analysis of the directive narratives in all the interviews, family by family, uncovered that taken together family, parent, and teen narratives intermingled forming a polyphony (Bakhtin, 1980) of voices that served as the context for the family's interactions with ICTs. They also provided insight into how the family dynamic had evolved surrounding ICTs. Interview data from over half the families (F2, 3, 4, 7 and 8) were coded as having family, parent, and teen narratives that seemed to interact with one another to help form the family dynamic around ICTs (see Major Finding 1.9). For example, family 3 had a family narrative that the world was a dangerous place that had become a shared worldview by all of the family members. This narrative helped direct how they interacted in the world and with one another and intermingled with their individual narratives. Discussing their worldview in the parent interview, Teen 3's parents said,

> Dad 3: "'cause you can't say it's a happy, that it's a happy world out there. You can't, you can't. Wish it was, but…"
>
> Mom 3: "It's not."

Each parent and their son had their own individual narratives that highlighted their perspective, but also recalled the family narrative. Explaining how she protected her children, Teen 3's mother said, "I try to keep them in my bubble, my world…and I don't care what anybody else thinks or what anybody else says, it's my kids" (M3, PI). Within this statement she had constructed a narrative that presented a view of herself and her

role as parent in relation to outsiders that included the family narrative of the world as a dangerous place as its context and her own role as her children's protecter. Her husband's narratives were analogous to hers and told a story of wanting to protect their children from what he went through as an adolescent. He said, "I was, caused a lot of trouble, too, and when I was younger, and I don't want my kids to go down that way because it doesn't leave anything good" (D3, PI). His narrative presented the world as a temptation to undesirable behavior and presented his own technological competence as something he could employ to safeguard their future. Discussing video games he related, "I taught him how to read by playing games" (D3, PI). His son later echoed this statement in his own interview, saying his father had "actually put an Xbox controller in my hand at the age of 6 and I've been playing since then" (T3, TI). When considered in correlation, the family's shared narrative of the world as a dangerous place, Teen 3's father's narrative of technology's educational benefits, and his mother's narrative of keeping her children safe within her "bubble" provided a structure for the parental decision to use ICTs as a resource to distract their children from the impulse to leave the household. Discussing restricting Teen 3 to their home, his mother said, "I know he's in my little bubble, my little world, I know he's gonna be okay. So, you know, he's okay over here. He's with his family, with his dad and the way he uses his technology" (M3, PI). Their narratives underscored how they compensated for their restriction by providing him with a large pool of technological devices and few ICT time restrictions. This dynamic had in turn, set their son, Teen 3, up to devote a large chunk of his time to online gaming. He had internalized the family narrative and accepted their attempts to

protect him. Discussing the danger of leaving the house, he said, “it’s the sad truth, but yeah I don’t really go out” (T3, TI). Consequently, Teen 3 had turned to the online environment to meet his social needs and his gaming had become a vital part of his personal identity. Describing his gaming, Teen 3 said, “so it’s a big thing, it’s just something I would like to do and it’s something that’s built into me that I have a lot of dedication for” (T3, TI). His parents, in turn, had encouraged his passion and had incorporated his narrative into their own. Discussing their son’s gaming, Mom 3 mused, “I know it's to further something that he wants, which is do the gaming designing, the graphic designing and gaming” (M3, PI) and Dad 3 proudly related “[h]e's like, he's big” (M3, PI) within the gaming community. Their acceptance of his narrative and their integration of it into their own narratives completed the polyphonic circle helping to provide a structure for how they interacted with ICTs as a family in their everyday lives and how they moved into the future (see Major Finding 1.10).

The example of Teen 3’s family suggests how directive narratives could contribute to the particular culture each family developed around ICTs. The shared meaning of the group or family narrative was important, but the individual members’ personal narratives were woven into those shared meanings and contributed to the dialogic that formed between the narratives. In Family 3, the family, parent, and teen narratives were alligned to accommodate and compensate for one another. In fact, there were no family groupings of narratives within the sample that seemed nonsynchronous, although there were teens whose narratives were less aligned with their parents. For instance, Teen 5’s narrative about being addicted to gaming

contrasted with his mother's belief that it was a waste of time. However, despite their differences, over time they had managed to integrate their narratives in way that would cause minimal conflict in their relationship. Teen 5's mother described coming around to her son's gaming, "I have tried one hour, the most I want him to use the computer is one hour, but no…either I let it go or we end up fighting" (M5, FI, trans). Instead she had developed a parenting narrative prioritizing his fuflimment of his household responsibilities. She admitted that she now repeatedly tells him, "[y]ou complete your tasks, there's no problem" (M5, PI, trans). Likewise, Teen 5 made an effort to take care of his responsibilities before he started gaming for the day. Similarly, the other teens and parent participants had incorporated their narratives into their routines in ways that created minimal friction. There were teens and parents with narratives that were less synchronized, but none that seemed incompatable at the time of the interviews.

**Summary Statements**

Analysis of the data from the family, parent and teen interviews resulted in these summary statements (Knowledge Claims) about the mediation practices of the Latino/a parents:

Restrictive mediation:

- Parents set rules about turning off devices at bedtimes and only allowing ICT privileges once responsibilities had been completed.
- Parents used restrictions on content, interaction, access, and screen time to mediate their teens' ICT interactions.

- Parents did not want their teens to view or interact with inappropriate content.
- What counted as inappropriate content was vague to both parents and teens, but was usually discussed in relation to violent and sexual content by parents.
- Parents did not often make specific restrictions limiting their teens' screen time.
- It was rare for parents to use covert monitoring or technical restrictions to mediate their teens' ICT use.

Devices

- All parents used the removal or threat of removal of their teens' devices as a method to get them to comply with them in regards to ICTs or other areas.
- Parents used the removal of devices to punish their teens for various transgressions, such as not doing well in school, having an attitude with parents, and staying on past the designated stop time

Monitoring

- Parents had a variety of monitoring practices related to their teens' ICT activities that included supervision, checking devices and online account activity, monitoring SM participation, and making verbal enquiries.

Privacy

- Parents used granting autonomy, independence, privacy in physical space, and device and account privacy as a method to increase their teens' trust in them and encourage their openness.

Active Mediation

- Parents actively mediated and shaped their teens' ICT use by discussing how teens should use ICTs in relation safety and health and parents' values and beliefs, helping them with technical assistance and information literacy, co-using ICTs with them, encouraging their use, and suggesting and scheduling alternative activities.

Social Media (SM)

- Parents had practices related to SM that made teens' negotiation of their boundaries difficult. These included parents' posting practices, their monitoring and judgement of teens' participation, and their extended social networks.

Directive Narratives

- Families had narratives that defined themselves as a family in relation to ICTs and influenced how they interacted with ICTs as a family.
- Parents had narratives that expressed their personal identities and their parenting priorities in relation to ICTs that influenced how they parented their teens' use of ICTs.

- Parents' beliefs about parenting and technology were related to the practices they used to mediate their teens' ICT use.
- Parents' beliefs were integrated into their directive narratives and helped provide the rationale for specific combinations of parental ICT mediation practices.
- Teens had narratives that expressed their personal identities and priorities in relation to ICTs that influenced how they interacted with ICTs.
- Family, parent, and teen narratives interacted and influenced the family dynamic that was created around ICTs.

**Summary of Major Findings Related to RQ 1**

Analysis of the data from the family, parent, and teen interviews related to RQ 1 resulted in the following major findings related to Latino/a parents' ICT mediation practices:

1.1 Most of the specific parental ICT mediation practices demonstrated by the Latino/a parents concur with the findings that have been established in the PM literature. Exceptions include [what exceptions were there?]….

1.2 Parental ICT mediation was inextricably interwoven with general parenting practices.

1.3 Parents had rules and restrictions for teens in relation to ICTs that related directly to their ICT use and others that were related to their concerns for teens' health and safety that indirectly influenced teens' ICT use and interactions.

1.4 PM of ICT devices often concerned the use of the removal of personal devices as a threat and a punishment. Parents used this strategy to procure teens' compliance about their ICT use, but also as a general parenting strategy.

1.5 The anticipation of occasional monitoring was used by parents as a way to provide teens with autonomy, feel secure there was nothing to be concerned about, and as an attempt to have teens internalize parents' rules and restrictions so they would comply of their own means.

1.6 Parents created a balance between the provision of privacy and monitoring.

1.7 Directive narratives were related to the ICT mediation practices that parents used and to how family members experienced their reality.

1.8 Parents' beliefs about parenting and technology were incorporated into their parental directive narratives and influenced their ICT mediation practices.

1.9 Family, parent, and teen directive narratives influenced one another and were constitutive of one another.

1.10 The polyphony of directive narratives contributed to the overall dynamic of the technological culture that had evolved.

This chapter has presented the findings for RQ 1 concerning the parental practices that parents used to mediate their teens' ICT interactions. The next two chapters will address teens' practies for managing their family small worlds in relation to ICTs.

## Chapter 6 : Findings for Research Question 2 (RQ 2)

This chapter and Chapter 7 will present findings for RQ 2 related to the practices that Latino/a teens use to negotiate their Information Communication Technology (ICT) interactions in accordance with the small world of their family. Teen participants were found to use a number of practices to negotiate their ICT use in accordance with their familial small worlds (see Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000). Data from all interviews were coded within the overarching theme Teens' Family Small World ICT Practices 505 times and coded into a typology of the two major themes related to RQ 2a and RQ 2b: resource negotiation (328 times) and negotiation of interpersonal relationships (176 times). Analysis further generated a typology of four subthemes of teens' ICT information behavior in relation to each major theme (see Table 6.1 below for the full typology and Appendix F for final codebook). Data was sometimes coded in more than one subtheme and category to represent their relevance to different aspects of the typology. As shown in Table 6.1 below, there were two major themes of Teens' Family Small World ICT Practices. The first was teens' negotiation of their resources, which included the following subthemes: physical space (157 times), ICT content and interactions (92 times), devices (58 times), and internet access (22 times). The second was teens' negotiation of their relationships and included the ensuing subthemes: parental authority (80 times), extended social worlds (51 times), mental frames (39 times), social media (SM) (26 times). This chapter presents the findings related to RQ 2a concerning teens' negotiation of resources, whereas Chapter 7 presents findings related to RQ 2b concerning teens' negotiation of their relationships. These major themes do

overlap, in such that negotiation of resources was sometimes for the purpose of managing relationships and vice versa. However, these two major themes do not represent a clear-cut division, but are separated to demonstrate the creative and habitual practices teens had for managing resources and relationships in relation to ICTs within family constraints. The results for the major qualitative themes and subthemes that were discovered in the data related to RQ 2a are presented below with illustrative quotations from the interviews, as appropriate. In describing and illustrating the major themes, subthemes, and categories, the analysis of the interview data was also supplemented with data from the teen surveys and mapping activity.

Table 6.1. Typology of Teens' Family Small World ICT Practices
(major themes and subthemes)

| **Teens' Family Small World ICT Practices** | **# of Teens** | **# of Codes** |
|---|---|---|
| | **8** | **505** |
| **Teens' Negotiation of their Resources (Major Theme)** | **8** | **328** |
| **Physical spaces** | **8** | **157** |
| Sharing space | 8 | 61 |
| Personal physical space | 8 | 50 |
| Spatial dance | 7 | 34 |
| ICT hubs | 7 | 12 |
| **Content and interaction** | **8** | **92** |
| Adjustment to parental expectations | | 35 |
| ICT brokering | 7 | 27 |
| Sibling mediation | 7 | 25 |
| Research | 3 | 5 |
| **Devices** | **8** | **58** |
| Sharing | 7 | 25 |
| Lending | 6 | 13 |
| Quality/breakdown | 6 | 12 |
| Borrowing | 4 | 8 |
| **Internet access** | **3** | **22** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Limit activities | 1 | 11 |
| Secure alternative methods to connect | 2 | 8 |
| Online applications | 1 | 2 |
| Adjust physical space | 1 | 1 |
| **Teens' Negotiation of their Interpersonal Relationships (Major Theme)** | **8** | **176** |
| **Negotiation of parental authority** | **8** | **60** |
| Earning leeway | 7 | 30 |
| Not hiding- hiding in plain sight | 7 | 18 |
| Pushing boundaries | 6 | 12 |
| **Social worlds** | **8** | **51** |
| Social relationships | 6 | 21 |
| Institutional use | 5 | 16 |
| Social capital | 1 | 10 |
| Interpersonal conversations | 1 | 4 |
| **Mental frames** | **6** | **39** |
| Acclimating | 4 | 13 |
| Positive | 3 | 11 |
| No control | 7 | 8 |
| The future | 2 | 7 |
| **Social media (SM)** | **8** | **26** |
| Teens' posts | 6 | 11 |
| Parents' posts | 6 | 9 |
| Social connections | 4 | 6 |

**Results for RQ 2a**

This section will present findings for RQ 2a related to the practices that Latino/a teens use to negotiate their resources in relation to ICTs. Teens were found to negotiate many of their household resources in ways that helped them fulfill their needs and maintain the balance of their familial relationships (see Major Finding 2.1). The subthemes for the branch of the typology included in this section are negotiation of physical space, devices, ICT content and interactions, and Internet access. See Table 6.1 for the table of Teens' Resource Negotiation Subthemes. As seen in Appendix F, criteria

for each category was as follows. Statements were classified as *physical space* negotiation when they referred to teens' use of household spaces, such as bedrooms, kitchens, and/or living rooms, to meet their needs. For instance, Teen 3 described how he used ICTs in his bedroom to get away from his siblings, "I usually spend [time] upstairs in my room and the kids stay here with my mom" (T3, TI)[5][6]. This type of references to the negotiation of household ICT technologies were categorized as *devices.* For example, explaining how he negotiated the use of his mother's TV, Teen 5, said "well I'm allowed to use like the TV, they let me, but I have to ask first" (T5, TI). Interview statements were coded as *ICT content and interaction* when they indicated the adolescents' choice of ICT content or activities were influenced by their membership in their family small world. Teen 3 said, he would "not go on stuff that I'm not supposed to be going on" (T3, TI). Lastly, teens' attempts to manage their connections to the Internet were coded within *Internet access.* Teen 6 described how he accessed the Internet on his phone when he did not have access to Wi-Fi: "I'll be like to my friend or something, can you put the hotspot real quick so I could text them" (T6, TI). Results for the major qualitative subthemes and categories that were discovered in the data

---

[5] Abbreviations are used to identify participants' family role, the number of the family in which they were identified with in Chapter 4, and the type of interview the quotation is derived from. M stands for mom, D stands for dad, and T stands for teen. M2, FI from the first quotation in this chapter identifies the quotation as a statement Teen 2's mother made in their family interview.

[6] All illustrative quotations were in English unless marked as translated. All translations are presented verbatim, without corrections for grammar, but filler words (such as ah, like, um), word repetitions that did not change the quotation's meaning, and interviewer responses are omitted to promote readability. Translations were all made by the investigator.

connected to the major themes of RQ 2a dedicated to teens' family small world ICT practices related resource negotiation are presented below in order of occurrence and illustrated with qualitative data from the interviews.

**Subtheme: Physical space.** The significance of the physical space of the home to teens' ICT use was apparent from data analysis (see Major Finding 2.2). The study methodology was designed to capture the importance of physical space and the teen participants all gave statements that were coded as managing physical space in some capacity in relation to ICTs 120 times. The physical spaces of the home were interwoven into teens' ICT experiences and they actively managed them to meet their needs. The four categories that were most prevalent in the interview data were: negotiating the shared use of space (61 times), physical privacy (50 times), participating in a "place-ballet" (Seamon, 1980) (34 times), and concentrating ICT activities in central-hubs (12 times). Findings related to these categories will be presented in order of the frequency of their occurrence and will be illustrated with qualitative data from the interviews as is appropriate.

***Category: Shared spaces.*** In the teen interviews, all eight participants discussed their practices for sharing physical space to create personal spheres and social connections 60 times. Spaces where there were stationary ICTs, such as desktop computers (F6), TVs (F1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8) or gaming systems (F3, 7, and 8), were often discussed as needing to be shared. In the surveys, teens said that the spaces that they

were most likely to use ICTs while they were with others were living rooms, family rooms, and basements.

The mobility of smart phones and the existence of multiple stationary devices in most homes increased teens' flexibility to choose whether or not they used them with family members; nevertheless, statements by all eight of the teens and many of their parents described their using ICTs in shared physical space with their families to connect socially at least occasionally (see Major Finding 2.3). In her individual interview Teen 7 said, "like maybe we watch like a movie on Netflix together or we watch TV together like on HBO, but, yeah. Like we hang out down there when we get the chance" (T7, TI). The adolescents also described or were described spending time with family members while they each engaged in their own individual ICT activity. Teen 5 explained how his family would use the living room together in the afternoons "for my sister for school work or for my mom it's for school work too, and for me it's for school work or video games" (T5, TI). The individualization of devices also meant that teens could be in a physical space with others doing their own activity and slip in and out of their personal sphere at will. In her explanation of the mapping activity, Teen 8 portrayed how her and her cousins would use their shared bedroom together. She said, "[w]e're separately on our phones. Well, sometimes she would like show me videos or something, if she sees something funny" (T8, TI). In this way, they could switch back and forth from using their bedroom as a social place or personal space.

Teens had practices for creating a personal sphere while they interacted with ICTs in shared spaces in order to engage in their own activity, accommodate others' comfort, and keep their ICT interactions and communications private. For instance, Teens 2 and 6 talked about using headphones while sharing physical space with family in order to work or watch independently. Teen 6 said that by using headphones he was able to use the shared living room while his family watched TV to, "watch TV shows, like the same as here, but without commercials" (T6, FI, trans). Participants also adjusted their ICT notifications and where they sent and responded to them in a way that allowed them to control their visibility and keep their information private. In the survey, half the teens said they sometimes kept their phone on silent while sharing space (T3, 4, 7, and 8) and half said they sometimes left the room to send or receive a message (T3, 5, 6, and 8). Discussing his phone, Teen 4, said, "I always have it on silent, always" (T4, TI). In the survey, two participants also said they minimized their screens (T5 and 6). Teen 6 said he did this, "'cause sometimes I see something, and it might be weird to them [his parents] but to me it's not" (T6, TI). The context of the space while teens were using it was discussed by participants as being important. Teens would participate in different ICT activities and interact with different content depending on who was in the room. Teen 2 explained, "I look up different things, like when you guys were talking, and Y was in my room doin' her homework, I was looking up dresses" (T2, TI).

***Category: Personal physical space.*** Teens' negotiation of physical space for personal ICT use was a prominent category that was coded 50 times from statements made by all eight teens in the teen interviews. Privacy itself was not often evoked by

the teens, though all of the teens discussed methods related to assembling privacy to use their ICTs. Participants often cited comfort as the motivation for seeking out private spaces, such as avoiding noise (T7) and cold temperatures (T8). Teen 7 explained that she found it difficult to participate in some ICT activities while other family members were present. She said, "If I'm watching something they're too loud about it, so I just go up to my room" (T7, TI). The survey data revealed that teens participated in most ICT activities more frequently when they were alone. This was also true for spaces that were used by the whole family, such as the living room. Teen 1 said she used her phone in the living room, "when it's like empty" (T1, TI).

When teens were asked specifically about privacy, all eight teens said they usually went to their bedrooms. This was true for youth with their own bedrooms (T1, 3, 4, 5, and 6), those that shared (T2, 7, and 8), and even for those that preferred common spaces for most of their ICT activities (T4, 5, and 6). Teen 4, said, "[s]ometimes I want to be alone or whatever so I just go to my room, my mom stays here" (T4, TI). Likewise, the participants (T2, 7, and 8) that shared bedrooms described a few methods of obtaining privacy. For example, Teen 2 claimed the bedroom she shared with her younger sister as her own. When asked if it was hard to find privacy, she said, "I go to my room usually. I dunno. That's like…I don't say off limits, but they know it's off limits…they can come in and sit down and whenever, but like, what are you doing here?" (T2, TI). When bedrooms were not available, teens used other spaces. Teen 5 said, "privacy for myself? Ehhhh, I just stay away from where wherever they are, like if they're upstairs I come downstairs or they're downstairs then I go upstairs" (T5, TI).

***Category: Place-ballet.*** Analysis of the teen mapping activity and their individual interviews demonstrated that their movement through the physical space of the household as they adjusted to the routines of other family members was a salient practice and was represented by seven teens, 34 times in the data. The youth would often participate in a kind of dance through the house as other household members moved through the physical spaces of the home and spaces became available. Following Seamon (1980) this type of movement through the house is called a "*place-ballet*" in this study. Teens moved within a habitual "time-space routine" (Seamon, 1980) of the house, but they used knowledge of that routine to improvise within the moment and use the spaces of their home to meet their current needs. This type of movement was visible in the data by most of the youth, though it was more common for those that had less physical space of their own (T6, 7, and 8). For those with small households without a room of their own, managing use of space could be a complex task that depended on knowing everyone else's schedule and routine movements. For example, Teen 7 and 8 both described the bedroom that they shared with Teen 7's younger sister as their favorite space. Though they had not discussed it, Teen 8 explained that because they were off school on vacation during the time of the interview, they had settled into a routine where Teen 7 used the room in the morning and then in the afternoon they would shift and Teen 8 would use it. Additionally, as other spaces in the household became available they would quickly adjust and assume use of them. Teen 7 said, "my parents when they work, I usually just stay in their room" (T7, TI). The availability of those spaces was inconsistent and Teen 7 said her use of her

parents' room, "depends on their schedule that day" (T7, TI). Having their own smart phones made teens mobile and able to adapt. In this way, they were able to create ad-hoc places out of the various spaces of their homes as they became available to them.

***Category: ICT hubs.*** Analysis of family and teen interviews revealed that the adolescents often had physical spaces in their home where they centralized personal ICT use. Ling and Thrane (2001) called this a "base of operations" (p. 9). Twelve statements from seven teens described how they used specific physical spaces at home as hubs for their ICT use. Two teens (T1 and 3) centered their ICT activities in their bedrooms, similar to what is called bedroom cultures (Bovill & Livingstone, 2001). For example, when Teen 3 was describing his bedroom during the mapping activity he said,

> when you [go] through the door I have my little corner where I have all my gaming set up and it's like a little desk in the corner, with I have my Xbox plugged into the corner with my tv, and I usually charge my phone and iPad there and leave it on the desk and stuff and all my school stuff too, and I use that as a workspace and gaming space" (T3, TI).

Teens 1 and 3 focused their ICT use in their bedrooms both because they were private and because they had great deal of ICT resources in those rooms. In contrast, some youth had their ICT hubs in a public area of the house (T4, 5, and 6) due to comfort (T4 and 5), social proximity (T4 and 5), and technical practicality (T6). Teen 4, said he stayed in the living room because "if my mom's doing something in the kitchen, I'm right here, we talk, I'm using the phone at the same time" (T4, TI).

Statements by three teens were coded four times describing a cycle of responsibility they routinely used, where they would leave their ICT hubs to complete a

responsibility and then return after it had been completed and then repeat the cycle again the next time they were needed. For example, Teen 3 had regular caregiving responsibilities, but would return back to his room at every opportunity. Explaining his process, he said,

> I'll play for a little bit by myself and then go pick up the kids from Casa and then come back and then they you know I tell them, did you do your homework, if you did I put all their stuff away again, get 'em undressed and into pajamas and stuff and then help them with their homework if they didn't finish…then I usually go back upstairs play for the rest of the night until the kids have to go to bed and then they go to bed and I play a little more until like ten then get off (T3, TI).

By enacting this cycle, participants described being able to fulfill their responsibilities, but also spend as much time as possible in their preferred space using their ICTs. While they would all regularly use other physical spaces in the home besides their personal hubs to access their devices, they used their hub spaces more often and preferred to use these spaces if conditions were favorable.

**Subtheme: ICT interaction and content.** All eight teens described or were described managing their ICT content and interactions in accordance with the family small world 91 times in the data from the interviews. Four categories emerged as the most prevalent within the data: teens' adjustment to parental expectations (35 times), ICT brokering (27 times), sibling ICT mediation (25 times), and research (4 times). These categories of the findings will be presented below in order of the quantity of the occurrence of the codes and illustrated with quotations from the qualitative data.

***Category: Teen adjustment to parental expectations.*** Analysis of the family and teen interviews showed that the adolescents' negotiation of their ICT interactions and content were regularly influenced by their parents' expectations (see Major Finding 2.4). They discussed trying to avoid content and interactions they knew their parents would disapprove of. Teen 3 said, "if it's my mom says it's a problem, then it's a problem, like I respect her opinion, yeah I respect it and I won't get on" (T3, TI). Some youth (T3, and 4,) specifically described not interacting with any content that they knew their parents disapproved of, but parents' expectations could be quite ambiguous. For instance, when asked what types of content his parents wanted him to avoid, Teen 5 said, "really weird stuff…cause some videos out there, they're really weird. People, just do some weird stuff, they do drugs or they do challenges" (T5, TI). Many of the participants' (T5, 6, 7, and 8) compliance was implied and they rarely described themselves or were described as engaging with content their parents objected to. However, some teens did compensate for parental restrictions by managing their content and interactions in unexpected ways that both extended and limited their personal information ecologies (PEIs), in order to meet their own needs. For example, Teen 4 compensated for his mother's restrictions to his access by regulating his information seeking practices to prioritize his limited data for SM. He explained, "I mean I barely can use my phone to google stuff or to be on the Internet, cause it take a lot of data and I don't have too Internet on my phone so the data that I have is for my social media" (T4, TI). Similarly, Teen 2 negotiated her mother's restriction against SM by borrowing her friends' phones and SM accounts. She said, "so I would take their phone and answer every single

Snapchat" (T2, TI). By using her friends' accounts, she could connect with her peers and "stay updated" (T2, TI) without overtly breaking her mother's rules. In this way, parents established the framework for what teens understood was possible for their own ICT interactions and then teens developed their routine ICT practices in relation with that structure.

***Category: Brokering.*** Twenty-seven statements from the teen and parent interviews indicated that all of the adolescents, except for Teen 3, performed some language or technical brokering of their parents' interactions with ICTs (see Major Finding 2.5). Teens were understood as brokering when they described or were described helping their parents make connections to ICTs with either technical or language assistance similar to what Katz (2010) and Correa et al. (2015) have articulated. There was a large range in parents' language and technical abilities and in accordance, teens' assistance. For some youth (T1, 4, 7, and 8), technical help included only some occasional help with parents' mobile phone or an application. For others (T5 and 6) technical help included installing, maintaining, and troubleshooting all family ICT devices. Mom 5 said, "they take care of it, there they are the experts" (M5, PI, trans). Teen 2 and 6 shouldered more language brokering responsibilities, such as filling out forms, paying bills and parking tickets, and buying plane tickets, than did the other participants because their parents lack of English proficiency and technical ability. Teen 6 stated "I'm the one that fills out everything" (T6, TI). Providing an example, his father said, "I had a ticket, that they give me for the car and I didn't know how to pay it, and I wanted to pay it, and it could be paid, I didn't know so he helped me with that" (D6, PI,

trans). Lack of English skills compounded parents need for technical help. Mom 1 explained that "[w]hen you see an application for something and especially if I don't understand the English, she will download it for me, and help me interpret it" (M1, PI, trans). This type of assistance could even include help with online safety. For instance, Teen 6 described helping his family avoid phishing scams. He explained, "they were telling 'em something about Verizon…to go to this website and my sister was about to do it and I was like 'what are you doing? no, that's a scam, stop'" (T6, TI).

***Category: Sibling ICT mediation.*** Teens' assistance mediating their younger siblings' ICT content and interactions was significant within the data from all the interviews. Seven teens (T1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8) discussed or were reported performing this familial responsibility 25 times and it was represented in every family where they had younger siblings. Sibling ICT mediation could generally be divided into incidental mediation and active mediation. Incidental mediation was more common and involved a general awareness of younger siblings and the constraint of ICT activities to content they felt was appropriate for them, while active mediation concerned an ongoing active role in their siblings' ICT interactions. Five participants (T1, 2, 3, 5, and 6) talked about watching different content or playing different video games with their siblings than they did on their own. Teen 1 said, "my shows that I watch aren't like for him so… I just try to like watch what he wants because I know I'm not going to be there for long" (T1, TI). Three adolescents (T3, 6, and 7) actively mediated their younger siblings' ICT interactions, regularly having them change content that looked inappropriate and making sure they were not involved in anything problematic. For example, Teen 7

described a scenario that had recently occurred with her sister. She said, her sister "was typing someone…and I think that person was bullying her, so I grabbed the computer and I blocked the person and it was basically like cyber bullying, and so I told my parents and they were like okay you're not allowed to go on this anymore, I don't want these people bothering you" (T7, TI). Teen 7 kept an eye on her sister's ICT activities and then reported back to her parents "[w]henever I see something I don't like" (T7, TI). Parents In two families (F3 and 7) seemed to depend on their teens to consistently perform this role. Mom 7 explained, "the big one is always checking, cause like the other one is younger and that, she is more attentive, closer to the little one, because we are in a ladder [laughs] us with the big one and the big one checks what the little one does" (M7, PI, trans). In these ways teens took personal responsibility by managing their siblings' ICT interactions and extending their parents' monitoring and mediation abilities.

***Category: Research.*** Data collected from the parent and teen interviews established teens sometimes performed ICT information seeking research for the family. Three of the youth (5, 6, and 8) described or were described being involved in performing research for the purchase of ICT devices five times. Teens researched both to assist in the purchase of their own ICT devices (T5 and 8) and as a routine part of the teens' ICT responsibilities for the family (T5 and 6). Two participants (T5 and 8) were depicted performing research and presenting an argument to their parents as evidence of why a certain ICT should be purchased. Dad 8 explained how his teenage children "research what they want, and so they let us know what they want and if we can buy

this or that technology" (D8, PI, trans). However, for Teen 6, research was a much more ongoing and in-depth process that was his responsibility to perform for the entire family. Describing how he would help his sister, he said, "sometimes she's like, 'I wanna buy this, can you check the reviews or something,' and I search and I'm like 'alright, it's good, you could get it' or 'no, get something else 'cause it's bad'" (T6, TI). The difference in the type of research teens provided was associated with their parents' and families' knowledge of ICTs, their English proficiency, and the level of ICT related responsibility that teens had taken on in the family.

**Subtheme: Devices.** Data collected from all interviews indicated that the negotiation of ICT devices was an important subtheme in relation to teens' ICT use in the family context and was reported 58 times. The technologies that were available in adolescents' homes served as both resources and constraints and their use of them was highly dependent on their negotiation practices (see Chapter 4, Inventory of Devices section and Table 4.6 for a summary of the devices available to participants). In the analysis of the family and teen interviews, teens were identified as having four categories of practices in connection with their household ICTs: sharing (33 times), lending and giving away (13 times), issues of quality or breakdowns (12 times), and borrowing (8 times). Findings related to these categories will be presented below in a topical progression that begins with teens sharing practices, continues to lending, then borrowing, and ends with teens practices concerning ICT breakdowns and quality issues.

***Category: Sharing.*** Adolescents' negotiation of shared devices was the most prevalent category of practices concerning devices that arose in the analysis of the teen mapping activity and the interview data. All eight teens described managing shared devices 25 times in the teen interviews. Though all the youth described sharing ICTs at some point, it was more common in households that had fewer technologies, such as Families 2, 4, and 6. In these families, parents expected teens to share and they had developed more techniques to do so. Also, TVs, gaming systems, desktops, and laptops were often meant to be shared (see Table 4.6, Chapter 4, for available devices in the household). Teens described a variety of social protocols to negotiate the shared technologies of the home, such as claiming, taking turns, and time limits. For example, Teen 8 explained how she determined whose turn it was. She said, "[i]f we had it first, and they wanna watch something, and we've been there for a while, I would give it to them…if they're there, then I would ask, but if they're watching something then I would just play another time" (T8, TI). Parents also played a large role in context. For instance, Teen 2 shared a laptop with her four younger sisters. Their mother discussed attempting to institute turn-taking "by time" when she was home (M1, FI, trans), however, when she was not home, her daughter said they used "first call" (T2, FI, trans). Teen 2 explained, "it's about who claims it, and that person who claimed it" (T2, TI). By establishing "first call" or being the person who "claimed" a device, the adolescents could take some control over how household technologies were used. The interviews revealed that establishing dominance over a device was a powerful strategy. Three teens (T2, 6, and 8) described establishing dominance through habitual use.

Reoccurring daily routines helped solidify their claim (T2 and 6). Teen 6 said each afternoon after school, his mother was "watching TV…my little sister on her tablet, and I'm on the computer" (T6, TI). This type of routine meant the desktop was rarely vacant and that in order to use the shared item, family members needed to specifically request it. Teen 6 explained, "[m]e and my mom switch sometimes, like, sometimes she wants the computer so I'm like, all right, and then I watch the TV for a while" (T6, TI). They took turns, but Teen 6 would resume use as soon as they completed their task, further establishing his dominance over the device.

***Category: Lending and giving away.*** Teens' practices in relation to lending or giving away personal technologies emerged as a prominent category within each type of interview and was discussed by six teens (T1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8) 13 times. Individualization seemed to increase teens' mobility, give them more autonomy over their interactions, and decrease their need to share or lend their devices out (see Major Finding 2.6). However, half of the adolescents (T1, 5, 6, and 7) still described allowing younger siblings to borrow their personal devices for reasons such as their own waning interest (T1 and 7) and siblings' pleas (T5 and 6). About his little sister, Teen 6 said, "'if she sees me with it and I don't give it to her, she just starts crying" (T5, TI). Teens described various tactics to mitigate the risk of lending to siblings, such as making rules (T5) and hiding (T6). Teen 6, explained that he "used to like hide it from her basically…I used to hang around a lot in my room like back two years ago because of that" (T6, TI). Parents were also described as providing teens and their siblings with their own devices specifically to decrease conflict between them. Mom 3 explained each of her six kids

"have their tablets…so there's no more fighting" (M3, FI). In addition, the purchase of a new personal device could inspire youth to give another away. Teen 1 said, "I gave the tablet to my brother and now the phone is just one of my favorites" (T1, TI). However, it was more common for the participants to describe inheriting a technology from an older sibling (T4, 5, and 6) than giving one away (T1).

***Category: Borrowing.*** Borrowing personal devices from family members was a salient theme in the data and analysis indicated that it influenced teens' use of those devices. Interview statements from four participants (T2, 3, 6, and 7) were coded eight times as discussing borrowing family members' ICT devices. Teen 2 described borrowing her mother's smart phone and Teens 3, 6, and 7 discussed borrowing laptops. Most teens did not have their own laptops and had to borrow devices to complete school work. Teen 7 explained, "so now I'm using my dad's, 'cause he has a MacBook so it's easier, so I use his to do projects and if I need to print something out" (T7, TI). Borrowing was less common then sharing and the ownership of the device by another family member and the need to request to use it seemed to be an impediment to teens' use of the borrowed devices (see Major Finding 2.7). Participants usually tried to use their phones first and limit their use to the ICT activity for which they were requested. Teens 3 and 7 both described restricting their use of their parents' borrowed laptops to do schoolwork and to print. Teen 3 said, "I only use it for educational purposes" (T3, TI). Teen 2 and 6 described borrowing devices for activities other than schoolwork, but this was limited.

***Category: Device quality and breakdowns.*** Managing low quality devices and breakdowns presented in the data as significant issues that impacted teens' use of household ICT and by extension, their PEIs. The majority of the adolescents (T1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8) reported these types of issues 12 times. By far the most common strategies that they used to cope with these problems were by becoming accustomed to the loss or by using another technology. Two teens (T1 and 6) discussed the issue of managing a slow computer and how it discouraged them from use. With his interest in learning about software and hardware at an advanced level, Teen 6, felt the lack of quality of his household desktop acutely. He said, "I tried to learn, on that one but it's too slow" (T6, TI). Teen 6 compensated for the low quality of the family desktop by limiting use to activities the computer could handle and by planning to build a better one in the future. He explained, "I could use it but, it's not what I want. Yeah, so when I make one, I need a job, 'cause the parts and that, they're not cheap" (T6, TI).

Half of the teens (T2, 4, 7, and 8) also talked about adjusting to technical breakdowns. Breakdowns could compound other access issues and lead youth to limit their ICT activities. For example, Teen 4 admitted when he had hacked his cell phone five months before "I did something wrong, so now I can't download or update anything" (T4, TI). He explained he needed access to another computer to do it, but he did not "wanna go to a friend's house and bother him or whatever" (T4, TI). Instead of attempting to use the social capital that was available to him to fix the incorrectly executed "hack," Teen 4 chose to adjust to the breakdown by limiting his ICT activities and by extension his PEI.

**Subtheme: Internet access.** Though it was an uncommon practice across the teens, the negotiation of Internet access was a significant factor in the data for three teens (T4, 5, and 6). Data from their teen interviews was coded within this category 22 times. Teen 4 and 6's negotiation of their Internet access was related to constraints on their smartphone data plans, while Teen 5's was related to constraints on the strength of the Wi-fi signal in his household. They had practices to circumvent their constraints that included limiting ICT interactions to certain parts of the house (T5), limiting activities (T4), using apps to compensate (T6) and securing alternative methods to connect (T4 and 6). Having Wi-fi at home did not guarantee a high-quality connection. Teen 5 described having difficulty connecting in various parts of his household such as both his and his mother's bedrooms. Of his mother's bedroom, he said, "there's no connection there, it's like horrible" (T5, TI). Consequently, he limited his use of his laptop to the living-room because, "I have a better connection" (T5, TI). In contrast, Teen 4 and 6 had no Wi-Fi at home and moreover limited data on their phones. This was a bigger constraint for Teen 4, as he had little other access to the Internet in his home, while Teen 6 had an Internet connected desktop. To negotiate his limited access, Teen 4 rationed his data in order to have enough for the social media activities that he prioritized. He explained, "the data that I have is just reach enough to use Snapchat or my social medias" (T4, TI). Teen 4 and 6 also described using other individuals' phones as hotspots to connect to the Internet. For example, Teen 6 said, "[s]ometimes, when I need it, when I see somebody and I need to text them, since my phone's not connected, I'll be like to my friend or something, 'can you put the hotspot real quick so I could text

them?'" (T6, TI). Additionally, when he was able to connect to Wi-Fi he used the messaging capabilities of various social media sites to text. He explained, "Snapchat…Messenger, the Facebook thing, Kik, I use a lot for texting" (T6, TI). Though these participants had very different levels of access they negotiated their resources in order to maximize their connections to the Internet and meet their needs.

The findings presented in this chapter demonstrated the strong role parents and families played in teens' negotiation of their resources. Summary statements of this chapter will be presented next, followed by the Major Findings. The findings concerning how teens negotiated their relationships in accordance with their family small worlds in relation to their use of ICTs will then be presented in Chapter 7.

**Summary Statements**

Analysis of the data from the family, parent and teen interview resulted in these summary statements (Knowledge Claims) about teens' family small world ICT practices.

Physical Space:

- Teens negotiated their use of the physical space of the home in order to establish privacy in physical space and to construct personal space in shared physical space.
- Teens had central hubs or locations in the household where they usually centered their ICT use.
- Teens negotiated their ICT use in the physical spaces of the home in accordance with context and participated in a kind of "place-ballet" (Seamon, 1980).

Devices:

- Teens negotiated their use of the ICT devices that they had access to in the household.
- Teens actively negotiated household ICT devices by lending, sharing, and borrowing them.
- Teens often needed to negotiate problems with technologies such as quality issues and breakdowns.

Content and Interactions:

- Teens' understanding of what was appropriate ICT content or interactions was shaped by their parents.
- Teens had a variety of practices to negotiate their ICT content and interactions in accordance with their family small world that included choosing approved content and avoiding disapproved content.
- Teens often negotiated their families' interactions to ICTs through ICT brokering, ICT mediation of their younger siblings, and research.

Internet Access:

- Teens negotiated their ICT access in accordance with their family small world by using messaging apps rather than text messaging, borrowing hotspots, using outside Wi-fi connections, prioritizing certain content because of limited data, and choosing physical spaces to use ICTs with stronger Wi-fi signals.

**Major Findings for RQ 2a Related to Teens' Negotiation of Their Resources:**

Analysis of the data from all interviews, the teen surveys, the mapping activity, and fieldnotes resulted in the following Major Findings about Latino/a teens' family small world negotiation of their resources in relation to ICTs.

2.1 Teens' membership in the small world of their families influenced how teens used the resources that were available to them.

2.2 Teens' presence in physical space influenced their interactions with ICTs.

2.3 Teens negotiated their use of ICTs in the physical space of the household to fulfill their needs for personal space and social connections

2.4 Teens' negotiated their ICT content and interaction in accordance with what they believed their parents thought was appropriate.

2.5 Teens were involved in managing their parents and families' ICT interactions.

2.6 Teens ownership of devices provided them with some autonomy and freedom in managing their resources.

2.7 Teens' need to share or borrow devices influenced the likelihood of using them and the extension of their PEIs.

This chapter has presented findings related to teens' negotiation of their resources, the following chapter will address how ICTs fit into teens' practices for managing people and their relationships relative to their family small world.

# Chapter 7 : Findings for Research Question 2b (RQ 2b)

## Results for RQ 2b

This section will present findings for RQ 2b related to the practices that Latino/a teens use to negotiate their interpersonal relationships (see Table 6.1 in Chapter 6 for the full typology and Appendix G for Teen Family Small World Practices Typology codebook). The subthemes for the negotiation of interpersonal relationships (coded 328 times), discussed below, are negotiation of parental authority (60 times), social worlds (51 times), the use of mental frames (39 times), and social media (26 times). Findings relating to RQ 2b from these major qualitative themes and their subthemes are presented below in order of the frequency of their occurrence and illustrated with verbatim quotations from all interviews as appropriate.

**Subtheme: Managing parental authority.** References within the interviews to the adolescents' practices for managing the power differential between them and their parents were categorized as *managing parental authority*. For example, discussing her parents, Teen 7 said, "when they're around I can't just be on my phone like that because it's family time… But if I see them on their phone, I'm gonna be on my phone, too" (T7, TI)[78]. Teen 7 follows her parents' rules, but also understands when they are less likely to

---

[7] Abbreviations are used to identify participants' family role, the number of the family in which they were identified with in Chapter 4, and the type of interview the quotation is derived from. M stands for mom, D stands for dad, and T stands for teen. M2, FI from the first quotation in this chapter identifies the quotation as a statement Teen 2's mother made in their family interview.

[8] All illustrative quotations were in English unless marked as translated. All translations are presented verbatim, without corrections for grammar, but filler words (such as ah, like, um), word repetitions that

be applied and is able to manage that knowledge for her own benefit. Analysis of the family, parent, and teen interviews uncovered that teens actively negotiated their parents' authority over them in relation to ICTs (see Major Finding 2.8)[9]. All of the teens used statements that were coded 60 times as describing a practice they used to negotiate the power differential between them and their parents. Often these practices were implicit and simply a part of their regular way of doing things, and other times they consciously managed their boundaries with their parents to avoid punishment, evade suspicion, and negotiate their relationships. Three categories arose in the interview data under the negotiation of parental authority subtheme: earning leeway (30 times), not hiding (32 times), and pushing their boundaries (14 times), as discussed below.

***Category: Earning leeway.*** Data from the interviews indicated that seven teens (T2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) referred to practices they used to earn their parents' trust and possibly negotiate some lenience or less oversight (30 times). Earning their parents' trust usually was comprised of fulfilling parental priorities, complying with rules and restrictions, recognizing parental authority, avoiding disapproved ICTs, and responding to parents' ICT communications (see Major Finding 2.9). Participants largely reported, and were reported by their parents, as complying with parental authority. When Teen 6 was asked about the repercussions of breaking his parents' rules, he responded, "I don't

---

did not change the quotation's meaning, and interviewer responses are omitted to promote readability. Translations were all made by the investigator.

[9] The Major Findings are presented in list form at the end of the chapter. When each finding is introduced into the text of the findings its number will be stated, such as (see Major Finding 2.8).

know, 'cause I don't break them" (T6, TI). Sometimes the adolescents seemed to have internalized the rules as simply the way things are done, but other times, they complied purposefully to evade punishment, or make life easier. Mom 7 said about her daughter, "[s]he says it's better, she prefers, doing what she has to do than see us [chuckling]" (M7, PI, trans). If teens complied with parents' authority and fulfilled their priorities, parents were generally depicted as being more complacent and open to their ICT use. For example, Mom 5 said, "I tell him the game is not going anywhere, go do your stuff and then you can sit down relaxed and I won't bother you (M5, PI, trans). In these ways, youth could maintain the relational balance with their parents, earn some leeway with their ICTs, and avoid having them taken away.

***Category: Not hiding or Hiding in plain sight.*** Analysis of teens and parents' interview responses revealed that a significant strategy used to negotiate parents' authority was not hiding. They utilized this strategy to build trust with their parents, evade suspicion, limit monitoring, and also, in rare cases, to hide in plain sight. These teens' practices included: being open with their parents by voluntarily disclosing information (T4 and 7), yielding information and devices when asked (T4, 7, and 8), leaving online accounts open (T8), disclosing passwords (T1 and 7), sharing space with parents (T2, 4, 5, 7 and 8), and in one case by using parents' ignorance to hide in plain sight (T6). Eighteen statements were coded from every teen, except for Teen 1, as using these types of practices. These strategies were often combined and used as a general way of engaging with their parents. For example, Teen 4 explained that he was routinely open with his mother about his ICT interactions. He said, "when I'm using my

phone, if I'm on the couch and she's sitting next to me and she want to look, I'm right there so I just show her…I don't have anything to hide, so [I] don't get mad at her if she want to see my phone or whatever (T4, TI). An open dynamic was an ordinary part of the everyday routine of his relationship with his mother.

Trust was an important principle mediating family dynamics and teens' openness was described by parents as an essential component of their trust. For instance, Dad 8 explained, "they don't mind that their Facebook stay open on the computer or their email, from that side we feel confident in what they do on the computer…and [we] respect what they do" (D8, PI, trans). Because his children were open with him and his wife, Teen 8's father believed they could, in turn, give them more autonomy to interact with ICTs. Regularly sharing household space also inspired parents' trust in their children. Mom 7 said she did not worry about her daughter because, "she is always at our side, she's near. When a child isolates herself and you see that she is always isolated you have to suspect that something is happening, but she doesn't give us that, that distrust, that she's very quiet or isolated, no she is always near us" (M7, PI, trans). Most teens (T2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) described themselves, or were described by their parents, as sharing space with parents at least occasionally, and many did it often. This allowed participants to build trust with their parents and preempt parental monitoring and mediation.

An inversion of not hiding was the use of open ICT interactions and shared physical space to hide in plain sight. Though not common, this tactic seemed to be

practiced by Teen 6. Dad 6 described how he and his wife kept the family desktop in the living room in order to supervise their children's ICT activities. However, Teen 6 said his parents "don't know about anything, basically. If I go on YouTube and I'm watching some video or something, they don't know about it" (T6, TI). He had a few practices to protect his personal boundaries from what his parents might consider "weird" (T6, TI), such as minimizing content when they were in the room, but what really seemed to give him confidence, was how much more he knew about technology and the Internet than they did. He said, "they know not even the basics, basically" (T6, TI). In a sense, he seemed to hide from them in plain sight by using their inattentiveness, dearth of technical knowledge, and lack of English language skills as a buffer.

***Category: Pushing boundaries.*** Though teens' and parents' accounts in the interviews described teens almost always following their parents' rules and respecting their authority, the data indicated they did participate in some attempts to push their boundaries with their parents and these types of practices were represented in the data 12 times. The participants usually attempted to do this through verbal attempts to affect change. Their pleas depended on their specific situation, but asking parents for a few more minutes or some more time on whatever device they were using was the most common form of persuading parents to change a restriction. For example, Teen 5's mother said, "sometimes I tell him, go to bed…and he is connected playing and to disconnect is a problem, 'just one hour,' now five muntes,' 'just let me finish this game' and it's a whole project" (M5, PI, trans). Five teens (T1, 2, 4, 5, and 7) were found to request a change or probe for an explanation for a rule or restriction they felt was

unfair. For instance, Mom 4 said that after she took her son's phone away, "everyday he was like, mami, please!" (M4, PI, trans). Four teens (T1, 5, 6, and 7) were also described or described themselves as being assertive about asking for the ICTs they desired. They would make arguments to their parents for certain ICT purchases. Teen 1 said she often talked to her parents, "when I want to show them something, I want this, I want that" (T1, TI). It was apparent in the data that the practices that participants used to extend or push their ICT boundaries with their parents were fairly benign, and not dramatic. However, teens did use a steady stream of verbal attempts that were successful at least some of the time.

**Subtheme: Social worlds.** Statements that referred to the ways that teens brought their ICT interactions with their social worlds, such as their peers and at school, into accordance with their family small worlds were categorized as *social worlds*. For instance, talking about one of the practices she used to meet her schools' ICT expectations, Teen 2 said, "I go to the public library to print…so I just type it there, and I print it, and then I take it home" (T2, TI). Analysis of the teen interviews demonstrated that the structures and constraints inherent in their family small worlds imposed constrictions on their ability to connect and conform to the ICT social norms and expectations of their extended social worlds. Fifty-one units of data indicated participants often confronted social norms and expectations related to their ICT use in schools and by peers. The need for this type of practice was more discernable in the teens who were the most constrained by the circumstances of their family small world. It was particularly visible in Teen 2's individual interview. Teen 2 was the only teen in

the study without her own smart phone because her parents were uncomfortable with technology and feared the change it would cause in their family culture. However, other participants with less constraints and abundant access also took actions to align their extended social worlds with their family (see Major Finding 2.10). The analysis of family, parent, and teen interviews uncovered that teens' extended world negotiation practices could be subdivided into four categories of practices, including the negotiation of social relationships (21 times), taking advantage of devices outside the home (16 times), using social capital (10 times), and engaging interpersonal methods (4 times). These categories will be presented below in order of frequency of occurrence and illustrated with verbatim quotations from the interviews.

***Category: Social relationships.*** Analysis of the interviews illuminated how the ICT social norms of the family small world could influence teens' choice of friends and how their choice of friends could influence their freedom to interact with ICTs. The influence of the family small world ICT structure and constraints on teens' social relationships were visible 21 times in the data. This was discernable in participants' descriptions of their interactions with their friends and communities, as well as their explanations for why they did not interact with their peers. Three teens (T2, 3, and 7) discussed having friends that made it easier for them to live by their parents' values and constraints. For instance, when Teen 7 was asked in her individual interview if her friends ever made it difficult to follow her parents' rules she said "[m]y friends are goody-goodies, I don't have that problem…good friends worry about their grades, worry about what their parents are thinking," (T7, TI). In addition, she seemed to believe that

having friends that her parents approved of helped them to trust her and consequently to give her more autonomy to interact freely with them and the ICTs she used to do that.

Parental constraints that affected teens' relationships seemed to lead teens to interact with ICTs in particular ways and, by extension, to choose one community of friends over another. Teen 3's mother had forbidden him to go outside without his family beyond school and an afterschool club. Teen 3 revealed that he conformed with that restriction, stating "I don't really have friends who socialize in real life." Instead, he said, "I do it mostly online, I don't really go out the house at all so, this is my space" (T3, TI). He focused all his need for social connection onto his online gaming community.

The data also revealed that half the teens (T1, 3, 4, and 6) sometimes used ICT practices that distanced them from their peers in order to comply with parental constraints and therefore limited their personal information (ecology PIE) (see Major Finding 2.11). Sometimes this involved simply accepting their parents' restrictions and other times it involved specific maneuvers to avoid their peers. For example, Teen 4 had given up gaming online with his friends to comply with his mother. He said, "she didn't like that kind of games so I had to delete them" (T4, TI). She disapproved of the violent games he was playing and the competitive behavior that it inspired and when his friends asked him to play, he would decline. He explained, "if they ask me now, 'do you play?', or 'do you have this game?', whatever, I'm like 'nah, I don't have it,' that's it, I don't really miss the games or playing with other people" (T4, TI). Teen 1, on the other hand,

was more active in her rejection of her peers to comply with her mother's social restrictions. Though she was vague in her interview, her mother provided details in the parental interview that she had read in her daughter's ICT communications. She said, "when they invite her, like a group is going to the pool…'no I'm doing something, but thanks,' or 'I don't have any money,' 'I'm going to do some other things,' she now knows, how to defend herself in that situation, I have seen her" (M1, PI, trans). Teen 1 complied with her mother's restriction from socializing outside of the house by providing her peers with socially acceptable excuses using chats and text messages as to why she could not participate in social events with them.

***Category: Devices.*** Teens' use of institutional or borrowed technologies to supplement their ability to meet extended social world expectations was coded 12 times in the interview data. The participants with no access to laptops at home, or even some with less access, generally compensated by using schools' (T2, 3, 4, 6, and 7), or less commonly, the public library's computers (T2). Teen 4 had no devices beyond his smart phone in his home, but he had developed a regular routine to help him meet the ICT expectations of his school. He said, "I have a routine now, if they gave me homework, then I know that I have to go [trans] to the library, so I just get a pass and go to the library and do it" (T4, TI). Teen 2 and 4 also borrowed their mother's cell phone (T2) and internet connection (T4) to keep up with school communications, such as text reminders about projects.

***Category: Social capital.*** Teen 2 also described using social capital (coded 10 times) to help her to meet her peer's ICT social norms and academic expectations. Teen

2 explained that she often enlisted her best friend to help her meet her school's expectations. She said, "I usually tell–one of my closest friends…'I'm gonna send you the link of this, could you print it?' She's like 'okay'" (T2, TI). By cultivating her friendships and understanding them as resources she was able to extend her PIE with resources that she did not have access to in her own household. Teen 2 also regularly borrowed her friends' phones while she was with them to connect with her peers and live up to the social norm of SM participation. She explained, "I'm the one always on their phone, I'm like, 'I feel like it's picture time,' I take their phone, I'm the one who's like 'let's Snapchat this!'" (T2, TI).

***Category: Interpersonal methods.*** Interpersonal methods of managing family small world ICT constraints in relation to extended social world expectations were especially salient for Teen 2. In her interview, she mentioned using interpersonal communication four times to negotiate not having a phone in environments where smart phones were the norm for everyone she knew. For instance, she described speaking to teachers in private when they asked her to complete a task in class that she was unable to do without her own phone. She explained, "my theology teacher was like, okay, take your phones out, and we did a live Quizlet, and it was about to pick the topic of our project, so everyone went in their phones, signed in, whatever and they picked…Yeah, so, that means I had to tell the teacher I can't get in" (T2, TI). Interpersonal practices such as these allowed Teen 2 to participate at school without calling attention to not having a phone, but she also used interpersonal methods with her peers. For example, she said, "today I had a field trip, I told my friend, are we gonna

bond or are you gonna bond with your phone" (T2, TI)? By commenting on her friends' behaviors, she was able to influence how her peers interacted with ICTs while she was present.

**Subtheme: Mental frames.** The *mental frames* classification was used when the participants communicated a narrative that indicated they processed a constraint in a way that helped them accept it. About not having a phone, Teen 2 said, "there's advantages…like one of my closest friends, her mom takes her phone away because it drives her [to] so much drama. So, to me, I'm drama free because I don't have to deal with that!" (T2, TI). Analysis of the data collected from teen statements in the family and teens interviews suggested that they often made an effort to mentally process the constraints to their ICT use in a way that enabled them to accept the constrain and maintain the balance of their relationship with their parents and their membership in their family small world (see Major Finding 2.12). Thirty-six instances of mental frames were coded from interviews with six teens. Four frames were most prominent in the data: acclimating to constraints (13 times), positive reframing (11 times), having no control (8 times), and looking to the future (7 times).

***Category: Acclimating frames.*** Statements from four adolescents depicting their adaption to an ICT constraint that had been imposed on them were classified as *acclimating frames*. Describing how things had changed since her mother's sister's family had moved into their household Teen 7 said, "[w]hen they weren't here, I used to spend time, all the time in the basement" (T7, TI). When she was asked how she found

privacy in the newly crowded house, she responded, “I don’t get much privacy, so I'm just used to it” (T7, TI). By choosing this frame, Teen 7 communicated that she had chosen to accept the constraints rather than create conflicts with her family or extended family. A variation of this narrative was participants’ description of their adjustment as being a result of having changed their own mind about the new constraint (T3 and 4). This frame enabled teens to accept the new circumstances, but position themselves as having agency. For example, Teen 4 explained how he had changed his mind about an activity his mother had forbidden. He said, “at the time, I disagreed with her, but after that I didn’t have the games and then some friend show[ed] me the games...[and] I didn’t like them anymore” (T4, TI).

***Category: Positive frame.*** Three participants (T2, 4, and 6) used positive frames to discuss a constraint. Accounts were categorized as positive frames when they demonstrated a teen discussing an ICT constraint as beneficial to them. For example, describing the effects of not having a smart phone, Teen 2 said, “okay, you have it, and now a million people are texting you, you have to reply. Sometimes I don’t have time for that and I don’t even have one to be all the time, ‘oh I just did this, blah blah blah’. How are you gonna live 24 hours of the day doing that? So sometimes I thank that secretly, that I don’t have one” (T2, TI). Positive frames were described by participants as allowing them to accept their constraints and not resent them.

***Category: No control frames.*** Four participants (T1, 2, 3, and 7) communicated eight statements that positioned them as not having any power to change their

situation. These were coded as utilizing the *no control* frame. For example, when asked what she did about the unflattering pictures her mother posted to SM about her, Teen 1 said, "I don't do anything, it's not my Facebook to control" (T1, TI). The acceptance of her mother's Facebook account as a place that was out of the realm of her control, helped Teen 1 to avoid the conflict that might occur if she had taken a defensive position to her mom's frequent posts.

***Category: Future frame.*** Statements from two teens (T3 and 6) were categorized as using *the future* framing device seven times. Adolescents' reports were coded in this category if they presented their constraints as temporary and situated their ICT use and knowledge as methods they would use to overcome their limitations in the future. For example, In the family interview, Teen 6 said, "I could like build a computer and stuff, like I know how to do it" (T6, FI). Later he explained that he had a concrete plan to buy the parts he would need online when he was sixteen and was able to get a job. He said, "if I had a better one, I could be doing more stuff. I could learn more" (T6, TI). He described the narrative of a better future as helping him to accept how things were, and directing how he interacted with ICTs in order to prepare.

**Subtheme: Social media practices.** Statements were categorized as *social media (SM)* when they referred to the complexity of boundary negotiation with parents as friends or followers on SM. Teen 3 explained how he would ask his mother not to make certain posts about him. Discussing asking his mother to take SM posts down, Teen 3 said, "I say it, it's just there's points where there's certain things that's kind of

embarrassing and stuff that you know I wouldn't do" (T3, TI). Analysis of interview data revealed that all of the teens had referred to managing their personal boundaries on social media (26 times). Social media was a pervasive presence that every teen in the study interacted with in one form or another. They often used social media to connect and communicate with their peers, to stay up-to-date, and to stay occupied, but in order to do so they often had to negotiate an audience that included a host of individuals from different contexts (see Major Theme 2.13). For example, Teen 4 said, "I just have like one [profile] for everybody--For my friends in school, my friends that I know for a long time, my friends from PR, my family, everybody has my one Instagram, my one Snapchat" (T4, FI). Participants described practices to negotiate the reception of their own posts and posts that were linked to them (11 times), the imposition of parents' posts (9 times), and to connect socially with family (6 times). These categories will be presented below in a topical progression using quotations from the qualitative interview data when suitable.

***Category: Parents' posts.*** Much of the negativity that participants described in relation to being friends with parents on SM was connected with the posts parents, particularly mothers, published about them. Teens discussed a number of coping strategies that included active strategies to change their mothers' behavior, as well as more passive practices nine times. Teen 4 was the only one that had asked his mother to stop posting about him altogether. His mother said that she had posted about her son "a long time ago" (M4, PI, trans), but said that she had stopped when he had asked her to refrain. In his interview, Teen 4 confirmed her statement, saying, "yeah, she

never posts anything" (T4, TI). Practices that participants used in connection with their parents' posts were making active requests for parents to stop posting about them (T4), asking parents to take down posts they had already published (T3 and 7), claiming lack of control (T1, 3 and 7), and making a decision to accept parents' posting practices (T3). Some adolescents did not have as much luck with their attempts to curb their mother's posts. Teen 3 and 7 expressed having asked their mothers to take down posts they disliked, but indicated they had less success. When Teen 7 was asked what she had done about an unflattering "throwback" photo her mother had posted of her, she responded she had asked her to "take it down, of course. She didn't listen, she was like 'this is before you' and blah blah blah, fine, I was like, 'but it's just annoying'" (T7, TI). While teens 3 and 7 had taken some action by asking their parents to take down posts, they communicated that they felt as if they had no ability to constrain them. Teen 3 framed his lack of control as an explanation for a decision to "toughen up" and tolerate his mother's posts. When he was asked how he had gotten to the point where he was okay with her "embarrassing" posts, he said, "I grew accustomed to it, but I would say just recently I got used to it, it was just like 'alright I have no choice anyways, you're going to do it anyways so, to toughen up'" (T3, TI).

***Category: Teens' posts.*** Analysis of the interviews uncovered that teens' posts to social media were another aspect of their social media participation that was made complicated by having parents as friends. More than half of the adolescents (T1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) discussed practices they used to control their social media posts and how they

were understood, (11 times), and half the teens (T1, 3, 4, and 7) demonstrated using these practices specifically in relation to their parents.

Teens that were friends with parents on social media, or had them as followers, described often choosing to either post items that they believed would be acceptable to all their audiences (T1, 4, and 7) and/or making posts only the intended audience would be able to understand, similar to what other researchers have found (see boyd & Marwick, 2011; Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Vickery, 2015). By keeping it "PG" (T7, TI) participants could avoid any negative consequences from being observed by an unintended audience member. For example, Teen 1 explained, "you know how [some people] just don't like certain things, they think this is wrong, they think this is right? Like if I post something, like a picture of, what is that thing called like, the march that they did for gay rights?...Yeah, some people get offended, I won't do that" (T1, TI). Three teens (T5, 6, and 7) also described managing their social boundaries on SM by making posts that only some individuals would understand. They did this by using song lyrics (T6), references to inside jokes (T5), or acronyms (T7). For example, Teen 7 disclosed, "maybe I'll say something like, no one uses it anymore, but you know what LOL means? There's those little short words that they don't understand, only my friends understand" (T7, TI). In these ways, participants were able to negotiate their personal boundaries and participate with their peers.

*Ancillary finding.* In his parent interview, Dad 8 made a comment that reveals another layer of complexity for Latino/a and immigrant teens' participation on SM. He

mentioned that their daughter helped him and his wife to negotiate what was appropriate for them to post on SM. He said, “many times she takes care of us, a lot of times too, of what people might think, other people” (D8, PI, trans). His comment suggests that immigrant teens might also be responsible for managing the boundaries of the family group on SM in addition to their own boundaries. However, there was no other data concerning this additional area of teen family responsibility and SM boundary negotiation.

***Category: Social connections.*** Despite having to negotiate extra surveillance and complicated layers of social norms from being friends with parents on social media, interview data revealed that teens also used social media to relationally connect with members of their families. Six instances of participants using social media to connect with family were coded from four teens (T5, 6, 7, 8). Practices that teens used to connect with family members were posting about them and interacting, and commenting on their posts. Four teens (T5, 6, 7, 8) described using social media to publicly interact and connect with family members. For example, Teen 7 was described by her mother as using SM to interact with her. During the parental interview, Mom 7 showed the investigator a quick video that her daughter had posted to Instagram. In the video Teen 7, said, “mira mami [look mom], my boyfriend, he’s cute, right? Right ma? Ok, mira, he plays basketball, he’s so tall, he’s so cute [Her mom giggles]” (M7, PI, trans). Teen 7 had posted this video to the Instagram account she shared with her mother, teasing her mother in a playful and affectionate way, about a fake boyfriend. Teen 7 could be understood as managing multiple audiences in this video. She was

communicating with her mother. She was quite possibly teasing her mother about a post that her mother had made her take down from Snapchat showing her with a boy, and she was performing their mother/daughter relationship in public for both sets of their friends. Teen 7's post demonstrated sophisticated negotiation of the intricacies of context and of relationship construction and maintenance on social media. Another social media practice that was revealed in the Family 7 interview, was the use of joint production of media content to connect relationally with family members. Teen 7 said, "me and my cousin like recording" (T7, FI) and posting to Snapchat. Mom 7 then described how they would enlist Teen 7's younger sister to film. She said "[w]hat the two cousins are doing, they put her on filming because she doesn't have Snapchat" (M7, FI, trans).

Though not common in the data, Teen 8 was also described using social media to connect with family members offline by her father in the parental interview. Dad 8 said she would come find them and, "show us something from her phone, or an application, like Snapchat" (D8, PI, trans). The social media content provided the context for Teen 8 to connect with her parents and share what was happening in her life with them.

This chapter has described findings concerning the ICT related practices teens used to negotiate their relationships in accordance with the family small world. The subsequent section presents summary statements for this chapter, followed by the Major Findings.

**Summary Statements**

Analysis of the data from the family, parent and teen interview resulted in these summary statements (Knowledge Claims) about teens' family small world ICT-related negotiation of their relationshsips.

Managing Parental Authority

- Teens did not often report or were reported by parents as breaking their parents' ICT rules and restrictions, and all teens demonstrated a general respect of their parents' authority.
- Teens earned leeway for their ICT use by following rules, respecting their parents' authority, and completing their responsibilities.
- Teens maintained an impression of openness for their parents by showing their devices when asked, leaving devices around the house, leaving online accounts open on shared devices, disclosing information, sharing passwords, and sharing space.
- Teens attempted to push the boundaries of their ICT use by asking parents for ICT devices, advocating for themselves, questioning their parents about their restrictions, asking for more time, and going past parents' ICT allotted time.

Extended Small Worlds:

- Teens' membership in the small world of their families influenced the connections they made with their other social worlds.

- Teens had a variety of strategies to negotiate their social worlds in order to stay in accordance with the small world of their family.
- Teens had a variety of practices to negotiate the influence that the familial small world ICT constraints had on their social connections.
- The methods that teens used to negotiate the boundaries of their familial small world influenced their access to ICTs.
- Teens used their social capital to extend their PIEs.

Mental Frames:

- Teens framed their ICT situations in ways that made it easier to adjust to their familial small worlds and maintain the equilibrium of their relationships with their parents.

Social Media:

- Teens needed to negotiate multiple audiences in the online environment.
- Teens had a variety of practices they used to negotiate their boundaries online that included, censoring what they posted, making posts only some people would understand, non-use, non-participation, and negotiations with friends and family about taking posts down.
- Teens often had to negotiate their parents' posts on social media.

**Major Findings for RQ 2b Related to Teens' Negotiation of Their Interpersonal Relationships**

Analysis of the data from the teen surveys, the mapping activity, and the fieldnotes from the family, parent, and teen interviews resulted in the following Major Findings about these Latino/a teens' negotiation of their resources in accordance with the family small world:

2.8 Teens had ICT related practices that were specifically connected to negotiating parental authority.

2.9 Teens' described and were described complying with parents' rules and restrictions and respecting their authority.

2.10 Teens had a variety of practices to manage their social worlds in order to negotiate their membership in the small world of their family.

2.11 The methods that teens used to negotiate the boundaries of their familial small world in relation their other small worlds both increased and decreased the extension of their PIEs.

2.12 Teens used mental frames to process their constraints in ways that made it easier for teens to accept them.

2.13 Teens had practices in relation to their friendships with their parents on social media to negotiate the collapsed context of SM and connect with parents and family.

This section has presented findings from the analysis of the surveys, mapping activity, and family, parent, and teen interviews concerning the practices that teens used to negotiate their ICT interactions in order to maintain the balance of their membership within their family and meet their needs. The following section will present a discussion of the findings.

# Chapter 8 : Discussion of Findings

This chapter contains the discussion of the findings, following the order of the research questions. The first section addresses the findings for RQ 1 concerning parental mediation (PM) practices, and the two following sections will address RQ 2, RQ 2a, and RQ 2b in relation to teens' family small world negotiation of resources and their interpersonal relationships.

## Discussion for RQ 1 Related to Finding Presented in Chapter 5

This section discusses the findings related to Research Question 1 (RQ 1), which asked: How do Latino/a parents mediate their teens' Information Communication Technology (ICT) practices? The discussion addresses the typology of ICT mediation practices that was produced from analysis of the data, afterwhich it will discuss directive narratives and their relation to parenting and the ICT context of the home.

The typology produced from this project subdivided parents' ICT mediation practices into six subthemes: rules and restrictions, devices, active mediation, parental monitoring, privacy, social media (SM), and directive narratives (see Chapter 5 for the PM typology and Appendix F for the full typology codebook with definitions and examples ). As discussed in the literature review (see Chapter 2) traditional PM theory generally concieves of three types of PM; active, restrictive and co-use (Nathanson, 2002, 2008). Other researchers have added categories to this classification, such as monitoring (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008), co-playing (Joiw et al., 2016; Nikken & Jansz, 2003, 2006; Shin & Huh, 2011) and participatory learning (Clark, 2011; Zaman et al.,

2016). Findings generally uphold these categories, but also diverge somewhat because of this dissertation's focus on PM in relation to its influence on adolescents' ICT use, rather than as a set of activities directed at protecting children from negative media effects (see Major Finding 1.1)[10]. For this this reason, findings revealed additional categories of active mediation, considers parental monitoring and privacy as connected, but separate concepts, and includes an entire subtheme devoted to SM.

Contrary to recent findings (Clark, 2011; Joiw et al., 2016; Nikken & Jansz, 2003, 2006; Shin & Huh, 2011; Zaman et al., 2016), this dissertation found limited evidence for co-use and co-playing and no evidence of participatory learning. There were families that discussed co-use (F 1, 2, 4, and 7)[11] and co-playing (F3 and 8), but these practices were only described as being frequent in Family 3, where father and son shared a gaming hobby (see "buddy parenting" in Zaman et al., 2016), and Family 4, where restrictions on his access meant that Teen 4 had little choice, but to share with his mother if he wanted to use the Internet. Many of these practices have been more readily identified with younger children (Nikken & Janz, 2014), which suggests the lack of evidence in this study for these types of practices might indicate parents use ICTs with their children more when they are young, but taper off as they get older. Parents

[10] The Major Findings are presented in list form at the end of each of the findings chapters. When each finding is introduced into the text of the Discussion its number will be stated, such as (see Major Finding 2.8).

[11] Abbreviations are used to identify participants' family role, the number of the family in which they were identified with in Chapter 4, and the type of interview the quotation is derived from. M stands for mother, F stands for father, and T stands for teen. M2, FI from the first quotation in this chapter identifies the quotation as a statement Teen 2's mother made in their family interview.

were involved in their teens' ICT use, but this was expressed more as help with ICTs, discussions about its use, and encouragement of certain types of interactions. If the assitance with ICTs that parents and teens gave one another was included as co-use, the practice would have been classified as common. However, these types of assistance were usually described by participants more as unidirectional help that either parents or teens were providing and neither discussed sitting down together to learn as a joint activity. Instructional assistance has typically been grouped with conversational active mediation in PM, but it is incuded in the dissertations's PM typology in Appendix F as a separate category of active mediation, because it often seemed like a different type of activity than conversation. While these two categories do overlapp somewhat, conversation seemed to be used more to shape teens' overall practices, or what is generally called a proactive parenting process (Padilla-Walker, Christensen, & Day, 2011), while ICT help was often more perfunctory and practical.

Consistent with the literature (Chakroff & Nathanson, 2009), parental conversations with their children concerning their use of media was a very popular form of PM in this dissertation. This dissertation provides a catalog of the topics that were most prominently depicted in parents' conversations that builds on past conceptualizations of conversation in PM as purposeful attempts to shape teens' evaluation of media (Eastin, Greenberg, & Hofschire, 2006; Kirwil, 2009) by distinguishing the topics that were most prominantly discribed by parents. Parents reported conversing with their teens about ICTs in relation to information literacy (P2, 4,

and 7), online safety (P1,2,3, 4, 7, and 8), rules and restrictions (P4, and 8), teens' transgressions (P1, 3, 4, 7, and 8), and their beliefs and values (P1, 2, 4, and 8).

The use of monitoring in a variety of forms was also a popular practice among the participating parents. Monitoring has generally been considered a kind of restictive mediation (Eastin et al., 2006; Kirwil, 2009; Nikken & Jansz, 2003, 2006; Oosting et al., 2008 ), but as Jiow et al (2016) have indicated, and was also found in this dissertation, monitoring is often not restrictive, and it is also often combined with other mediation practices, particularly privacy practices, that make it beneficial to address it singularly. This designation needs updating for today's more extensive media environment and the important role ICT monitoring seemed to play in PM and parenting. Zaman et al. (2016) argue that parents use supervison in conjunction with deference (see Padilla-Walker, Coyne, Fraser, Dyer, & Yorgason, 2012), to grant their children some autonomy over their interactions with ICTs, but also to stay involved. This finding was upheld by this dissertation, but there was also a range of monitoring and privacy provision that are not addressed within the concept as Zaman et al. have concieved it. The parents in this dissertation were found to use various types of monitoring that included supervison, but also incorporated verbal enquiries, and monitoring of teens' devices, online accounts, and Internet histories. These additonal subdivisions are simlar to the Ledbetter et al. (2010) classifications of parental invasions of privacy. However, invasion is a loaded word for these parenting practices, considering that in interviews parents reported using monitoring for a variety of purposes and with a range of intensity. Though infrequently it was described as an active process that involved reading all

communications and following all Internet interaction (P1), monitoring was usually discribed as a more passive practice that hinged on the possibility that it could occur (see Major Finding 1.5). Mom 3 explained, “I trust him 'cause…so let's say my husband falls asleep and he's still online, and I gave him a bedtime and he didn't go to bed, my husband could find out if he's still playing, who he's talking to” (M3, FI)[12]. Her ability to check Teen 3’s gaming history, and her belief in his knowledge that she could check on him at anytime allowed her to trust him enough to refrain from engaging in any actual monitoring of his activities. This type of internalization of external motivation is called integration by Deci and Ryan (2008) and was often integrated into parents’ balance between monitoring and the provision of privacy.

While parents often balanced monitoring with privacy they have been separated in the typology assembled in this dissertation in order to clarify their distinct dimensions. Privacy provison, often referred to as deference (Padilla-Walker, 2008; Padilla-Walker et al., 2012), was divided between the granting of four types of privacy: autonomy, independence, physical space, and device and account privacy. These varying types of privacy were distributed differently among the parents and combined with the various types of monitoring in contrasting ways (see Major Finding 1.6). For example, Teen 7’s parents used SM monitoring and occasional monitoring of her

[12] All illustrative quotations were in English unless marked as translated. All translations are presented verbatim, without corrections for grammar, but filler words (such as ah, like, um), meaningless word repetitions, and interviewer responses are omitted to promote readability. Translations were all made by the investigator.

personal devices coupled with the provision of a high degree of autonomy to interact with ICTs as she felt was appropriate. On the other hand, Teen 1's mother used extensive monitoring of her accounts and devices, but allowed her daughter privacy in her bedroom. Parents used these combinations of practices to control their teens' ICT practices, but they were also used as resources for parenting.

An important aspect of findings regarding PM was that the practices that were oriented towards limiting the negative effects of ICTs on teenage children were completely intertwined with mediation that was more a product of general parenting concerns and used as a parental resource (see Major Finding 1.2). Clark (2011) has critiqued the traditional focus on media effects within the PM literature (e.g., Borzekowski & Robinson, 2007; Lemish, 2008; Nathanson, 1999; Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999) as idealistic and called for research that includes a more realistic consideration of ICT parenting practices. As media and ICTs converge (Jenkins, 2006) and become integrated into every aspect of modern families' routines, it is more helpful to characterize PM in terms of the overall influence that parents have on their children's ICT practices. PM research could be very relevant to everyday life information seeking (ELIS) research as it would promote understanding of parental information practices and their influence on children and teens' practices. There is also already a large body of literature that describes parents' intermediation between children and ICTs to serve as a foundation. To make the transition the "mediation" terminology should be understood to have a more nuetral intermediary quality than the PM literature has generally proposed. This is not to imply that parents are nuetral in their

influence of teens' ICT use, but that their influence has many pretexts and purposes that are not soley related to wanting to prevent the negative effects of ICTs. For instance, Teen 1's mother encouraged her daughter to use ICTs in a way that would benefit her future and make her more attractive to colleges. This encouragement could be described both as a parenting practice or an attempt to instruct her daughter on how to use ICTs in a responsiible and productive manner. One ICT mediation practice that was used by all of the parents more as a general parenting practice was the removal of devices as a threat or punishment. This practice was often used by parents as a behavior contingency (see Hogan, 2001; Kutner et al., 2008; Nikken & Janz, 2006) to persuade teens to comply with them in the moment and to influence their priorities in general (see Major Finding 1.4).

Parents influenced their teens' ICT use with behavioral contingencies that constrained the context of teens' use and with rules and restrictions that put specific limits on the type of content, interactions, and access that were allowed or possible (see Major Finding 1.3) as O'Connor et al. (2013) have specified, however, the contextual backdrop of this dissertation indicated that most of parents' influence on teens' interactions with ICTs was messy and less delineated than those classifications would suggest (see Major Finding 1.7). The devices they allowed into the household, their own technical competencies, the activities they supported, the help they provided, the values they tried to impart, and the family narratives they established were intertwined with the explicit limits parents made on ICTs. This finding regarding broad familial ICT influence was more similar to what Silverstone et al. (1989) have called technological

inheritance than to PM, when it is depicted as a group of distinct practices that are used in isolation as it is often characterized by scholars (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008; Nathanson, 2002, 2008; Yardi & Bruckman, 2011). For example, Teen 3's father was a gamer and had always encouraged and helped his son to strengthen these skills. Teen 3 described how his father had "actually put an Xbox controller in my hand at the age of 6 and I've been playing since then" (T3, TI). His father's encouragement, assistance, and co-playing in this domain seemed to have an enhancement effect (Nathanson, 2002, 2008), setting the groundwork for Teen 3 to focus most of his time on improving his gaming skills. Teen 3 said, "I spend, I would say most of the day [gaming],…I would say more than eight hours" (T3, TI). Family context influenced teens in various ways. For instance, Teen 6 developed some of his ICT competence to provide his parents with language brokering and technical assistance. This familial need in combination with the ICT freedom his parents afforded, and an extended family member that reinforced his interests, helped spark his interest in technology and the technological competence he built over time, despite being a member of one of the least affluent families in the sample. The early introduction and encouragement of technical activities seemed particularly instrumental. Teen 6 explained that he had become interested in computers because his cousin "knows a lot about computers basically...since we were little, like seven or something we used to play on computers a lot, that's why" (T6, TI). All of these contextual factors influenced the ICT competence that Teen 6 developed.

Parents, teens, and individual family members seemed to reveal their priorities within their accounts of their practices. Parents positioned themselves in relation to

society by using “publicly available stock” (Carey, 1989; Hoover et al., 2004) as “an explanation and justification of themselves as ‘good’ parents and by extension, creators of healthy families” (Hoover et al. p. 8), but in doing that they communicated their personal priorities as parents and individuals in relation to their practices. Plowman (2015) has shown that parents “ethnotheories” influence the group of practices that parents use with young children. In addition, Silverstone et al. (1989) have argued that the stories or “family mythologies” that families recount about themselves were important to the functioning of family households. This dissertation builds on their argument by demonstrating that both family and individual narratives were significant to the evolving dynamic of the family around ICTs and what the family experienced as their reality. Mitchell and Egudo (2003) assert that narrative is “deeply constitutive of reality, not merely a device for establishing meaning” (p.2). In concurrence, data analysis identified family directive narratives as providing a shared context that helped to establish the boundaries of the family, their orientation to one another, and to outsiders (1.11).

Parents were not solely directed by family and parental narratives, they also had individual narratives. While PM has been found to be gendered (Louie, 2003; Liau, Khoo, & Ang, 2008), analysis of the individual directive narratives helped to reveal the connection between parents’ personal identities and the differences in how each mediated their children in everyday life. For instance, Teen 7’s mother and father had very different stances on technology and this was reflected in the differentiated ICT activities that they both performed in the home. He was instructive and she was more

of an ICT companion and sometime student. Some parents (P2, 7, and 8) discussed their shared parenting philosophies in great detail, but demonstrated differences when discussing themselves as individuals. This indicated that there were two types of parent narratives: a) parental narratives that presented them as they wanted to be seen as parents by the investigator, similar to what Silverman (2006) calls interpretive repertoires, and b) personal narratives that identified their own ICT practices and priorities. Both of these types of narratives exemplified different aspects of families' technological cultures or small world.

It was difficult to get a sense from the parental interviews about which mediation practices were enforced, and which were simply preferences or representations of values they had and/or felt it was important to present to the investigator. In the past researchers have found that parents only enforce their rules 20% of the time. (Austin, 1993; Dorr & Rabin, 1995; Strasburger & Donnerstein, 1999). Parents and teens' perceptions of mediation have also long been demonstrated in the literature to be in disagreement (Austin, 1993; Byrne & Lee, 2011), and this dissertation does echo those results to some extent. In the survey, participants demonstrated differences in their perceptions of the frequency of mediation, with teens reporting less PM than did parents. However, the difference was minimal, and whether or not parents' or teens' reports in the survey or interview accounts were entirely accurate, they seemed to be indicative of their beliefs and their general orientation towards technology and parenting (see Major Finding 1.8). As other researchers have found, parents' beliefs and values seemed connected to their parenting, (Ames et al. 2011;

Clark, 2012; Nikken & Jansz, 2014; Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002), but directive narratives clearly contextualized parents' practices in ways that connected them directly with their personal histories and beliefs. The directive narratives also provided a rationale for the set of varying mediation practices that the parents had assembled (1.11) that went far beyond demographic predicters. In particular, the Latino/a demographic characteristic did not seem linked to any categorical notion of parenting styles (Baumrind, 1966) (see Chapter 2, section on parenting styles), upholding findings that Latino/a parents ways of parenting do not fit well into the traditional classfications (Guillermo-Ramos et al., 2007; Halgunseth et al., 2006; Rodriguez et al., 2009). Furthermore, the differences that Ames et al. (2011) found between middle class and lower class parents in their underlying values and beliefs concerning technology were not visible within this dissertation. While the two more educated and affluent parents (P7 and 8) did generally have more authoritative parenting styles than the other parents, they did not have the "cautious" and restrictive way of parenting ICTs that Ames et al. have described, and they were not overly concerned with the dangers that ICTs posed to their children. Dad 7, said "we are not afraid of technology, it is a resource that I understand that we all need…I hope that they use it well" (D8, PI, trans). Moreover, contrary to previous research, the parents (P1, 2, and 3) that were closer to demonstrating the types of parenting meant to cultivate their teenage children (Clark,

2013; Lareau, 2011) were relatively less affluent[13] (especially when family size was considered) and less educated.

Identifying narratives rather than parenting styles was less effective for identifying parents as belonging to typical types, but more beneficial to identifying the dynamic within families and the dialogical way they had evolved. The dialogic that existed between the monitoring and privacy practices that parents used and teens' practices was highly relevant to how parents used them . To present them singularly as PM research has traditonally done (Clark, 2011), ignores that parents and teens' practices were often responsive to one another in the moment and over time and also carefully balanced by each party (see Major Finding 1.9). Data analysis revealed that teens were open with their parents in order to inspire trust, and that parents devised their particular combination of monitoring and privacy provison to encourage openess. These practices constituted a reponsive process that evolved over time and was often integrated into parents' narratives of their own parenting and the family dynamic (see Major Finding 1.10).

The boundary negotiation process revelaed in this dissertation is similar to the process described by Petronio (2002), Erickson et al., (2015), and Ledbetter et al., (2010) in that variations of parental control and teen autonomy were important to the dynamic between parents and teens and manifested in their individual practices. However, this

[13] No income information was shared by family 1.

dissertation contributes a typology of both teen and parental practices that extends beyond the invasive and defensive practices identified by Ledbetter et al., (2010) to include parental practices that shape teens' ICT use, but are not invasive, and teens' practices by which they negotiate other contextual factors of their families beyond their parents' restrictions or monitoring. These distinctions provide a more thorough account of what is entailed in the parent/teen boundary negotiation process surrounding ICTs that also acknowledges positive and structural elements.

**Discussion for RQ 2a Related to Findings Presented in Chapter 6.**

This section will discuss the findings for Research Question 2a (RQ 2a), which asked: what practices do teens use to negotiate their resources in relation to ICTs in accordance with their families? The participating teens' ICT practices and access were shaped by their parents, their household ICT culture, and the strategies they had developed to negotiate this influence. Parents overtly influenced teens through the devices they chose to purchase, the rules and restrictions they created for how teens could interact with ICTs, and the types of interactions they explicitly and implicitly encouraged (see Major Finding 2.1). These practices shaped the structures that teens needed to negotiate and the ICT content and interactions teens understood as appropriate.

Teens had also developed practices to negotiate their physical resources, such as the ICT devices and the physical spaces that were available. As Cresswell (2004) asserts, households had physical barriers that impeded movement, explicit rules about how spaces were to be used, and social rules, that were more implicit and dependent on the

family culture (see Major Finding 2.2). These adolescents regularly negotiated their use of ICTs in physical space to be alone, to create personal space within shared space, and to connect with their family members (see Major Finding 2.3). The added mobility that smart phones provided made their negotiation of space especially relevant to their ICT use by enabling them more autonomy over their practices and more ability to move their location in response to context (see Major Finding 2.6). Teen 6 stated, "when I can't watch TV down here and I wanna watch something, I just go upstairs instead" (T6, TI). Teens also used different information and media depending on who was in the room. For instance, they reported being alone most of the time when they were looking up personal information. The censoring effect created by sharing space was especially important for those teens that needed to manage space in order to be alone. To cope they had developed a kind of "place-ballet" (Seamon, 1980) where they took advantage of private physical spaces as they became available and in a sense, they converted them into a place with their use of media as their context. Teens adapted their use to the circumstances and context of the room, which often changed from day to day. In this way, the spaces of the home were never complete and were always being constructed through the integration processes and routines of the home and their practices (Pred, 1984). At the same time, their personal devices and the media they accessed created continuity, making the new space immediately familiar and their own. Though there was evidence of the construction of "bedroom cultures" (see Bovill & Livingstone, 2001; Kearney, 2007; Lincoln, 2014; Ling & Thrane, 2001), most of the teens had not created this sort of space, similar to what Lim (2008) found in Chinese and Korean teens.

However, they did have ICT hubs or "base[s] of operations," as Ling and Thrane (2001) have identified, where they centered most of their ICT activities. Teens also adjusted to sharing space by various practices meant to create a personal sphere or a bubble of solitude that could easily be modified to shift to a more communally shared experience. Thrift (1997) has emphasized the importance of practice to the use of space. He believes that focusing on practice creates knowledge that is more in tune with the embodied experience of reality and less theoretical.

Teens' descriptions of their use of the material ICT objects is also important because they are a distinct part of their immediate practices and, in a sense, can be considered an extension of the body (Dourish, 2001). Perhaps this is one explanation for the extreme attachment the participants had developed with their phones, and their hesitance to lend them to family members. Like physical space, material objects also contain barriers that constrain use, and affordances that promote it (Norman, 1988). These practices are not necessarily the same as those that were intended by the designers, because individuals interact with devices within the constraints of their own knowledge, habits, and concoct creative solutions to solve problems within their personal context. However, while teens used ICTs to manipulate their visibility and create a sense of personal space when they shared space as Ito (2005) has described, many of the teens were purposefully open with their parents in order to evade suspicion and to connect with them, as mentioned above. This finding was also true for material technologies and the online space. As Bernheim et al., (2007) have found, the

teens in this dissertation rarely used different profiles or technical settings to control their privacy, depending heavily on social protocols.

Over all, the teens primarily used social protocols to help negotiate their household resources, which may have affected their access. The contrast between the number of devices that were available in the home and the number teens used is a good example of this. (see Table 4.6 Devices per Family, per Teen, and Home Access per Teen in Chapter 4 for an inventory of household devices.) For instance, Teens 7 and 8 both had 17 devices in their home, but each only used approximately five devices. In all, the teens ranged from using two devices to eleven devices each. However, even this number could be misleading, as it did not demonstrate the number of devices that were regularly used, the frequency of use, or the activities for which each device was used. The number of ICTs that that teens regularly used appeared to be dependent on how they negotiated the use of devices they had access to in the home. Some participants were more proactive in securing their use. They found ways of dominating the technologies they shared with others and were able to extend their personal information ecology (PIE). Others rarely requested or attempted to use those technologies and had developed the habit of depending mostly on their smart phones, which seemed to limit the range of their ICT activities (see Major Finding 2.7) and their PIEs. This could be important as Pearce and Rice (2008) have found that teens that only accessed the Internet from their mobile devices engaged less in "capital enhancing" activities on the Internet.

Teens also seemed to be constrained by what they understood their parents thought was appropriate (see Major Finding 2.4). Parents were found to often serve a gatekeeping function (see also Dias et al., 2016), sometimes purposefully, others times not. Teen participants did not generally describe accessing content their parents disapproved of or had forbidden. This practice left some room for use that was not explicitly prohibited, such as how Teen 2 borrowed her friends' SM accounts, as she was not allowed to create her own, in order to participate with her peers. Generally, however, the youth limited themselves to topics their parents encouraged, such as educational oriented apps.

In agreement with the literature (DiMaggio, Hargittai, Celeste, & Shafer, 2004; Hargittai, 2003; Yu & Zhou, 2016) data analysis for this dissertation found that access and ability were separate issues of information inequality. Socio-economically disadvantaged teens were not more likely to report lower technical competency in their interviews. Though they often did have less access to ICTs, they also sometimes had more need to build competency because of their role within their family as ICT brokers (see Major Finding 2.5). They described providing parents with language and digital media brokering, technical assistance, assistance with ICT research, and ICT mediation of their younger siblings as the literature has demonstrated is typical of immigrant teens (Correa, Straubhaar, Chen, & Spence, 2014; Katz, 2010; Clark & Sywyj, 2012). Technical knowledge was often diffused from teens to their parents (see Correa, 2014) and teens also regularly influenced what technologies their families decided to purchase (see Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Similarly, the participants that had the most sophisticated

practices were generally found to be those that had the most parental restrictions and needed to find creative ways to meet their various needs. Those that had the most educated and technically skilled parents (T7 and 8), on the other hand, did not report more skill or more sophisticated ICT practices. This finding might have been related to Teens 7 and 8 having fathers that took on the expert role in their homes as Correa et al. (2015) have reported. It also may have been gendered as both of these teens (T7 and 8) were girls, though Teen 8's father was proud of the ways that his daughter did show technical competency and described being somewhat disappointed that she showed no interest in taking after him and pursuing a technology career. The social roles family members took on related to ICTs, was found to be influential to the roles that teens took on and therefore how teens interacted with ICTs.

**Discussion for RQ 2b Related to Findings Presented in Chapter 7**

This section will discuss the findings related to RQ 2b which asked: what practices do teens use to negotiate their interpersonal relationships in relation to ICTs in accordance with their families? The specific major findings presented within the chapter will be indicated with the number they are listed under in the findings section.

Teens demonstrated behaviors that showed that maintaining the balance of their membership in their families was one of their main priorities, such as limiting their interactions with peers, but they also used their ICTs to fulfill their personal needs, which included maintaining their connections to other social worlds. These adolescents described practices they adopted to negotiate their personal, peer, and family boundaries on SM, participate in their peer and academic social worlds, and cope with

their parents' authority in ways that usually did not upset the balance of any of their relationships.

These teens understood that the social norms of their peers and schools were different from those of their households and made adjustments to enable their participation in both. For instance, Teen 2 demonstrated creative family small world ICT mangement skills when she used her relationship with her best friend to meet the expectation the school had that she print out her papers (see Major Finding 2.10). The facility with which teens negotiated their family small worlds depended on their understanding of their and their parents' roles and the degree of harmony and dissonance between the social norms of their various small worlds and their own priorities. To negotiate their ICT interactions in accordance with the small world of the family, teens had to make priorities in relation to their openess/closedness, the degree of participation in each of their family, peer, and academic social worlds, and the extension of their PIE (see Major Finding 2.11). Each family's social world had different expectations for their ICT connectedness and communication similar to what Burnett (2015) has described in his theory of information worlds. Teens had to use strategies and practices that prioritized certain aspects over others. For instance, extending the reach of their PIE often meant that teens gave up some of their privacy. This practice could leave their information, ICT activities or communicative activities more exposed or open to others. For instance, Teen 2 often used her mother's phone to text with her friends or receive messages from the school, which could be seen by her mother. Similarly, teens that wanted to maintain more privacy might have to limit their PIE in

some way, such as not participating on a popular SM network with their peers. Additionally, the methods that teens used to negotiate the boundaries of their familial small world influenced their ability to connect with their other social worlds and meet their ICT expectations. Sometimes complying with the social norms of one small world meant limiting participation in another small world and their PIE in the process. Though some teens managed to participate in each social world to the extent of the expectations from that world, others had to choose to prioritize one world over another. For example, Teen 4 reported that despite the constraints he had to his access, he was able to manage his resources in a way that met his school's ICT expectations by regularly using the computers in the school library. However, he also described limiting the extension of his PIE over time by reducing his ICT interactions with the social world of his peers to meet his mother's expectations. Teen 4's ICT use was helping him to assimilate into US culture, but as Lombano-Bermudez (2015) has found, his engagement was peripheral and constrained by his mother's lack of integration.

Teens' use of ICTs to circumnavigate their family cultures should not be exaggerated. Findings reveal that the power differential between teens and parents was very important. In contrast to what has been reported in the literature for majority culture teens (Nathanson, 2002; Smetana et al. 2006), this dissertation's results corresponded with the Clark and Sywyj's (2012) finding that immigrant teens did not see parents' ICT restrictions as outside their right as parents and they also did not seem to have negative emotions about their parents' restrictions contrary to what Padilla-

Walker (2008) has found. These results support findings that the boundaries of what is considered in the personal domain and outside of parents' authority has been found to vary among different ethnic cultures (Nucci, 1996; Smetana & Daddis, 2002). While the adolescents did tend to be more comfortable and to have more positive views of ICTs in general than did their parents, their parents' level of restriction did not seem to influence them to have more positive views of restricted ICTs or to be more likely to interact with them as Nathanson (2002) has observed. This is in keeping with the Phinney, Kim-Jo, Osorio, and Vilhjalmsdottir (2005) finding that US teens of ethnic backgrounds outside of majority culture were more compliant with their parents than teens of European-American descent. Even teen participants with parents that had the most restrictive and controlling mediation practices, generally stated that they went along with parents' rules and restrictions, and did not report negative feelings about their parents (see Major Finding 2.9). Accordingly, children with socially controlling families have been found to feel obligated to conform with their norms (Soenenes & Vansteenkiste, 2010). Moreover, the teens did not report many attempts to hide from parents or to deceive them using SM or otherwise, and in many cases, they were purposefully open with their parents, sharing space, leaving smart phones strewn about and their accounts open in order to create a balance of trust with their parents, though one teen did describe activities meant to allow him to hide in plain sight as described by Gomez, Booth, and Katz (2011). The teen participants were most likely to respond to their parents' ICT restrictions and authority as it was enforced in the moment by complying, as Montemayor (1983) and Smetana et al. (1991) have shown, but they did

report and were reported making verbal attempts to change their parents' minds, question their rational, and convince them to purchase ICTs (see Major Finding 2.8).

One aspect that seemed important to how family directive narratives integrated to form the family dynamic was how teens chose to process the constraints parents imposed. Teens used mental framing devices to help them adjust to their current circumstances and negotiate their relationships with their parents (see Major Finding 2.12). The six teens (T1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7) that demonstrated using mental frames often utilized more than one, employing different frames depending on the situation, and seeing different limitations or infringements from within different frames. In the frames that teens chose to describe their situations, they tended to cast themselves as either having control or not having control over their circumstances. Frames that were constructed around the idea of not having any control seemed to be more interpretive than active. Frames, such as *the future frame*, that were used to present themselves with agency were more constructive, and a direct result of teens' attempts to view their situation in way that helped them mentally adjust to how things were. All the mental frames facilitated teens' adjustment to the requirements of their situation and influenced their attempts to use their agency to extend their PIE.

Social Media was salient in the data as an area that was particularly complicated for teens to negotiate their relational boundaries (see Major Finding 2.13). The parents and teen participants had both thoroughly incorporated SM into their lives and the commonality of being friends meant that they were in the process of negotiating new

norms for how to use that shared space and that their perceptions of the boundaries did not always correspond. Though they were not very common, adolescents reported using some of the privacy tactics described as social privacy in the literature (e.g. boyd, 2014; Grinter & Palen, 2002; Ito, 2005; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Vickery, 2015), such as only making posts that would be acceptable to all of their audiences, and obscuring or censoring posts. Teens and their parents also described how they needed to contend with the extra monitoring that came with being visible to their parents' social networks and used some of the same practices to evade that visibility. However, though some teens were found to be uncomfortable with parental friendships on SM (see also similar findings from: Madden et al., 2012; Ito et al. 2008; West et al., 2008), most teens had no problem with accepting parents as friends, as Child and Westerman (2013) have indicated, or with the posts that parents made about them. Furthermore, some additional social ICT practices were revealed in the data, such as teens' use of SM to connect with their parents and family. One participant was described using SM as the context for interacting with parents offline (T8) and another few (T5, 6, 7, and 8) were described using their public posts to relate socially with their parents and family. Similar to what Caron and Caronia (2004, 2005) have found with mobile phones, teens' public performance of their relationships on SM meant that they understood the social norms of various audiences (Marwick & boyd, 2007), and how to wield the complex "social grammar" particular sites afforded them to construct their relationships.

This chapter has discussed the project's findings in relation to RQ 1 and RQ 2, 2a, and 2b. Chapter 9 will present sections devoted to theoretical discussion, contributions, limitations, and the conclusion.

## Chapter 9 : Contributions, Implications, Limitations, and Conclusion

The following chapter presents discussion that goes beyond the findings of the study. It will begin with an examination of the project's theoretical implications and delineation of its contributions, focusing on the three main contributing theories. It will then proceed to the main methodological and pragmatic contributions to Library and Information Science (LIS), present the limitations of the dissertation, and suggest directions for further study. The dissertation will conclude with final remarks that reflect on the changes the project generated to the investigator's understanding and its significance to the broader library and information science (LIS) research community.

Below, the Silverstone et al. (Silverstone et al., 1989, 1991, 1992), theory of the domestication of technology, Chatman's (1991a, 1991b, 1996, 1999, 2000) small world theories, and Nardi & O'Day's (1999) concept of information ecologies will be discussed and the specific contributions of this dissertation will be provided.

### Theoretical Implications and Contributions

Domestication of technology (Silverstone et al., 1989, 1991, 1992), small world theories (Chatman, 1991a, 1991b, 1996, 1999, 2000), and information ecologies (Nardi & O'Day, 1999) were the key theoretical frameworks used to inform this dissertation These concepts were similar in that they all conceived of a system of interactions within which family practices related to ICT use can be placed, but they each characterized these interactions from a different angle, contributing to the overall analysis of the data, including the development of the typologies (see Appendices F and G). The following

sections will address these important contributing theories and indicate how this dissertation study applied, contributed to, and extended them.

**The domestication of technology.** Silverstone et al.'s (1989, 1991, 1992) understanding of the family as a system, emphasis on technology, and the process of incorporating technology into that system informed the data analysis in highlighting the importance of both social and material factors to how this process would evolve in Latino/a housholds. This dissertation drew on Silverstone and colleagues' notion of the technological culture of the home (Silverstone et al. 1989) to look at individual families as the cultural unit, rather than their ethnic affiliation. From this perpective it was understood that the household ICT culture would be more significant to how family members interacted with ICTs and would consequently play an important role in both how teens used ICTs and in how parents mediated their use. Silverstone et al. (1989) believed that underlying family mythologies were integral to how the family system functioned. This concept directed the data analysis to focus on participants' shared understanding of their mythologies, or family narratives, which create context for their experience. Shared family mythologies or narratives emerged as significant organizing agents that cast individual members in certain roles in relation with other members, enabling them to understand how they should proceed in the moment. However, the concept lacked a consideration of how family narratives were enacted within households or how individual members' own priorities fit into the family system. This dissertation is able to address this lack by expanding the theoretical tools to address individual agency within the system. It does this by extending the analysis beyond the

shared understandings of family narratives to member's individual narratives. The examination of individual narrative and its connection to individual agency facilitate a clearer view of the dynamic of the full system.

The directive narrative nomenclature was developed from accounts by individual family members that expressed their identities and priorities (see Appendix F for the Directive Narrative subtheme and categories within the full parental mediation typology). During the analysis, these individual narratives appeared to intermingle with one another and the family narratives in a way that is similar to what Bakhtin (1984) describes as polyphony (Bakhtin, 1984). Bakhtin argued that in a polyphonic novel, individual characters have their own fully formed narratives that interact with other characters' narratives in a dialogic fashion. In other words, statements are said, or practices are enacted, in response to current circumstances within the context of what has occurred in the past and what is anticipated of the future. Though this is a literary concept it could be applied to the dynamic within the families that participated. The individual family members had their own personal perspectives and narratives that were essentially in a dialogue with their other family members' narratives that continued over time and changed in response to one another. In accordance, the scripts and narratives that participants had about themselves often situated their practices directly in relation to one another and even when they did not, they provided insight into individual priorities and practices and how they might interrelate and create certain family dynamics. Parents and teens had individual priorities that were shaped by the shared meanings of the family, but also reflected their individual needs.

Results from this dissertation expanded and further developed the domestication of technology body of theory in the following ways:

- Extended the domestication of technology framework to take into account the power differential within parent/teen relationships.
- Utilized the domestication of technology concept of family mythologies to explore parent/ teen dynamics around ICTs
- Expanded the theoretical framework to include individual narratives and their significance to the technological culture of the home.
- Refocused the framework from technologies onto the social relationships within the home.
- Delineated parent and teen typologies that specified contextual factors that were significant to the technological culture of the home.
- Developed a typology of specific practices parents used to mediate teens' interactions with ICTs within the household.
- Developed a typology distinguishing how teens negotiated their ICT interaction in relation with the technological culture of the family
- Distinguished nuances of the Latino/a cultural experience that were relevant to the technological culture of their home, such as parental English proficiency and teen brokering.

This section has explored the theoretical implications and contributions of this dissertation, the next section will discuss Chatman's (1996, 1999, 2001) small world theories.

**Small world theories.** This project drew on Elfreda Chatman's small world and normative behavior theories (1991b, 1996, 1999, 2000) to analyze how teens' membership in their families influenced their ICT participation. Her work assisted to direct the dissertation's focus on individuals' practices. Her emphasis on the role that groups play in individual information behavior informed the analytic framework used to interpret teens' ICT practices in relation to their families. Chatman had found that individuals limited their information behavior in accordance with the social norms of those groups. Similarly, teens did seem to manage their ICT practices in ways that would permit them to meet the norms of their family group. However, they also managed their practices in ways that allowed them to assimilate information from outside that main group affiliation and meet the expectations of their extended information worlds. They understood that their peer and academic social worlds had different ICT social norms and expectations than did their family, and they made attempts to negotiate those expectations using strategies that enabled them to meet at least some of their personal need for competence and social connections (see Deci & Ryan, 2008, theory of self-determination) and extend their PEIs. Though Chatman's (1996, 1999, 2001) small world conceptualization was key to the analysis of the qualitative data, it was not a perfect fit. It is essentially a deficit perspective of the individual in the small world. The focus on the closed world of the group was meant to

discover how group membership leads to information poverty for their members, but this assumption limits Chatman's original small world theoretical framework's ability to be utilized to observe individual agency and by extension to perceive the creative information practices that group members construct to negotiate the structure of the group.

In using Chatman's (1996, 1999, 2000) small world theories, it is hoped that the findings of this dissertation make a lasting theoretical contribution to this body of work. Results from this dissertation refined and expanded Chatman's small world theories in the following ways:

- Extended the small world framework to include families.
- Expanded the small world's consideration of social types to parent and teen roles within the household and the power differential that helps to characterize their interactions around ICTs.
- Identified contextual household factors that were important to how teens negotiated their family small world.
- Delineated a teen family small world typology of the practices that adolescents used to negotiate their membership within their families in relation to ICTs.
- Reframed Chatman's concept of Information behavior as an active process of information negotiation, rather than a passive consequence of group membership.

- Incorporated material factors, such as household ICT devices and physical spaces, into the small world conceptualization.
- Explored how the interconnected nature of modern technology influences the information behavior of individual members of the family group.
- Identified practices that teens used to connect with and meet the expectations of their other social worlds while maintaining their membership in the family group.

This section has addressed contributions to Chatman's small world theories, the following section will explore the Nardi and O'Day (1999) concept of information ecologies.

**Information ecologies.** The concept of the information ecology (O'Day & Nardi, 1999) provided a framework to observe contextual factors of the home that took the data analysis beyond the understanding of the household as a purely a social construct and provided an inventory of factors that would compose teens' immediate information environment. There were devices in local environments, that people had taken on specific roles to sustain, and the entire system seemed to function according to shared values. However, the notion of the information ecology was limited in its ability to grasp the dynamics of how one individual's information activities would relate to the broader ecology beyond the home. The findings suggested that teens' ICT interactions were grounded and shaped by their household ecologies, but that they used its resources to extend beyond that ecology to meet the expectations of their other social

worlds, mainly their peer and academic worlds, that they needed to interact with during the course of their everyday lives. For this reason, the analysis turned towards Jarvelin's (2011) conceptualization of the PEI provided a framework to understand how an individual's habitual information practices and resources intersected with multiple information ecologies (see Chapter 2 for an explication of the PEI). Yu (2012) argues that the "information worlds of individuals" have a number of dimensions, such as availability and accessibility, that exist in space and time. Similarly, it is this dissertation's finding that participants seemed to animate these dimensions of their PEIs n the physical spaces they inhabited within the everyday routines of their lives to cope with the conflicting expectations of their "information worlds" (Burnett, 2015). However, the notion of a PEI might lean too heavily on the physical metaphor, because teens' PEIs seemed to be more analogous to an active sphere of ICT interaction that they enacted in relation with the various information ecologies and their own needs. Imagining the PEI in this way might more accurately explain the way that the Latino/a teens established the extension of their personal information ecologies within the cultural context of their families' information ecologies, but individually managed their PEIs in order to meet their own needs to the best of their ability. Seeing teens' PEIs in this way is not predicated on a deficit perspective, but more as the development of power to act within the resources and structures at hand.

Results from this dissertation expanded and further developed the information ecology perspective of Nardi and O'Day (1999) in the following ways:

- Expanded the information ecology concept to the family household.
- Connected the information ecology concept to individual members.
- Delineated two typologies of the practices that parents and teens used within the information ecology of the household (see Appendices F and G for the full typologies).
- Identified some of the roles that family members take on around ICTs within the household information ecology.
- Distinguished factors that influenced how the various parts of the information ecology (i.e., people, technology, values) interacted within the household.
- Demonstrated the importance of social relationships to functioning of the information ecology of the home.
- Identified how individual members had adopted practices to facilitate their movement within the various information ecologies of their social world.

**Bringing it all together.** This section has discussed the theoretical implications and contributions of this dissertation regarding the three major frameworks that were utilized for both its design and the analysis of the data. Above each theory is discussed on its own, but it is also important to discuss why they were used in conjunction rather than singularly. Each theoretical construct helped the analysis consider a different aspect of the family household in relation to teens practices that would not have been possible individually, specifically the technological infrastructure and diffusion of information within the household, the social aspects of group relations, and the influence of the family group on individuals' information access, competence, and use.

Neither of these theories correlated directly to the observation of all of these characteristics, but together they help to compensate for their individual weaknesses in relation to this study.

Information ecologies (Nardi & O'Day, 1999) provided a way to look at the local place of the household as a distinct information ecology with an infrastructure of relationships and ongoing habitual information practices that are conducted using ICTs and physical resources that evolve over time in response to changes in technology, priorities, and relationships. Chatman (1996, 1999, 2000) and Silverstone et al. (1989, 1991, 1992) offered guidance towards how the social aspects of that infrastructure would function. They both specify the importance of social norms, social roles (though Chatman, 2000, calls them social types), and shared meanings, however Chatman focuses on groups' influence on individuals' reception of information, while Silverstone focuses on the family as a cultural unit that develops a particular perspective towards technology in relation with the broader discourses outside the home. Chatman's theory of information behavior is integral to the dissertation's concept that the teens' personal information processing would be shaped by their group membership, but Silverstone and colleagues' engagement with the interchange between the household and the broader culture assist the analysis to get beyond Chatman's notion of the group as having rigid boundaries. This helped the analysis to extend the insular conceptualizations of small worlds and information ecologies to how teens were negotiating the boundaries of the family group in order to participate in their other social worlds as well. In addition, Nardi and O'Day's understanding of information

practices as “engagement and participation” assisted in framing the adolescents as active participants that negotiated the social norms and structures of the family group in relation to their personal needs, rather than just passively internalizing its constraints (p.57). The teenagers’ practices included a toolbox of active strategies that were grounded in their “particular combination of person and situation” (Case, 2007, p. 13).

This section has addressed the most important theoretical contributions to this dissertation. While no theoretical construct fits perfectly, together they were better able to assist the analysis to construct a holistic picture of teens’ practices within the household. The next section will discuss contributions of the methodology.

**Methodology Discussion**

The following section will present a discussion of the contributions of the dissertation’s methodological approach. As described in Chapter 3, this dissertation was devised within a social constructivist framework that conceptualized participants’ understanding of reality as grounded in their interpretations and attempts to make sense out of their experience (Lincoln & Guba, 1994) and "[i]nformation [as] a disappearing category" (p. 12) with no ontological status in and of itself (Dervin, 1999). Analysis thus viewed, collected data not as truths, but as related to truth. From this standpoint, participants’ survey data and accounts provided evidence of some truth, but were provided in response to particular conditions, susceptible to demand characteristic bias (Orne, 2009), and only partial understandings. The dissertation was designed from this perspective on the evidentiary potential of interview data and the belief that a mixed-method study that was able to gain and compare knowledge from various

methods and perspectives would compensate for the individual weaknesses of each method (Connaway & Radford, 2017; Fidel, 2008) and provide valuable insight into the parent/teen dynamic that is a large part of the context for parents' and teens' ICT practices. This mixed-method approach was deemed appropriate for an exploratory study that was meant to integrate a variety of disciplines to provide a broader and more context oriented understanding of teens' ICT practices for everyday life information seeking (ELIS) research. For this reason, the investigator collected survey, mapping, and interview data from families, family members, and individually from parents and teens. Each type of data was meant to provide a view of the family from a different perspective. The mixed-method approach provided supplementary, complementary, and conflicting information. These various types of information offered a broader view of the family system.

Though the survey and the interviews asked participants about some of the same practices, they also revealed different types of information. The surveys asked about the frequency of certain ICT practices, and the interviews captured the underlying context of what had inspired parents or teens practices, each providing valuable information about how the practice fit into the dynamic between parents and teens. For instance, in the surveys, none of the teens and only two of the teens' parents (P2 and 7) reported parents asking teens to take posts down from social media (SM), however, interview data from both parents and teens revealed that this practice was significant to teens' boundary negotiation online. Though this was an infrequent practice, parents' and teens' vivid accounts demonstrated that taking down posts

retained an important place in the imagination of participants, suggesting it was a significant indicator of underlying issues involved in parents' mediation and teens' boundary negotiation.

Additionally, the participants revealed supplementary information about one another's practices, with parents sometimes relating teen family small world information practices that teens had not described and vice versa. For example, Teen 7 complained about being friends on SM with her mother and the times that her mother had asked her to take posts down during her teen interview. However, in the family interview, her mother described and provided video evidence that her daughter would borrow her Instagram account and make affectionate posts that engaged with her mother in a performative way for both sets of their friends. If the investigator had only interviewed Teen 7, the evidence would have suggested her interactions with her mother on SM were almost exclusively an irritation. If only the parents had been interviewed, the annoyance Teen 7 felt about her mother demanding she take down posts would not have been revealed. Moreover, if only the survey was given the investigator would have only been able to conclude that the parental demand for SM posts to be taken down was nonexistent or infrequent in their family and the novel use of SM to connect with a parent would have never been revealed. The varying self-accounts are subjective in nature, but they do demonstrate participants' focus within their interviews and communicate different facets of the parent/teen relationship, each helping to assemble a holistic picture of the family dynamic.

The inclusion of the mapping activity, derived from the instrument developed by

Katz and Gonzalez (2016), also added more data about the physical context of teens' ICT use in the household. Teens' maps and their accounts of those maps in their individual interviews were able to capture how participants moved through and shared the physical spaces of the home in relation to their ICT use. These descriptions of how they rearranged their use of the physical spaces of the home to meet their needs would most likely not have been uncovered without a systematic method of going over their maps one room at a time. As Travlou et al. (2008) have argued, the teens' maps seemed to reiterate their cultural understandings and did not always reveal an objectively accurate picture of the physical space. For example, Teen 7 and 8 both drew maps of the bedroom they shared without including the other's bed. However, their accounts of their maps coupled with a semi-structured interview technique allowed the interviewer to follow-up on teens' explanations in ways that exposed the omission and gave the investigator the opportunity to reflect on the more accurate information of how the space was used and what the omission might reveal.

The mixed-methods included in this study were demonstrated to be fruitful to an exploration of the complex social and physical space of the family household. While this mixed-method approach could be problematic to research intended to provide an objective conclusion about specific practices, the multiplicity of methods was appropriate for an exploratory study meant to discover fruitful areas of new research.

**Pragmatic Contributions and Recommendations**

This project contributes to LIS by helping to extend the boundaries past the "discursive formations" (Weigand, 1999) that have limited the field's ability to

understand individuals' information behavior in the modern information environment. This dissertation demonstrates the benefits of understanding information activties as including all types of social and communicative ICT activities, as well as traditonally informative ones. It also demonstrates the advantages of considering the constellation of ICTs that are routinely used, and the structures that must be negotiated. The family context provided a framework of physical and social structures that shaped what teens understood as appropriate and inappropriate ICT content and interactions, the level of agency they believed themselves to have, and their personal priorities. This project's results also affirm the significance of an information practice stance that goes beyond the traditional understanding of information behavior as purposive information seeking (Williamson, 1998). Teens' practices included strategies to negotiate devices, physical spaces, Internet access, SM, ICT content and interactions, social worlds, and parental authority in relation to ICTs, but these practices were embedded in their everyday lives and manifested as they became relevant. Participants' ability to negotiate these structures to their advantage influenced their level of access and their ability to meet the ICT expectations of their social worlds. Savolainen has defined one of the important facets of everyday life information seeking (ELIS) to be "the mastery of everyday life" (1995, p. 264). However, while there has been important work about specific issues such as adolescents' use of heroin information (Todd, 1999), the use of information in the LGBTQ process of coming out (Hamer, 2003; Mehra & Braquet, 2007), career planning (Julien, 1996), and urban teens' information needs (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006a; 2006b), there has been little research of their interactions with information

across devices, platforms, time, and contexts as they go about their daily lives. This is the case despite the fact that teens' information interactions are understood to intersect with their social behavior (Foss et al., 2013; Ito, et al., 2008; Meyers et al., 2009), and that teens' parents (Meyers, et al., 2009) and peers have been found to influence how they interact with information (Foss et al., 2013). By utilizing Chatman's notion of information behavior and integrating elements from Silverstone's et al (1989, 1992) work on the domestication of technology and Nardi and O'Day's (1999) concept of information ecologies, this dissertation was able to distinguish a typology of some of the particular ways that parents influenced teens' ICT practices and another of practices that served as the basis for teens' family small world ICT negotiation and helped to constitute their PEIs. It also provides insight into the ways their practices are socio-enacted (Lloyd, 2012), and must be negotiated as they cross the boundaries of their social worlds and manage their varying ICT expectations (see also Burnett, 2015 for discussion of information worlds) utelizing their own understandings and priorities. Their practices were socio-enacted but they were also influenced by their own proactive natures (Sonnenwald, 1999) and creativity. Many researchers have demonstrated that information literacy goes beyond access (Hargittai, 2010; Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008; Livingstone, 2004; Van Dijk, 2012; Yuen, Park, & Chen, 2016), but the results from this dissertation suggest teens' family small world ICT practices, including both the physical and social structures the family imposes, should be a measure of teen digital literacy because data analysis revealed that the negotiation had a significant influence on the extension of their PEIs.

This research also contributes to the importance of including physical space in LIS research. Though researchers have long shown that locality and context influence individuals' information interactions (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000; Dervin, 1999; Nardi & O'Day, 1999; Pettigrew, 1996), there is little understanding of how individuals' presence and movement through physical space relates to information use. This study's results substantiate findings that the context of physical space had an influence on teens' use of ICTs in the home (Ling & Thrane, 2001; Kawser & Brush, 2013). Data analysis revealed that adolescents used ICTs differently and interacted with different information when they were alone than they did when they were sharing physical space. Participants also had strategies for moving through physical space in response to their immediate environment, the other people that were present, and the context that was unfurling within that moment, that allowed them to use the spaces according to their needs.

This research also affirms findings that a variety of contextual factors contribute to ICT practices and information inequality beyond socio-economic status (Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008; Yu & Zhou's, 2016) and broad cultural factors, such as ethnicity. While there is some research within LIS dedicated to minority groups (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2006a, 2006b; Meyers et al., 2009), and immigrants (Fisher, Durrance, & Hinton, 2004; Lingel, 2011), Latino/a families or adolescents have rarely been of focus. This dissertation contributes knowledge towards filling this gap, by identifying ICT practices by parents and teens that were connected with their being members of Latino/a

immigrant families, but it was also able to construe culture in a way that went beyond ethnicity that might be useful to cultural research within the field.

This section has described the contribution this study makes to LIS, the following sections will discuss the limitations of the dissertation.

**Limitations.** While this dissertation takes a mixed-methods approach, with rich data that has informed robust findings leading to both theoretical and pragmatic contributions, there were a number of limitations inherent in its exploratory design. To explore parental mediation and teens' ICT practices in the Latino/a family context a primarily qualitative mixed-methods study was designed that would provide insight into the technological culture. This approach took into consideration the variety of ICTs that teens and their families used as a part of their everyday lives and the spaces of the household in which they used them. The multi-perspective interviews and mapping activity provided a broad holistic understanding of the issues underlying the household information ecology, but the absence of observational data weakened the researcher's ability to fully grasp the contextual richness of the families' everyday interactions around ICTs. The analysis was also constrained from a lack of data concerning the relationship between parents' practices and physical space, as parents, unlike teens, were not asked to draw maps and explain them. Considering the significance physical space played in teens' practices, it would have been useful to have this data for the sake of comparison. In addition, the exploration of multiple variables limited the ability of

the researcher to understand and full describe the intricacies of any one of these factors.

Though the study was never meant to be representative, the small sample of eight families might also have hindered its ability to ascertain the full spectrum of teens' family small world practices, especially considering that the families that participated all conveyed fairly harmonious relationships and the adolescents did not demonstrate many of the online privacy behaviors exhibited in the literature (e.g. boyd, 2014; Grinter & Palen, 2002; Ito, 2005; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Vickery, 2015). Additionally, self-selection bias could have been a factor due to the volunteer aspect of assembling the sample (Costigan & Cox, 2001; Robinson, 2014). Participants that were interested in the subject matter might have been more inclined to participate. Also, it was parents, rather than teens, that volunteered their families in all but one of the families (F6) and the study was limited to participants from a small geographic area.

Furthermore, demand characteristic bias might have played a role in how parents and teens responded to the interview questions (Orne, 2009). Parental mediation has been found to be an area of modern parenting on which parents expect they will be judged (Hoover et al., 2004) and parents might have adjusted their responses to what they felt the investigator wanted or was expecting to hear. Teens might also have interpreted the interviewer as an authority figure and limited their responses to ones they felt were socially acceptable. For instance, two teens that were

described looking at porn by their mothers never mentioned it within their own interviews.

The cultural heritage of the investigator may also have influenced her interpretation of the data, in that the author has a subjective perspective based on the particular context of her upbringing. The author is light-skinned woman of Latin American decent who was born in Colombia and was raised mostly in the U.S. by her Colombian father and Spanish-Speaking American mother. The investigator went back and forth from the U.S. to Colombia during her childhood, but was raised and educated mostly in the U.S., though she did a year of primary school and a semester of college in Colombia. Her parents worked in social services and earned graduate degrees during her childhood. These experiences and her identification as Latina may have shaped her understanding of Latino/a and family culture as well as parenting, and by extension the analysis she developed for this dissertation.

In addition, the investigator conducted all of the interviews, data collection, and analysis of the data, which may have limited the range of the analysis. Also, because of restrictions on time and resources that contributed to the researcher's choice to use geographic proximity as a factor in selecting the sample, all of the participants were recruited from the Lehigh Valley area, specifically Allentown, which could have influenced the results of the data collection and limited the dissertation.

Fourteen of the interviews in this dissertation were conducted in Spanish and then transcribed by the Investigator and a Spanish speaking research assistant. The

translations that were included in the dissertation were all translated by the author. The investigator aimed for the translations to be as close to verbatim as possible, while still communicating the intended meaning. There are limitations to translations (Venuti, 1995) and to the use of only one translator. However, there is a reasonable expectation that they were accurate as the investigator is fluent in written and spoken Spanish and is confident that she was able to understand utterances (including colloquial expressions) and express herself in a way that was easily comprehended by the Spanish speaking participants.

This section has discussed the limitations to the study. The following section will explore its implications and make suggestions for further study.

**Implications and Further Study**

The results of this study revealed a host of useful knowledge about the Latino/a family context in relation to ICTs. It demonstrated the breadth of influence parents' social and material ICT mediation practices had on teens and the interconnection between those practices and the ICT practices that teens had incorporated into their routines. It provided evidence that adolescents were constrained by the various structures the family imposed, but that they also actively negotiated their use of ICTs to meet their needs. The large role that teens' needs played in the negotiation of their PEIs deserves more focused exploration. It might be beneficial to incorporate self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) in a future study to probe how power, control, and autonomy fit into the parent/teen dynamic. It would also be beneficial, for

the sake of conceptual clarity, if a future study was able to construct a measure of the extension of teens' PEIs that took the social, structural, and personal aspects of their lives into account. Though other researchers have conceptualized different versions of the PEI (Jarvelin, 2011; Burnett, 2015, Yu & Zhou, 2016), this analysis demonstrates, that any framework that measures teens' PEIs should include a measure of their actual use of available ICTs and of their ability to negotiate them to meet the expectations of their main social worlds.

Adolescents' access should also be addressed in terms that go beyond simple device availability or technical competence (Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008). It is significant that three teens in the study (T3, 7, and 8) chose to use their phones as their primary access point to the Internet, despite having physical access to other devices. Connecting to the Internet primarily through phones has been found to compromise the quality or sophistication of ICT interactions (Pearce & Rice, 2008; Smith, 2015), and teens' rational for these types of choices should be explored.

The findings from this project also suggest parents' negotiation of their ICTs was influenced by their social worlds. For instance, some parents reported or were reported being influenced by family and/or friends' judgements about the appropriateness of their teens' posts to SM. It would be interesting for a study to explore the ramifications of the intersection between their social networks and their practices on SM. For instance, Teen 8's father acknowledged that that their daughter helped them to negotiate his and his wife's participation on SM. His comment hints that Latino/a and

immigrant teens may be responsible for managing more than their own participation on SM. There was also some evidence that adolescents use SM to connect relationally with parents and other family members, both online and offline. These practices extend beyond evasive techniques that have generally been the focus of any discussion that includes parents in this type of research (e.g. boyd, 2014; Grinter & Palen, 2002; Ito, 2005; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Vickery, 2015).

It was striking how involved parents and teens were in one another's ICT interactions. Even beyond parents' rules and restrictive practices, parents actively influenced teens by discussing ICT related issues, providing them with help, and explicitly and implicitly encouraging certain types of ICT use. Likewise, adolescents spent a good deal of time helping their parents with ICTs and brokering their interactions. The provision of all of this help has important implications for research on adolescents' everyday life information practices, as well as research on families' use of ICTs. While there has been some investigation of parent/teen boundary negotiation (Burke, Adamic, & Marciniak, 2013; Child & Westermann, 2013; Cranor et al., 2014; Erickson et al., 2015; Livingstone, Ólafsson, O'Neill, & Donoso, 2012; Sorbring & Lundin, 2012) there has been little investigation of the reciprocal practices that teens and parents provide for one another and how they influence one another from an information literacy perspective.

The dialogic quality of parents' and teens' ICT practices as revealed within the directive narratives was another important finding. It would be beneficial for

researchers to do sense-making interviews (Dervin, 1999) where parents and teens discuss a particular interaction surrounding ICTs. These interviews should involve in-depth discussion of their moment-to-moment interactions with their worlds that would try to uncover any internal thoughts, ideas, desires, goals, and emotions that were directly influencing how that person oriented themselves towards their information and technology use. Suchman (1987) discusses the responsive nature of human action. She says that "mutual intelligibility is achieved on each occasion of interaction in reference to situation particulars, rather than be discharged once and for all by a stable body of shared meaning" (Suchman, 1987, p.50-51). Moreover, because the dialogical process was also found to happen over time, it would be interesting to concentrate on how parents' and teens' practices evolved in relation to one another. To do this, a longitudinal study could be devised where researchers interviewed or surveyed teens and parent participants once each year, or multiple times, over the course of the teens' adolescence.

Finally, the connection between narratives, beliefs, and practices that was found in the study opens up a methodological framework that identifies new areas of interest and could broaden how culture is studied within LIS. Narrative was very useful in uncovering the particular culture of the participants' families. It would be fruitful to use narrative methodology to explore the dynamic between teens and their parents, that was more focused on their narratives and interpretive repertoires (Silverman, 2001) from the beginning. The individual and family narratives that parents and teens conveyed in their interviews depicted their relationship to ICTS and to one another

surrounding ICTs. This method could be used to provide insight into the dynamics between teens and parents and the reasons behind those dynamics as understood by the participants. Narrative methodologies have been useful in studying families (Byng-Hall, 1973, 1979, 1988, 1999), organizations, places (Tuan, 1991), knowledge transfer (Darwent, 2000), decision making (O'Connor, 1997), the construction of identity (Czarniawska, 1997). They could also be useful for gaining more detailed understanding of how narratives are implicated in parental decision making, teen rebellion against their parents, and how knowledge is transferred between family members, among other aspects of family interactions around information, communication, and technology.

**Implications for practice.** The finding that the Latino/a teens and their parents both have a significant influence on one another's ICT interactions in these immigrant families has important implications for information and media literacy. It suggests that it could be beneficial for literacy programs that serve one or the other of these two populations to include some information literacy as a part of their curricula, as well as instructive techniques that can be used to impart their newly acquired knowledge to family members. Additonally, the use of narratives by family therapists (Byng-Hall, 1973, 1979, 1988, 1999) to create more functional interrelation family patterns reveals that family, parent, and teen narratives could possibly be employed by practitioners to promote more functional literacy and ICT practices in both populations.

Furthermore, considering how parents helped create teens' awareness of what resources were available and what ICT interactions were appropriate, public and school libraries should consider providing instruction about the extent of the resources that are

available online and include recreational, social, and interest driven applications that go beyond what the field generally considers information to expand their exposure. School and public libraries often put technical restrictions on interactions with the Internet that compound the restrictions that children and adolescents already experience. Technical restrictions need to be reconsidered in light of how teens' information behaviors are understood to cross the boundaries of their online social interactions (Meyers et al, 2009; Ito et al., 2008) and that using ICTs to explore their personal interests have been found to be beneficial (Ito et al. 2008; Tripp, 2011).

**Conclusion**

This dissertation was meant to explore teens 'ICT practices in relation to their parents' mediation and the family context in a way that contributed to everyday life information seeking research and provided insight on the particular practices that evolved in Latino/a families. It used a social constructivist information practices approach that would allow consideration of teens' communicative and recreation practices as information activities. Analysis was thus based on accepted understandings within the literature that information use is dependent on context and that it can be assembled from a variety of sources and intersects with social life activities, through a variety of devices, mediums, formats, and applications (Chatman, 1996, 1999, 2000; Pettigrew, 1996; Savolainen, 2007; Williamson, 1998). The mixed-method design permitted a collection of a variety of perspectives of the parent/ teen dynamic around ICTs and analysis revealed the complex social and physical spaces in the participating Puerto Rican and Dominican family households**.** The combination of methods enabled

parents and teens' practices to be viewed from the context of the other, which helped to better explain their individual positions and the family dynamic.

This dissertation moves the exploration of teens' and parents' relationships in relation to ICTs away from privacy towards information influence, interaction, negotiation, and culture. Research on parents and teens has often focused on conflict and privacy evasion or invasion (boyd, 2011; Ledbetter et al., 2010), however analysis of the enthnographic type data collected for this dissertation suggests that it would be more accurate to frame teens and parents' practices as a dialectical process where information disclosure and use are negotiated and renegotiated over time in relation to one another and their roles within the technological culture of the home. Considering parents' and teens' practices in relationsip help more accurately represent their individual practices and their motivations.

Despite the strong focus the dissertation initially took on privacy and the research protocols' emphasis on questions concerning privacy and conflict, the results seem to indicate very little conflict and a high level of familial negotiation at the time of the interviews. This of course may have something to do with demand characteristic bias, but the teen participants, especially, seemed to enjoy the process of communicating about their lives and providing detailed answers that indicated they were trying to be as accurate as possible. Though they may not have expressed content they used that they felt was embarrasing, most of their descriptions concerned fairly mundane descriptions of daily practices that were probably less subject to an internal need to respond in a specific way.

While it has long been understood that parents and teens relationships are not filled with as much conflict as is generally protrayed in the popular media (Smetana et al., 2006), this dissertation indicates that the Puerto Rican and Dominican teens had a stronger bond with their families and more deference to parental authority than has generally been found for majority culture teens. Though, this was a small sample with a great deal of demographic variety, it is striking how synchronized the findings across the sample were. Among the families there was a strong differentiation of social roles and the teens overwhelmingly described and were described abiding by parents rules and deferring to their authority. This was true in homes in which teens had more familial responsibilities and across the variations of parenting practices that parents used, from those that were more permissive to those that were more authoritarian. In addition, the teens did not describe viewing parents' restrictions or monitoring as outside their parents' parental rights or express negative feelings about their parents' mediation. They also discussed few practices for evading or hiding information from parents. Openess in their ICT activities was found to be a distinct practice that participants used to negotiate their relationships with parents and it was a reciprocal process with parents describing giving their teens more autonomy when teens were open with them and they did not percieve that they were hiding anything.

The variability of the sample make it difficult to propose rationale for the lack of conflict or teen ICT evasion in these homes. Overall, teens seemed to shape their practices in relation with their parents' expectations of them, which seemed to lead to less conflict. There are a variety of reasons they might have been more likely to do this

than their majority culture counterparts. For instance, it is possible that, in general, Latino/a immigrant teens might interpret their parents' mediation differently and have a stronger "family orientation" (Clark & Sywyj, 2012; Veliz-Moran, 2016). Latino adolescent have been found to have a strong sense of family obligations (Villalobos & Smetana, 2012) and this type of "familism" leads to conflict avoidance in Latino/a families (Marín & Marín, 1991). However, it was also clear that the adolescents' practices were grounded within the particular combinations of their experiences, such as socio-economic status, parental English and technological proficiency and educational status, neighborhoods, and living arrangements. Teens involvement in their parents' acculturation and the sustainment of their family routines appeared to make them more aware of the difficulties inherent in their parents' experiences and more likely to show respect and deference for them. Their descriptions of their practices demonstrated that they were aware of their parents' weaknesses and vulnerabilities and sensitive to their hardships, such as the long hours their parents needed to work and their unpredictable schedules. For some teens this sensitivity may have facilitated their ability to negotiate the ICT social norms of their family lives and those of their other social worlds. The findings showed that teens' information practices (see Appendix G for the full Teen Family Small World ICT Practices typology) were constrained by physical barriers and by what they believed was possible within the confines of the family social structure, but that participants also used their resources to manage their circumstances in ways that helped them to pursue their priorities; principally maintaining the balance of their family relationship, participating in their social worlds, and engaging with ICTs in ways

that helped them to explore their personal interests. It appeared that the facility and creativity with which they were able to do this influenced their ability to meet their own needs and the overall extension of their PEIs. It is hoped that the typology of practices that was developed in this dissertation will demonstrate the importance of familial contextual factors to teens' everyday life information behaviors and that this connection will continue to be explored.

In addition, it is hoped that this dissertation will make a significant contribution to LIS literature through its exploration of parental mediation as the practices by which parents influence their children's information interactions. Scholars have identified that parents are a significant influence and barrier on children's information and communication activities (Agosto & Hughes-Hassell, 2005; O'Connor et al. 2013; Foss et al, 2013; Meyers et al., 2009), but little is known about their specific practices. This dissertation reveals that parents provide structures of access to devices, and implicit and explicit rules, mediation, and encouragement that seemed to be linked with their personal and family narratives and their beliefs about parenting and technology. The mediation practices they chose to use and how they were integrated into their everyday routine seemed to be directed by narratives that stemmed from their personal contexts and framed how they appoached the world, their parental responsibilities, and the practices they developed. The overwhelming occurrence of ICT parenting practices suggests these practices should be studied in and of themselves and in realtion to children's practices.

The relevance of parents' practices and the underlying system of beliefs and stories to teens' ICT use suggests that this type of influence should be further explored. Exactly how parents influence their teens' ICT habits is a critical question, especially considering that the participating teens did not venture very far outside the boundaries their parents set for them on content. They also generally reported habitually visiting the same few websites each day and, for some, even the use of a basic search engine seemed outside of their routine. While parental mediation was intertwined with parenting practices, the very limited amount of help and encouragement to explore given to their teens was surprising. This finding suggests that these parents were not taking advantage of the range of educational and developmental opportunities on the Internet, or taking a lead role in exposing their children to the variety of content available. Having access, freedom, and/or more educated parents did not necessarily lead to more encouragement or teens' proficiency or advantageuous use. Also authoritative parenting, which is generally connected with positive outcomes (Baumrind, 1989, 1993), did not necesarily relate to technological competence and/or extended PEIs. The most extensive PEIs reported in their survey and interviews for three teens (T3, 5, and 6) had the fewest time restrictions and the highest overall use of ICTs. These teens discussed seeking more varied information online from more sources and had more clearly used ICTs to build competence in their personal areas of interest. Additionally, teens with parents with less education, English proficiency, and technology skills had also developed some competencies to fill that role. Level of use, however, is not necessarily connected with the quality and competence of use and in truth it was

challenging to assess the extent of teens' PEIs or their competency from the limited survey data that was collected or interview accounts. Analysis of interview data demonstrated that parents and the family context influnced teens' interactions, but they also exhibited the complexity of trying to connect demographic characteristics to particular teen practices, as different attributes appeared to manifest in participants' lives in diverse ways. Katz and Gonzalez (2016) have recently highlighted the need for research on information equality to focus on how family and community contexts contribute to the quality of teens' access. This dissertation adds to the understanding of adolescents' everyday information behavior by identifying their family small world ICT practices and drawing connections between these and broader debates on culture, parenting, and information access, inequality, and literacy. The complexity underlying the differences between the ICT competence that teens developed suggests that this issue needs to be further considered from an intersectional approach that explores the variety of instutional structures that influence the identities of Latino/a teens and families (Zambrana, 2011).

This dissertation demonstrates the salience of parental mediation practices and the family context as structural agents in teens' ICT use and as research topics within LIS. The findings show the relevance of ICT negotiation practices to teens' overall information use and help to extend what is understood about how their information practices are embeddded in their everyday lives. It is the hope of the investigator that this dissertation will make a lasting contribution to this critically important topic by building bridges between the various literatures discussed in this dissertation

# Appendix A

## Major Findings for RQ 1

RQ 1. How do Latino/a parents mediate their teens' Information Communication Technolgy (ICT) practices?

1.1 Most of the specific parental ICT mediation practices demonstrated by the Latino/a parents concur with the findings that have been established in the PM literature.

1.2 Parental ICT mediation was inextricably interwoven with general parenting practices.

1.3 Parents had rules and restrictions for teens in relation to ICTs that related directly to their ICT use and others that were related to their concerns for teens' health and safety that indirectly influenced teens' ICT use and interactions.

1.4 PM of ICT devices often concerned the use of the removal of personal devices as a threat and a punishment. Parents used this strategy to procure teens compliance about their ICT use, but also as a general parenting strategy.

1.5 The anticipation of occasional monitoring was used by parents as a way to provide teens with autonomy, feel secure there was nothing to be concerned about, and as an attempt to have teens internalize parents' rules and restrictions so they would comply of their own means.

1.6 Parents created a balance between the provision of privacy and monitoring.

1.7 Directive narratives were related to the ICT mediation practices that parents used and to how family members experienced their reality.

1.8 Parents beliefs about parenting and technology were incorporated into their parental directive narratives and influenced their ICT mediation practices.

1.9 Family, parent, and teen directive narratives influenced one another and were constitutive of one another.

1.10 The polyphony of directive narratives contributed to the overall dynamic of the technological culture that had evolved.

**Major Findings for RQ 2**

RQ 2. What practices do Latino/a teens use to negotiate their (ICT) interactions in accordance with the small world of their family?

2.1 Teens' membership in the small world of their families influenced how teens used the resources that were available to them.

2.2 Teens' presence in physical space influenced their interactions with ICTs.

2.3 Teens negotiated their use of ICTs in the physical space of the household to fulfill their needs for personal space and social connections

2.4 Teens' managed their ICT content and interaction in accordance with what they believed their parents thought was appropriate.

2.5 Teens were involved in negotiating their parents and families' ICT interactions.

2.6 Teens ownership of devices provided them with some autonomy and freedom negotiating their resources.

2.7 Teens' need to share or borrow devices influenced the likelihood of using them and the extension of their personal information ecologies (PIE).

2.8 Teens had ICT related practices that were specifically connected to negotiating parental authority

2.9 Teens' described and were described complying with parents' rules and restrictions and respecting their authority.

2.10 Teens had a variety of practices to manage their social worlds in order to negotiate their membership in the small world of their family.

2.11 The methods that teens used to negotiate the boundaries of their familial small world in relation their other small worlds both increased and decreased the extension of their PIEs.

2.12 Teens used mental frames to process their constraints in ways that made it easier for teens to accept them

2.13 Teens had practices in relation to their friendships with their parents on social media to negotiate the collapsed context of SM and connect with parents and family.

## Appendix B

**Adult Technology Survey**

Gender:_____

Where were you born?_____

If you were born somewhere other than the U.S. how many years have you been in the U.S? _____

Where were your parents born?_____

How do you usually describe your ethnicity? Check all that apply

____Latino or Hispanic

____Caucasian or White

____African American or Black

____American Indian or Alaskan Native

____Indian

____Asian

____Pacific Islander

____Arab

____Other_____

What languages do you speak in your home?

How many people live in your household?

How many kids (ages 0-17) live in your household?

List your kids' ages below?

Girls:

Boys:

How long have you lived in the area?

What is your marital status?

____Married

____Living with someone

____Separated

____Divorced

____Widowed

____Not married

What is the highest grade that you have completed?

____Some High School

____High School Graduate

____Some College or Technical School after High School

____College Graduate

____Some Graduate Study

____Graduate Degree

What is your employment status?

____Full Time employment (40 or more hours per week)

____Part time employment (less than 40 hours per week)

____Self employed

____Temporarily laid off

____Homemaker

____Stay at home Parent

____Retired

____Student

____Permanently disabled

What type of work do you do? _____

What is the combined income for everyone in your household?

____Less than 20,000

____20,000 to less than 40,000 dollars

____40,000 to less than 60,000 dollars

____60,000 to less than 80,000 dollars

____80,000 to less than 100,000 dollars

____100,000 to less than 150,000 dollars

____150,000 dollars or more

Tell us a little more about how use technology in your house in the table below. (Check off whether you use your device in each of the different household location listed below and whether you use it alone or with others)

| **Where do you use your devices?** | | **Mobile or Smart Phone** | **Tablet** | **Desktop Computer** | **Laptop** | **TV** | **Gaming Device** | **Music player** | **Camera** | **Video camera** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meals** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Kitchen** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Living Room** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Family Room** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Bedroom** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Bathroom** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Yard** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Car** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Garage** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |

Indicate any other rooms that technology is used in your home.

Do you have anything you would like to add?

**Thanks so much for your help with this research!**

**Encuesta Para Padres de familia**

Género:_____

¿Dónde nació usted?_____

Si usted nació en otro lugar que los EE.UU. cuántos años ha estado en la U.S? _____

¿Dónde nacieron sus padres?_____

¿Cómo se suelen describir su origen étnico? Marque todo lo que corresponda

____Latino o hispano

____Caucasiano o blanco

____Africano Americano o Negro

____Americano Nativo o Nativo de Alaska

____Indio

____Asiático

____ De las Islas Pacificas

____Árabe

____Otro_____

¿Qué idiomas hablan en su casa?

¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar?

¿Cuántos niños (edades 0-17) viven en su hogar?

Enumerar las edades de sus hijos.

Niñas:

Niños:

¿Cuánto tiempo ha vivido en esta región?

¿Cuál es tu estado civil?

____Casado

____Viviendo con alguien

____Separado

____Divorciado

____Viudo

____No casado

¿Cuál es el grado más alto que ha completado?

____Algún grado de Secundaria

____Graduado de Secundaria

____Un poco de Universidad o escuela técnica después de la secundaria

____Graduado de la Universidad

____Unos estudios de Posgrado

____Graduado de Posgrado

¿Cuál es su situación laboral?

____ Trabajo de tiempo completo (40 horas o más por semana)

____Trabajo de menos de tiempo completo (menos de 40 horas por semana)

____Trabajo por cuenta propia

____Temporalmente sin trabajo

____Ama de Casa

____Padre que se queda en casa

____Retirado

____Estudiante

____Permanente discapacitado

¿Qué tipo de trabajo hace usted? _____

¿Cuál es el ingreso anual combinado de todos en su hogar?

____Menos de 20.000 dólares

____ 20.000 a 40.000 dólares

____ 40.000 a 60.000 dólares

____ 60.000 a 80.000 dólares

____ 80.000 a 100.000 dólares

____ 100.000 a 150.000 dólares

____ 150.000 dólares o más

**Cuéntanos un poco más acerca de cómo utiliza la tecnología en su casa en la siguiente tabla. (Marque si se utiliza el dispositivo en cada uno de los diferentes hogares Marque también si lo usa utiliza en usos lugares solo o con otros.**

| ¿Dónde usa su tecnología? | | Teléfono | Tableta | Computador de Mesa | Laptop | TV | Despositivos de juegos | Musica | Camera | Video |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Durante Comida | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Cocina | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Sala | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Cuarto Familiar | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Su Cuarto | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Baño | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Patio | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Carro | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |
| Garaje | **Solo** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Con Otros** | | | | | | | | | |

Cuenta si hay algunos otros cuartos en su hogar donde usa la tecnología.

¿Tiene algo más que le gustaría incluir?

**Muchas gracias por su ayuda con esta investigación!!!!**

**Children's and Teens' Technology Survey**

Age:_____

Grade:_____

Gender:_____

Where were you born?_____

Do you have your own bedroom? __Y___N

If no, who do you share with? _____

Do you have your own cell phone? __Y__N  Smartphone?__Y__N

If no, who do you share with? _____

How do you usually describe your ethnicity? Check all the following that apply:

____Latino or Hispanic
____Caucasian or White
____African American or Black
____American Indian or Alaskan Native
____Indian
____Asian
____Pacific Islander
____Arab
____Other_____

Can you tell us a little more about how use technology in your house in the table below? (Check off whether you use your device in each of the different household location listed below and whether you use it alone or with others).

| Where do you use your devices? | | Mobile or Smart Phone | Tablet | Desktop Computer | Laptop | TV | Gaming Device | Music player | Camera | Video camera |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Meals | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitchen | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Living Room | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Room | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Bedroom | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Bathroom | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |
| Yard | Alone | | | | | | | | | |
| | With Others | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Car** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Garage** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |

| **Activity on device** | | **Texting / chatting** | **Personal info searches** | **Casual Internet browsing** | **Social Media** | **Homework** | **Gaming** | **Music** | **Email** | **TV shows/ Movies** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meals** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Kitchen** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Living Room** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Family Room** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Bedroom** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Bathroom** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Yard** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Car** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Garage** | **Alone** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **With Others** | | | | | | | | | |

Indicate any other rooms that technology is used in your home:

Do you have anything you would like to add?

**Thanks so much for your help with this research!**

## Appendix C

**Family Interview Protocol**

Thank you so much for meeting with me today. I am so happy to talk with your family. I have asked to meet with you because I am trying to learn more about how technology and media are integrated into families' everyday routines. I am especially interested in learning about how families with teenagers negotiate the shared use of technologies, the spaces of the family home, and the rules parents have for technology use in the home and outside the home. I am hoping today's conversation will last about an hour to an hour and a half. It should give you a lot to think about in terms of how you use technology personally and within the family.

You do not have to answer any questions that you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time. Also know that your identity and all of your responses will be kept confidential.

**To begin:**

**Typical Everyday Routine**

1) Walk me through a typical day in your home, paying special attention to how technology fits into it. Start with when you wake up.

    Probe: How about after school? Dinner time, evening, bedtime?

    Probe: Describe how weekends are different.

**Habits**

2) Which media and technologies are most popular in your house?

Probe: Are there any devices you share? For instance, mobile phones, gaming devices, tv, computer, … How do you negotiate shared use?

3) Describe any favorite spots that family members use their devices. For exp. a favorite chair or room.

**Rituals**

4) Describe any family rituals that revolve around technology, such as a Sunday afternoon Skype date with grandparents, a movie night, specific shows you watch together, games you play together, etc.

Probe: Describe any times when you use computers, laptops, cells, tablets, or any other devices when you are spending time with your family.

**General Technological Culture**

5) How does your family use technology differently than other families you know or to what you believe is the norm?

Probe: Are there any technologies, devices, media, that your family especially disapproves of?

**Rules and Restrictions**

6) Describe any rules or restrictions you have for any devices or media. For exp. TV, tablets, mobile phones, laptops, etc.

Probe: Who decided on these rules? Who usually enforces the rules?

Probe: How have these rules changed over time? Why did they change?

Probe: How are your family's rules

different than other families? Probe:

Describe any conflicts these rules create.

**Social Media Practices**

7) We haven't really touched too much on the Internet or social media; describe any rules or restrictions you for the Internet or social media.

**Ok, we are going to wrap up now, but is there anything else you can think of to tell me about how your family uses technology that we haven't covered?**

**Thank you so much for your help with this research!!!**

**Protocolo de Entrevista de Familia**

Muchas Gracias por reunirse conmigo hoy. Estoy muy feliz de hablar con usted. He pedido reunirme con usted porque estoy tratando de aprender más acerca de cómo la tecnología y otros medios de comunicación se integran en las rutinas diarias de las familias. Estoy especialmente interesada en aprender acerca de cómo las familias con adolescentes negocian el uso compartido de las tecnologías, los espacios de la casa, y las reglas que tienen para el uso de la tecnología su hijo/a. Espero que la conversación de hoy tenga una duración de alrededor de 60 a 90 minutos.

En primer lugar, quiero decir que cuando les pregunto acerca de la tecnología en general, puede referirse al uso de cualquier tecnología que los viene a la mente - por ejemplo, tabletas, teléfonos móviles, dispositivos de juegos, ordenadores portátiles, sitios de Internet, medios de comunicación social, aplicaciones, o incluso contenido, tales como programas de televisión, música, películas y libros electrónicos.

También quiero recordarle que usted no tiene que responder a ninguna pregunta que no desee y puede detener la entrevista en cualquier momento. Todas sus respuestas son confidenciales.

Para Empezar:

Hablamos sobre la rutina diaria típica

1) Camina conmigo a través de un día típico en su casa, prestando especial atención a cómo usan la tecnología. Comenzar con cuando se despierta.

Sonda: ¿Cómo es después de la escuela? ¿La hora de la cena, por la noche, antes de dormir?

Sonda: Describen como son diferentes los fines de semana.

**Hábitos**

2) ¿Qué medios de comunicación y tecnologías son los más populares en su casa?

Sonda: ¿Hay tecnologías que comparten? Por ejemplo, los teléfonos móviles, dispositivos de juegos, televisión, ordenador, ... ¿Cómo se negocia el uso compartido?

3) Describa los partes de la casa preferidos de usar la tecnología? ¿Diferentes miembros tienen espacios favoritos? Por ejemplo, una silla preferida o un cuarto.

**Rituales**

4) Describir los rituales familiares que giran en torno a la tecnología, como por ejemplo Skype con los abuelos domingos, una noche de cine, que juegan juntos, etc.

Sonda: Describa cualquier momento cuando se cualquier tecnología cuando está pasando tiempo con su familia.

**Cultura general Tecnológico**

5) ¿Cómo es su uso de tecnología diferente a otras familias que conoces?

Sonda: ¿Existen tecnologías, dispositivos, medios de comunicación, que su familia desaprueban?

**Reglas y Restricciones**

6) Describen las reglas o restricciones que tienen para todos los dispositivos o medios de comunicación. Por ejemplo. TV, tabletas, teléfonos móviles, ordenadores portátiles, etc.

Sonda: ¿Quién decide sobre estas reglas? ¿Quién por lo general hace que cumplen las reglas?

Sonda: ¿Cómo han cambiado estas reglas atreves del tiempo? ¿Por qué cambiaron?

Sonda: ¿Cómo son las reglas de su familia diferente de otras familias?

Sonda: Describe cualquier conflicto que crean estas reglas.

**Prácticas de los medios sociales**

7) En realidad no hemos tocado demasiado en el Internet o las redes sociales como Facebook; describe las reglas o restricciones que tienen para el Internet o las redes sociales.

**Ok, vamos a terminar ahora, pero ¿hay algo más que quiere contarme sobre el uso de la tecnología de su familia que no hemos cubierto?**

**¡Muchas Gracias por su ayuda en este estudio!!!**

## Appendix D

### Interview Protocol for Parents

Thank you so much for meeting with me today. I am so happy to talk with you. I have asked to meet with you because I am trying to learn more about how technology and media are integrated into families' everyday routines. I am especially interested in learning about how families with teenagers negotiate the shared use of technologies, the spaces of the family home, and the rules parents have for technology use in the home and outside the home. I am hoping today's conversation will last about an hour and a half.

First, I want to say that when I ask about technology in general I'm using that to mean any devices like tablets, mobile phones, gaming devices, laptops, any Internet, social media, or app related activities, and even media content, such as TV shows, music, movies, and ebooks. You should feel free to talk about any technology that comes to mind when I ask about technology in general.

I also want to remind you that you do not have to answer any questions that you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time, but do know that all of your responses will be kept confidential.

### Technological Culture/Values

1) When did you come to the Lehigh Valley?

   Probe: Why did you decide to come to this area?

2) How do you feel about technology?

Probe: What influenced your thinking?

3) If two parent household, ask…Describe any areas in relation to technology and media in which you both have different opinions?

4) Describe any ways that your opinions about the use of technology are different than your teenage children's.

5) Describe any ways your teenage kids use technology in ways that you disapprove of.

Probe: Describe any ways their friends use technology in ways that you disapprove of.

6) Describe any ways your teenage kids help you with technology.

Probe: How does that affect the way you set rules and limits about technology?

**Rules and Restrictions:**

7) Can you list all of the tech you have in the house and where you keep any stationary tech?

Probe: Why do you keep each tech item in the spaces you discussed?

8) Do your children have their own mobile phones?

Probe: Who decided they should have one and why?

Probe: Who decided on the phone they would get and why?

9) Why did you decide to get each tech item? Who decided?

Probe: Who maintains the various technologies in the house?

10) Please describe any rules about how each tech item can be used, who can use it, where they can use it, or when it can be used?

Probe: How did you decide on the rules and restrictions that you have for them?

Probe: How have these rules changed as your teen has gotten older?

Probe: In what ways did family or friends influence your thinking? How about social media?

11) Who tends to enforce the rules and restrictions?

Probe: What happens if they don't follow the rules?

Probe: Describe any differences in how you and your spouse enforce rules or restrictions.

Probe: Do either of you ever make exceptions to your rules or restrictions?

12) Describe how your rules and restrictions have changed over time.

13) Do all your children have the same rules? If not, why not?

14) **Parental Mediation Practice Series:**

| How often do you: | Very Often | Often | Once in a while | Never | Which Parent? | Describe or give an example |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tell your child to get off their phone | | | | | | |
| **Ask them what they are doing on some tech device** | | | | | | |
| Ask them who they are talking to | | | | | | |
| **Look through their phone** | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Take their phone or another device away | | | | | | |
| **Talk to them about what they do on the Internet** | | | | | | |
| Stand behind them when they are doing something | | | | | | |
| **Sit with them while they are online, but not join in** | | | | | | |
| Stay near them to keep an eye on what they are doing | | | | | | |
| **Go online with them** | | | | | | |
| Ask them to take something that they posted online down | | | | | | |
| **Help you with something technical** | | | | | | |
| Help them understand something online | | | | | | |
| **Encourage them to go online to learn something new or explore** | | | | | | |

15) Tell me about any ways your teens have to get around your rules, restrictions, and monitoring. Do you have an exp.?

**Conflict**

16) Tell me about any ways that technology causes conflicts with your kids.

**Privacy**

17) How do you feel about your teen's need for privacy?

18) Do you allow your teen to keep tech in their room? If so, why did you decide to allow this?

19) Describe any ways that you purposefully give them privacy and explain why. For example, not reading a diary, text messages, etc…because you think that those are spaces that more private than others

20) Describe how you post about your teens on social media Probe: Why do you give them privacy in these areas?

**Differences**

21) Describe any ways that you parent your teen's technology different from other parents you know.

**Ok, we are going to wrap up now, but is there anything else you can think of to tell me about how you parent your teen(s) technology use that we haven't covered?**

**Thank you so much for your help with this study!**

**Entrevista Suplementario para los Padres**

Muchas Gracias por reunirse conmigo hoy. Estoy muy feliz de hablar con usted. He pedido reunirme con usted porque estoy tratando de aprender más acerca de cómo la tecnología y otros medios de comunicación se integran en las rutinas diarias de las familias. Estoy especialmente interesada en aprender acerca de cómo las familias con adolescentes negocian el uso compartido de las tecnologías, los espacios de la casa, y las reglas que tienen para el uso de la tecnología su hijo/a. Espero que la conversación de hoy tenga una duración de alrededor de 60 a 90 minutos.

En primer lugar quiero decir que cuando le pregunto acerca de la tecnología en general, puede referirse al uso de cualquier tecnología que le viene a la mente - por ejemplo tabletas, teléfonos móviles, dispositivos de juegos, ordenadores portátiles, sitios de Internet, medios de comunicación social, aplicaciones, o incluso contenido, tales como programas de televisión, música, películas y libros electrónicos.

También quiero recordarle que usted no tiene que responder a ninguna pregunta que no desee y puede detener la entrevista en cualquier momento. Todas sus respuestas son confidenciales.

**Cultura Tecnológica / Valores**

1) ¿Cuando llego al Lehigh Valley?

   Sonda: ¿Porque se mudaron a esta región?

2) ¿Cómo se siente sobre la tecnología?

Sonda: ¿Qué influyó en su pensamiento?

3) Si hay dos padres, pregunte... Describe como son diferentes sus opiniones con relación a la tecnología y otros medios de comunicación.
4) Describe las formas en que sus opiniones sobre el uso de la tecnología son diferentes de sus hijos adolescentes.
5) Describe cualesquiera formas en que su hijo/a utiliza la tecnología en formas que ustedes desaprueban.

Sonda: Describe cualquier manera en que los amigos de su hijo/a utilizan la tecnología en formas que usted desaprueban.

6) Describe cualquier manera en que su hijo/a le ayudan con la tecnología.

Sonda: ¿Esto cómo afecta la forma en que establece normas y límites sobre la tecnología?

**Reglas y Restricciones**

7) ¿Puede enumerar los lugares en la case donde mantienen diferentes tecnologías?

Sonda: ¿Porque los mantienen en estos lugares?

8) ¿Porque decidieron conseguir su hijo/a su propio teléfono móvil?

Sonda: ¿Quien decidió que era buena idea?

Sonda: ¿Porque decidieron en el teléfono que escogieron?

9) ¿Porque decidieron conseguir las otras tecnologías que tienen?

Sondo: ¿Quien decidió que era buen idea?

Sonda: ¿Quién investigo las diferentes tecnologías para decidir cuál escoger?

Sonda: ¿Quién mantiene la tecnología en la casa?

10) Describe reglas acerca cómo pueden utilizar diferentes tecnologías, donde los pueden usar, o cundo los pueden.

Sonda: ¿Porque escogieron estas reglas?

Sonda: ¿Cómo han sido influenciados por familia o amigos?

11) ¿Quién haga cumplir las reglas?

Sonda: ¿Qué pasa si no las cumplen?

Sonda: Describir las diferencias entre ustedes en la forma de hacer cumplir las reglas o restricciones.

Sonda: ¿Hacen excepciones?

12) ¿Describe cómo han cambiado las reglas y restricciones a través del tiempo?

13) ¿Tiene las mismas reglas para todos sus hijos? Si no, ¿por qué no?

14) Practicas Mediaciones de Parientes:

| ¿Con que frecuencia hacen lo siguiente? | Con mucha frecuencia | Con frecuencia | A veces | Nunca | Cuál de los padres lo hace mas | ¿Me puede dar un ejemplo? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Que su hijo/a deja el teléfono | | | | | | |
| **Preguntar le que está haciendo en alguna tecnología** | | | | | | |
| Preguntar con quién está hablando | | | | | | |
| **Mirar por su teléfono** | | | | | | |
| Quitarle su teléfono | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hablarle de lo que hace en el Internet** | | | | | | |
| Hacer se detrás para poder ver lo que están haciendo | | | | | | |
| **Sentarse con el/ella cuando está en el Internet si participar** | | | | | | |
| Quedarse cerca para estar pendiente en que está haciendo | | | | | | |
| **Participe con ellos en mirar el Internet** | | | | | | |
| Pedirles que quiten algo que han puesto en Facebook o Instagram | | | | | | |
| **Pedir les ayuda con alguna tecnología** | | | | | | |
| Ayudarles entender algo en el Internet | | | | | | |
| **Animarles a aprender o explorar algo en el Internet** | | | | | | |

15) Háblame de las maneras que su hijo/a usa para evitar sus reglas, restricciones, y seguimiento.

**Conflicto**

16) Háblame de cómo piensa que la tecnología crea conflictos con su hijo/a.

**Privacidad**

17) ¿Cómo se siente acerca de la necesidad de su hijo/a a la privacidad?

17) ¿Les deja tener la tecnología en su cuarto propio? ¿Porque?

18) Describa cualquier manera que le da privacidad a su hijo/a y cuenta me porqué. Por ejemplo, no leer un diario, mensajes de texto, etc…porque crees que son sitios más privados que otros.

19) Describir que ha publicado en los medios de comunicación social sobre su hijo/a.

**Diferencias**

20) Describa cualquier manera que el uso de la tecnología en su familia es diferente al uso en otras familias que conoce.

**Ok, vamos a terminar ahora, pero ¿hay algo más que quiere contarme sobre el uso de la tecnología de su hijo/a que no hemos cubierto?**

**¡Muchas Gracias por su ayuda en este estudio!**

**Interview Protocol for Teenagers**

Thank you so much for meeting with me today. I am so happy to talk with you. I have asked to meet with you because I am trying to learn more about how technology and media are integrated into families' everyday routines. I am especially interested in learning about how families with teenagers negotiate the shared use of technologies, the spaces of the family home, and the rules parents have for technology use in the home and outside the home. I would especially like to use todays' interview to explore how you keep things private and create some personal space for yourself. I am hoping today's conversation will last about 60-90 mins. At this time, I want to remind you that you do not need to answer any question that you do not want to answer and you can stop the interview at any time. Also, do know that your identity and all your responses will be kept confidential.

First, I want to say that when I ask about technology in general I'm using that to mean any devices like tablets, mobile phones, gaming devices, laptops, any Internet, social media, or app related activities, and even media content, such as TV shows, music, movies, and ebooks. You should feel free to talk about any technology that comes to mind when I ask about technology in general.

We are going to start with…

(1) Your favorite spaces to use technology

(2) Your least favorite spaces to use technology

(3) What you most like to do online or with your device

(4) How you try to create some privacy for yourself

(5) The ways that technology use is different in your family than in other families

**Questions about Mapping Activity**

2) Is this a room that your whole family uses together? If so when does your family use this room?

Probe: Show me your family members' favorite places to sit or be in this room. When do they sit in these places?

Probe: Who uses each tech device the most? Do they use it most often when other people are in the room or when they are alone?

Probe: What do they use it for?

3) Is there any tech that you share in the room? If so, how do you decide who gets to use it.

4) Do you mostly use this room when you're alone or with others?

Do you tend to use (each circled tech item) in this room when you are alone or when others are present?

Probe: In either case, when do you use (each circled tech item)? And what do you tend to use (each circled tech item) for when you're in this room?

5) Please describe any rules about how (each circled tech item) can be used, who can use it, or when it can be used?

Probe: Who enforces these rules?

Probe: What happens if the rules are broken?

Probe: Describe any times your parents make exceptions to the rules are restriction we've talked about.

6) Can you describe any arguments you and your family members have about using any of the tech items in the room?

Probe: Ask about the following topics if they haven't been brought up in the conversation about the photos they sent or the mapping worksheet:

**Routines, Habits, Rituals**

7) Take me through your day starting from when you wake up paying attention to how technology is integrated into your everyday routine. For instance, you might wake up with a text message or an alarm on your phone, and then check your Facebook page and so on…during school, after school, evening, bedtime?

**Technological Culture**

8) If you have your own mobile phone at what age did you get your own phone?

Probe: Who decided you should have one and why

Probe: Can you connect to the Internet on your phone?

9) Describe any ways that your opinions about the use of technology are different than your parents?

Probe: What do you think your parents worry about the most in relation to your technology use

10) For kids with two parents, describe any ways your parents feel differently about technology. For instance, my mom hates watching TV, but loves anything to do with the computer while my dad loves TV, but hates technology, mobile phones, and emails.

11) How do you personally use technology differently when you are with your family than you would by yourself?

**Rules, Restrictions, and Monitoring**

12) Describe any differences in the rules your parents have for you and your siblings.

Probe: What do you think of these differences?

Probe: Who or what you do think most influences the rules and restrictions your parents put on your use of technology?

Probe: Describe any rules that your parents enforce differently.

Probe: Tell me about any rules your parents have for technology that you don't like or think are unfair.

13) Parental Mediation Table:

**(Very often means daily or almost daily, often means at least twice a week, once in a while means at least once a month)**

| How often do your parents: | Very Often | Often | Once in a while | Never | Which Parent? | Describe or give an example |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tell you to get off your phone | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ask you what you are dojng** | | | | | | |
| Ask you who you are talking to | | | | | | |
| **Look through your phone** | | | | | | |
| Take your phone or other device away | | | | | | |
| **Talk to you about what you do on the Internet** | | | | | | |
| Stand behind you when you are doing something | | | | | | |
| **Sit with you while you are online, but not join in** | | | | | | |
| Stay near you to keep an eye on what you are doing | | | | | | |
| **Go online and browse with you** | | | | | | |
| Ask you to take something that you posted online down | | | | | | |
| **Help you with something technical** | | | | | | |
| Help you understand something online | | | | | | |
| **Encourage you to go online to learn something new or explore** | | | | | | |

14) Would you tell me a little about your best friends?

Probe: how do you communicate with one another?

Probe: Describe any way your parents' rules or monitoring make it difficult to communicate or socialize with your friends.

Probe: Describe any ways that your friends make it hard to follow your parents' rules

15) **Privacy Practices:**

**(Very often means daily or almost daily, often means at least twice a week, once in a while means at least once a month)**

| How often do you | Very Often | Often | Once in a while | Never | Exp. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| keep your phone on silent when your parents are around | | | | | |
| **leave the room to send a message or talk to someone** | | | | | |
| minimize something when someone else is in the room or comes into the room | | | | | |
| **erase your browsing history** | | | | | |
| control your browsing history | | | | | |
| **Avoid posting something online because your parents might see it** | | | | | |
| Post something online so that only some people will understand what you are talking about (exp. Subtweet) | | | | | |
| **Ask someone to take something down online because you are afraid of who might see it** | | | | | |
| Help your parents with something technical | | | | | |
| **Help your parents with finding or understanding something online** | | | | | |
| Help a sibling with something technical | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Help a sibling to find or understand something online** | | | | | |
| Tell your sibling he or she shouldn't be doing something on some tech device | | | | | |
| **Avoid phone calls, chats, texts from your parents** | | | | | |
| Avoid phone calls, chats, texts from your friends | | | | | |
| **Text while you are in the room with your parents** | | | | | |

16) Tell me about any social media, like Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat that you are friends with your parents.

17) Describe any times your parents have posted pictures of you or status updates related to you on Facebook or some other social media. How did that make you feel?

18) Describe any activities you do online that your parents don't really know about.

Probe: How do you avoid them finding out?

19) Describe any places outside the home that you use technology in a way you're not able to at home.

20) Access Points:

**Very often means daily or almost daily, often means at least twice a week, once in a while means at least once a month**

| How often do you go online at | Very Often | Often | Once in a while | Never | What device do you use? | Why do you use it here? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| in class at school | | | | | | |
| school library or computer lab | | | | | | |
| Public library | | | | | | |
| in the car or bus | | | | | | |
| at a friend's house | | | | | | |
| at a relative's house | | | | | | |
| local business (like Target, McDonalds | | | | | | |
| In church | | | | | | |
| Are there other places you go online? if so, list | | | | | | |

21)How do you respond when your parents call or text you when you're with your friends? Or text?

22) Range of Information behavior:

(Very often means daily or almost daily, often means at least twice a week, once in a while means at least once a month)

| How often do you: | Very often | often | Once in a while | Never | What websites do you use | What devices do you use | Where do you do this? | Rules or restrictions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| make phone calls | | | | | | | | |
| use video conferencing like Skype | | | | | | | | |
| send text messages | | | | | | | | |
| chat online | | | | | | | | |
| listen/download music | | | | | | | | |
| go on social media | | | | | | | | |
| play games online | | | | | | | | |
| search for personal info | | | | | | | | |
| search for homework help | | | | | | | | |
| watch videos online | | | | | | | | |
| watch tv | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **read the news** | | | | | | | | |

**Conflict**

23) Describe any ways technology has caused conflict in your family or with your parents.

**Privacy**

24) Can you describe any times that it's difficult for you to get privacy from your parents?

Probe: How do you deal with it?

**Differences**

25) Describe how your parents' rules or feelings about technology are different from other parents.

**Ok, we are going to wrap up now, but is there anything else you can think of to tell me about how you use technology that we haven't covered?**

**Thank you so much for your help with this research!**

**Appendix E: Mapping Protocol**

LIVING ROOM—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

1. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc. Circle the ones that you use.
2. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
3. Doors and furniture

Notes:

KITCHEN—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

4. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc. Circle the ones that you use.
5. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
6. Doors and furniture

Notes:

_____ BEDROOM—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

7. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc. Circle the ones that you use.
8. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
9. Doors and furniture

Notes:

_____ BEDROOM—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

10. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc. Circle the ones that you use.
11. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
12. Doors and furniture

Notes:

OTHER BEDROOM—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

13. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc. Circle the ones that you use.
14. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
15. Doors and furniture

Notes:

_____ ROOM—Mark locations of the device and write the name of the device next to it:

1. Stationary media devices—TV, computer, DVD player, VCR, landline phone, video game consoles, etc.
2. Where mobile media—cell phones, game boys, laptops, e-readers—are usually located or used.
3. Doors and furniture

Notes:

**Appendix F: Parental Mediation Typology**

| **Parental Mediation Typology** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Major Themes, Subthemes, and categories** | **Definition** | **Example** |
| **Major Theme: Parental ICT Mediation Practices** | **Based on Clark's (2011) understanding of parental mediation as going beyond parental concerns over media effects on their children. Includes parenting practices that influence teens' relations with media and technology** | |
| **Subtheme: Directive narratives** | **Grounded on the Silverstone et al. (1989) concept of family mythologies that described how the stories that each family tells itself about itself that shape how technologies become incorporated into the family's small world** | |
| Family directive narratives | The narratives and accounts that participants express about their identity as a family | "Yeah, we're not a big fan of technology" (Y, FI) |
| Parent directive narratives | Narratives in which a parent describes their personal identity in relation to ICTs or that express an idea of who they are as parents | "That's how I do it, yes, yes. That's how I think I care, that's the only way I know that I could kinda keep them from, you know–especially my oldest because like I said, he's sixteen, you know, I know they talk at school, oh this weekend we're goin' clubbing or we're gonna go to the hookah lounge or whatever the case may be…yeah, you're not goin' nowhere so don't even think about it! But I feel by allowing him to do that and giving him that freedom and showing him that you necessarily don't have to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | be outside to have fun" (M3, PI) |
| Teen directive narratives | Teen narratives about their identities and/or priorities | "that's how people make money with gaming and that's the step that I'm taking too, is I'm a professional gamer for Gears of War" (T3, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Restrictive mediation** | Parental guidelines developed for the home that relate to ICT use | |
| Restrictions | The development of practices that specifically restrict teens' interactions with ICTs (Gentile et al., 2012; Livingstone & Helsper, 2008; Nikken & Jansz, 2014). | "Yeah, I try to give them each an hour" (M2, PI) |
| Rules | Specific household rules that indirectly restricted teens use of ICTs. | "when they go to bed they tell me…now turn it off, you have to go to bed for school" (T6, TI) |

| **Subtheme: Active mediation** | Active mediation has generally included parents' discussion with their teens about their ICT use (Eastin, Greenberg, & Hofschire, 2006; Kirwil, 2009). The concept is extended here to include other practices that involved parents' active involvement with teens in relation to their ICT use. | |
|---|---|---|
| Discussions about use | Discussions parents have with their teenage children about their ICT use | "Well, it was work for him and it was hard and we have talked a lot about that because that does a lot of harm to youth" (M4, PI, trans) |
| Help or understanding | References to parents helping teens with ICTs | "he's a big help and he's a big influence, he tells me a lot about certain things and all that when it comes to technology" (T3, TI) |
| Active co-use | Actively using ICTs with children. Builds on research that has described co-suing and co-playing 2002, 2008; Joiw et al., 2016; Nikken & Jansz, 2003, 2006; Shin & Huh, 2011 | "Like me and my mom go into like, what could we do for the house and we look up things like that, and for some reason I find that really entertaining because like, oh that would look cute on this wall, oh…so we do that together" (T2, TI) |
| Encourage exploration | The explicit ways that that parents were described promoting the use of ICT activities to teens | "[y]eah, she's like, [you], go to YouTube and find useful videos of what they're teaching you in school to keep yourself, cause I'm not a big numbers person, but she wants me to" (T2, TI) |
| Alternative suggestions or activities | Practices that referred to parents' providing alternative suggestions or activities for teens as Eklund and Bergmark (2013) have demonstrated. | "always when I go out to the store and I see a book I bring him a book, because before he liked to read" (M5, PI, trans) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Subtheme: Devices** | Mediation practices that were focused on the material technologies teens interacted with. | |
| Choices about devices | References to parental decision making concerning what technologies are allowed into the house. | Teen: "mom she felt as if I was responsible enough to do it, but at the time it wasn't, like I had my phone you know with unlimited data talk text and all that stuff<br>INTERVIEWER: "you didn't?<br>TEEN 3: "yeah, it was just like a $30-dollar plan just keep my phone on to call her or whenever and stuff" (T3, TI). |
| ICT removal as threat or punishment | Warren (2001) has found that parents use restrictive mediation to punish their children. That is extended here to include removal of technologies as a punishment or threat to promote some type of behavior | "'if you don't put it away, I'm going to take it for a week,' but we've never had to do it, we don't have to do it" (D8, PI, trans) |
| **Subtheme: Parental monitoring** | The ongoing monitoring of the websites that their children visit and their online communications (e.g., chat messages and social networking activities) (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). Researchers have called for a need for more research on this aspect of mediation (Eastin et al., 2006; Kirwil, 2009; Nikken & Jansz, 2003, 2006; Oosting et al., 2008) | |
| Supervision | Based on Nikken and Jansz (2016) concept of supervision and includes the casual monitoring of teens in the general physical vicinity in order to confirm that nothing of concern is being done. | "this is where we mainly spend our time so I could monitor them more when I'm here (trans)" (M2, PI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Verbal inquiries | Based on the Ledbetter et al. (2010) concept of verbal invasions. It included references to parents asking teens who they are talking to and what they are doing. | "Yes, I investigate too. What are you doing? Let me look. Who are you talking to? "(M4, PI, trans) |
| ICT device or accounts | Based on the Ledbetter et al. (2010) concepts of telephone and computer invasions. It included monitoring ICT devices, Internet histories, online accounts, etc. | "I don't ask her who she's talking to or anything, I just see the page that they were using, Kik, or Messenger, or WhatsApp, when they talk what she says to see if they talk in good terms, how she presents herself, if she knows how to defend herself from any questions her friends ask" (M1, PI, trans) |
| **Subtheme: Privacy** | Extends the Padilla-Walker et al. (2012) concept of deference. This includes parental practices that grant children personal space based on trust | |
| Autonomy | Descriptions of parental practices meant to allow teens control over their own ICT use. | "before we were really on top of her to control the amount of time, but now she has the capacity, to dedicate time to homework, and the other to do something recreational like using technology" (D7, PI, trans) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Independence | References to parents taking measures to allow their children to be separate from them and not seek out information about them. | "I don't wanna embarrass him you know? Or he'll tell me if you don't take it off I'm gonna block your page so I take it off. I respect him, you know, if he doesn't wasn't me to put it, he doesn't want me to put it, what can i do" (M3, PI) |
| Privacy in physical space | References to parents allowing teens to be alone in various areas of the household | "Yeah, I know that he needs time to be alone sometimes and I let him. He closes the door. and he's big now, and I understand that it's normal" (M4, PI, trans) |
| Privacy for devices and accounts | Statements that refer to parents purposefully choosing not to look through their children's technologies or accounts | "I never looked at it…I know that's giving him reasons not to trust me" (M3, PI) |
| **Subtheme: Social media (SM)** | The parental SM practices that influenced teens' SM participation. This concept is grounded in research showing teens' discomfort with having parents as friends on SM (Ito et al., 2008; West et al., 2009) | |
| Monitor and judge on social media | Statements that describe or refer to parental monitoring or judgement of teens social media accounts. | "if she puts some photo that they think is pretty, but for someone, they will not know if she is well-mannered. Me that, I keep that in mind to check" (M1, PI, trans) |
| Parents' posts | Descriptions of parents posting on SM about their children. | "I stay on and I post things about my kids, and good morning, how are things doin'" (M3, PI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Parents’ extended network | References to parents' social networks on SM and their influence on teens. | "And she [her mom] has her little friends on my Snapchat" (T7, TI) |

**Appendix G: Teen Family Small World Typology**

| **Teen Family Small World Typology** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Major themes, subthemes, and categories** | **Definition** | **Example** |
| **Teen Family Small World ICT Practices** | **Practices that teens used in relation to ICTs to maintain their membership in their families** | |
| **Major Theme: Teens' Negotiation of their Resources** | **Practices used to negotiate available resources, such as physical spaces, household devices, ICT content, and Internet access** | |
| **Subtheme: Physical spaces** | **Practices used to negotiate household spaces, such as kitchen, living room, and bedroom, in relation to ICTs** | |
| Sharing space | Practices for using ICTs in shared household spaces to construct personal space (Ledbetter et al., 2010; (Ling & Thrane, 2001; Livingstone, 2007b), control visibility (Ito 2005), and connect with others. | "I look up different things, like when you guys were talking, and Y was in my room doin' her homework, I was looking up dresses" (T2, TI) |
| Personal physical space | Practices used to be alone within the household (Ledbetter et al., 2010). | "Sometimes I want to be alone or whatever so I just go to my room, my mom stays here" (T4, TI) |
| "Place-ballet" | Adjustments to the context of physical space in the moment (see Seamon, 1980) | "[W]hen I can't watch TV down here and I wanna watch something, I just go upstairs instead" (T6, TI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ICT hubs | Focusing ICT use in specific household spaces (see Ling & Thrane on "base of operations" 2001, p. 9) | "I go in my room until I have to pick up the kids again, I'll play for a little bit by myself and then go pick up the kids from Casa and then come back and then they you know I tell them get, did you do your homework if you did I put all their stuff away again, get em undressed and into pajamas and stuff and then help them with their homework if they didn't finish… and then put all their stuff away and then I usually go back upstairs play for the rest of the night until the kids have to go to bed and then they go to bed and I play a little more until like ten then get off then go to sleep" (T3, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Content and interaction** | **Family practices related to what teens watched and interacted with on ICTs** | |
| Teen adjustment to parental expectations | Practices used to adjust ICT content and interactions to what teens believed their parents expected of them | "if it's my mom says it's a problem, then it's a problem, like I respect her opinion, yeah I respect it and I won't get on" (T3, TI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brokering | Practices related to providing parents with technical (see Correa, et al., 2105) and language assistance on ICTs (see Katz, 2010) | "Like usually with my dad, he likes to know, he always asks, like hey, could you teach me how to do this? I think this is the new thing or whatever and I'm like okay, you can actually just favorite it or things like that, you know, so that way you don't always have to type it in" (T2, TI) |
| Mediation of siblings' ICT use | How teens monitor and mediate their siblings' media use (see Clark, 2009) | "my shows that I watch aren't like for him so… I just try to like watch what he wants because I know I'm not going to be there for long" (T1, TI) |
| Research | Teens' help with seeking information to help with ICT purchases (see Beatty & Talpade, 1994) | "Sometimes she's like, 'I wanna buy this, can you check the reviews or something,' and I search and I'm like 'alright, it's good, you could get it' or 'no, get something else 'cause it's bad'" (T6, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Devices** | **Practices that were used to negotiate ICT technologies in the household** | |
| Sharing | Practices related to operating household devices used by multiple members | "sometimes I have computer homework and like things I have to do on the computer, and sometimes I'm like, you use it first, then I'll do my computer homework, so I'll do my computer homework, like I do everything I have to do later" (T2, TI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Lending or giving away | Related to individualization (see Livingstone, 2007b), but extended to include practices used in relation to teens' personal ownership of technologies | "I gave the tablet to my brother and now the phone is just one of my favorites" (T1, TI) |
| Quality/breakdown | Practices for coping with breakdowns and quality issues (see Gonzalez, 2016) | "I tried like to learn, on that one but it's like too slow" (T6, TI) |
| Borrowing | Practices for using ICTs owned by other family members | "[S]o now I'm using my dad's, 'cause he has a MacBook so it's easier, so I use his to do projects and if I need to print something out" (T7, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Internet access** | **Practices used to negotiate limitations teens had to the online environment** | |
| Limit activities | Practices that describe teens restricting their ICT interactions in order to manage access to the Internet | "[T]he data that I have is just reach enough to use Snapchat or my social medias" (T4, TI) |
| Secure alternative methods to connect | Strategies for connecting to the Internet outside of the household | "Sometimes, when I need it, when I see somebody and I need to text them, since my phone's not connected, I'll be like to my friend or something, 'can you put the hotspot real quick so I could text them?'" (T6, TI) |
| Online applications | Use of SM and Internet sites to cope with the limitations of not having data on their phone | "Snapchat…Messenger, the Facebook thing, Kik, I use a lot for texting" (T6, TI) |
| Adjust physical space | Strategies used to increase ability to connect to the online environment in various household spaces | Using particular place as ICT hub (living room) because, "I have a better connection" (T5, TI) |

| **Major Theme: Teens' Negotiation of Their Interpersonal Relationships** | **How teens negotiated their interpersonal relationships** | |
|---|---|---|
| **Subtheme: Negotiating parental authority** | **Strategies used to cope with the power differential between teens and their parents** | |
| Earning leeway | Practices used to gain parental lenience concerning ICTs | When asked about punishments for breaking the rules, Teen 6 said, "I don't know, 'cause I don't break them" (T6, TI) |
| Not hiding/hiding in plain sight | Practices used to present themselves as being open and non-evasive with parents | "when I'm using my phone, if I'm on the couch and she's sitting next to me and she want to look, I'm right there so I just show her, or whatever, so, I don't have to like, I don't have anything to hide so don't get mad at her if she want to see my phone or whatever and just show it to her or whatever" (T4, TI) |
| Pushing boundaries | Participants' attempts to verbally question parents' decisions, defend themselves, and request ICT devices | Teen 5's mother said that her son would ask for "'just one hour,' now five minutes,' 'just let me finish this game' and it's a whole project" (M5, PI) |
| **Subtheme: Social worlds** | **Practices related to meeting the ICT expectations of social worlds beyond the family (see Burnett, 2015)** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Social relationships | How ICT social norms within family small worlds could influence choice of friends and conversely how choice of friends could influence teen interactions with ICTs | Teen 3 stated, “I don’t really have friends who socialize in real life” (T3, TI). Instead, he said “I do it mostly online, I don’t really go out the house at all so, this is my space” (T3, TI) |
| Device use | The use of ICT technologies to supplement ability to connect to extended social worlds | "Like I have a routine now, if they gave me homework, then I know that I have to go [translated from Spanish] to the library, so I just get a pass and go to the library and do it” (T4, TI) |
| Social capital | Using social relationships to extend ability to connect to social worlds on ICTs | “I usually like, M, I'm gonna send you the link of this, could you print it? She's like okay” (T2, TI) |
| Interpersonal conversations | Practices related to speaking with others to adapt to the ICT expectations of social worlds | "[S}ometimes I'm just like, at random, if I know you, and we're okay, you're not really close but you're part of my group or whatever, I'm like, and they give it to me, I'm like, can you put your pass code? Yeah, or like your thumb or something? And they're like okay (T2, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Mental frames** | **Use of narrative frames to cope with circumstances and maintain their relationships with their parents.** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Positive | Accounts that demonstrate an optimistic view on limitation(s) to ICT access | "Cause, okay, you have it, and okay, now, a million people are texting you or whatever, you have to reply. Sometimes I don't have time for that and I don't even have one to be all the time and oh I just did this, blah blah blah. How are you gonna live 24 hours of the day doing that? So sometimes I thank that secretly, that I don't have one" (T2, TI) |
| Acclimating | Demonstrating adjustment to circumstances | "No, I don't get much privacy, so I'm just used to it" (T7, TI) |
| No control | Statements that indicate a lack of agency | "I don't do anything, it's not my, it's not my Facebook to control" (T1, TI) |
| The future | Presenting ICT constraints as something they would be able to fix over time | "When I work basically, I'm gonna buy the parts and make one and then I could play games in it or like do work and stuff" (T6, TI) |
| **Subtheme: Social media (SM)** | **Practices used on SM to negotiate personal boundaries (see boyd, 2010; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Oolo & Siibak, 2013; Palen & Dourish, 2003)** | |
| Teens' posts | Practices used to control teens' SM posts to negotiate personal boundaries (see boyd, 2010; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Oolo & Siibak, 2013) | "[I]t's rarely that I post something she doesn't want me to post, so…I keep it PG" (T7, TI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Parents' posts | Practices for adjusting to the discomfort of parents' SM posts about teens | “it was just like alright I have no choice anyways, you’re going to do it anyways so, to toughen up” (T3, TI) |
| Social connections | Use of SM to connect relationally with parents and family | "[Y]eah, so when my stepbrother, me, him and my uncle we’re really close, we go to the gym every single day and we workout or we play and talk with inside jokes with each other, so my stepbrother he posted one time to me he said, because there was an argument, not an argument, but we were joking around that they were calling me ugly and my brother he said ‘ooooh, he’s so ugly,’ ahahha, on Facebook and my uncle reacted to it” (T5, TI) |

## Appendix H: Sample Consent Forms

### PARENTAL INFORMED CONSENT

Your children are invited to participate in a research study entitled IN PLAIN VIEW: LATINO/A TEENS' USE OF ICTS TO CONSTRUCT PRIVACY IN THE FAMILY CONTEXT. This study is being conducted by Stefani Gomez, who is a doctoral student in the Communication, Information and Library Studies Ph. D. Program at Rutgers University. The purpose of this research is to explore how teens integrate technology, such as cell phones, laptops, computers, Facebook, etc., into the everyday routines of their families.

About 6-8 families and 18-35 subjects will participate in the study. Each stage of the study will last approximately:

10-15 minutes -Survey of family members **(Children 8 and older)**

60-90 minutes -Family interview **(Children under 14 and over 16)**

25-50 minutes over two weeks - Photo-elicitation (PEI) **(Parents and 14-16-year-old teens)**

60- 90 minutes – Parent interview **(Parents)**

60-90 minutes – Teen Interview **(14-16-year-old teens)**

And each individual's participation will last approximately:

90-120 mins for family members besides participating parents and 14-16-year-old teens.

3-4hr over the course of two weeks for participating 14-16-year-old teens

3-4hr over the course of two weeks for parents

The study procedures include:

- All family members eight and older will be asked to fill out a survey that collects basic demographic information. Participants will also be asked to check off where in there house they use different technologies, like cell phones, laptops, computers, Facebook, etc. and kids will also indicate in where in their house they do certain activities like, homework, google searches, texting, etc.
    - Children living in the household in between the ages of 8-13 will be allowed to participate in the survey and family interview with parental consent, but they will not be interviewed individually.
- The family as a whole will be interviewed about how their family uses technologies, like cell phones, laptops, computers, Facebook, etc. The family interview will be audio-recorded.
    - Children under eight will also be allowed to participate in the family interview with parental consent, but will not be asked to fill out a survey or be interviewed individually
- Each parent will also be asked to take pictures and/or short videos that illustrate prompts and email or text them to the investigator over the course of a week.

- 14-16-year old teens will also be asked to take pictures and/or short videos that illustrate prompts and email or text them to the investigator over the course of a week.
- Parents will be interviewed together. The photos and/or short videos they emailed during the time between the family interview and their interview will be used to direct the individual interview. Your photos and interview responses will not be shared with your child.
- 14-16-year old teens will be interviewed. The photos and/or short videos they emailed during the time between the family interview and their interview will be used to direct the individual interview. Your teen's photos and responses to the individual interview will not be shared with you unless your child shares something makes us worried for his /her safety or someone else's.

This research is confidential. Confidential means that the research records will include some information about your child/children and this information will be stored in such a manner that some linkage between your/your child's/children's identity and the response in the research exists. Some of the information collected about your child/children includes Information concerning age, gender, ethnicity, race, marital status, education level, employment, the devices, such as cell phones, laptops, computers, Facebook, and other social media that are owned and/or accessed, and where they are accessed will be collected in the survey.

Please note that we will keep this information confidential by limiting individual's access to the research data and keeping it in a secure location. All digital Images, short videos, interview recordings, and transcripts will be stored under pseudonyms and be kept on a password protected computer that is kept in the researcher's locked home office. Participant contacts and the images and short videos that are sent by text message to the researcher will be stored by pseudonyms in the researcher's phone and the phone will be both password and fingerprint protected. Hard copies of the interview transcripts, and any participant elicited images will also be stored under pseudonyms and be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's locked home office. Consent and assent forms will be stored in separate locked cabinet. The linking list that links participants' names with the pseudonyms that will be used in the research will be kept in a different locked cabinet than the consent and assent forms in the researcher's advisor's office at Rutgers.

The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only parties that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. We will not share your 14-16-year-old's photos or interview responses with you, except in certain rare cases where your child or someone else is felt to be in danger. In some situations, it may be necessary for the researcher to break confidentiality. If any photo or video is suspected to depict bullying, we will need to discuss it with you and if someone seems to be in danger the appropriate authorities as well. If your child threatens to harm themselves or another person or reports any incidents of child or elder abuse (or if it is strongly suspected), then the investigator is required to notify the appropriate

authorities. Also, your child should not send any nude photos. Nude photos of minors will need to be reported to the appropriate authorities. Your child should also not send us photos/videos or tell us any information about current, past or future crimes that are either unknown and/or crimes that they have been convicted of and/or not been charged with, or crimes that they may currently be participating in, as such information about these crimes may have to be reported to the appropriate authorities.

If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated. If something relating to your child is discussed a pseudonym will be used. All study data will be kept for 10 years. After 10 years all the research data will be deleted and destroyed.

It is anticipated that there will be minimal risk as a result of participation in this research. There is some risk that your family will uncover differences of opinion about technology in the family interview that might cause some conflict, but we will attempt to minimize this risk by avoiding any topics that seem contentious or cause discomfort. If a subject does become upset or emotional while describing their family's or their own personal practices the researcher will move on to a different question or if the participant prefers the interview and data collection will be stopped. The following is a list of counseling services that can be contacted if a subject feels that it is needed.

KidsPeace / Orchard Behavioral Health

801 E Green St

Allentown, PA 18109

610-799-8910

or

450 W Chew St

Allentown, PA 18102

610-776-5465

Pinebrook Family Answers

402 North Fulton St.

Allentown, PA 18102

610-432-3919

Bethlehem Counseling Associates

2045 Westgate Drive, Suite 304, Gateway Professional Building

Bethlehem, PA 18017

(610) 865-8177

Olivewood Counseling

510 Delaware Ave

Fountain Hill, PA 18015

(610) 417-0463

For your participation, your family will receive a pizza meal to eat during the family interview. Participating parents will also receive one $20 gift card after they have sent the images and/or short videos that have been requested to the researcher and $20 gift

card after the completion of the parental interview. 14-16-year-olds participating teens will also receive a $15 gift card after they have sent the images and/or short videos that have been requested to the researcher and a $15 gift card upon completion of their individual interview.

There are no direct benefits for participation in this study beyond the pizza and monetary compensation, but your child/children may gain a better understanding of your family's technological practices and the values underlying these practices. There is no cost to you or to your family for participation in this study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose for your child/children not to participate, and you may withdraw your child/children from participating at any time during the study activities without any penalty to your child/children. In addition, you or your child/children may choose not to answer any questions with which you or they are not comfortable. And if, for any reason, at any time, your child/children wishes to stop an interview, or withdraw from the study, they may do so without having to give an explanation.

If you or any of your children have any questions about the study or study procedures, you/ they may contact myself at:

Stefani.gomez@gmail.com

484-866-6309

4 Huntington St.

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Or my adviser Marie Radford at

mradford@rutgers.edu

848-932-8797

Office: Dewitt, Room 206

4 Huntington St.

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

If you or your child/children have any questions about their rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews research studies in order to protect those who participate). Please contact an IRB Administrator at the Rutgers University, Arts and Sciences IRB:

Institutional Review Board

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey

Liberty Plaza / Suite 3200

335 George Street, 3rd Floor

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Phone: 732-235-9806

Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

Your child/children will also be asked if they wish to participate in this study. You will be given a copy of these consent forms for your records.

Please indicate below the name and age of every child you are consenting to have participate in the study and then please sign your own name. Sign below if you agree to allow your child to participate in this research study:

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Parent/Legal Guardian (Print ) _____

Parent/Legal Guardian's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal Investigator Signature _____ Date _____

**Audio/Visual Addendum to Consent Form**

You have already agreed to allow your child to participate in a research study entitled IN PLAIN VIEW: LATINO/A TEENS' USE OF ICTS TO CONSTRUCT PRIVACY IN THE FAMILY CONTEXT conducted by Stefani Gomez. We are asking for your permission to allow us to audiotape your child as part of that research study and to have your 14-16-year-old child take photos and short videos and send them to the researcher. You do not have to agree allow your child to be recorded or to send photos or short videos to the researcher in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The photographs, videos, and recording(s) will be used for analysis by the research team.

The audio-recording(s), photos, and short videos will not include your child's name and will be labeled with a pseudonym. If your child says anything that he/she believes at a later point may be hurtful and/or damage his/her reputation, then he/she can ask the interviewer to delete the recording and record over such information OR that certain text be removed from the transcripts. Additionally, you or your child can ask the researcher to destroy any photo or video at any time.

Your child will be instructed to concentrate on taking photos and short videos of virtual and physical spaces and to avoid taking photos in which anyone can be identified. Photos or videos in which your child can be identified will be immediately deleted when they are received. Your child/children should never send nude photos/videos. Nude

photos/videos of a minor will need to be reported to the appropriate authorities.

The audio recordings of the interviews and transcripts and the photographs and videos that are taken by the participant will be stored in a locked cabinet in my home and on a password protected computer and all subjects will be referred to by pseudonyms in the transcripts, analysis, and in the write up of the research. After ten years, all interview recordings, photos, and videos will be deleted and all the transcripts will be shredded.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record your child as described above during participation in the above-referenced study and to receive photos and videos from your child. The investigator will not use the recording(s) or photos and videos that your child takes for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Child (Print ) _____

Age of Child_____

Name of Parent/Legal Guardian (Print ) _____

Parent/Legal Guardian's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal Investigator Signature _____ Date _____

**CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO DE LOS PADRES**

Sus hijos están invitado a participar en un estudio de investigación titulado: EL USO DE LA TECHNLOGIA POR LOS ADOLESCENTES LATINOS PARA CONSTRUIR LA INTIMIDAD EN EL CONTEXTO DE LA FAMILIA. Este estudio está siendo realizado por Stefani Gómez, quien es estudiante de doctorado en Comunicación y Información en la Universidad de Rutgers. El propósito de esta investigación es explorar cómo los adolescentes integran la tecnología, tales como teléfonos móviles, ordenadores portátiles, computadores, Facebook, etc., en las rutinas diarias de sus familias.

Aproximadamente 6-8 familias y 18-35 sujetos participarán en el estudio. Cada etapa del estudio durará aproximadamente:

10-15 minutos -Encuesta de la familia (**todos los miembros de la familia de ocho años o más)**

60-90 minutos – Entrevista de la familia **(Niños menos de 14 años y más de 16**)

25-50 minutos - Foto-elicitación (PEI) **(padres y adolescentes de 14-16 años de edad)**

60- 90 minutos - Entrevista con **los padres**

60-90 minutos - Entrevista individual con **adolescentes de 14-16 años de edad**

Y la participación de cada individuo tendrá una duración aproximada:

90-120 minutos para miembros de la familia que no participan en entrevista individual

3-4hr en el transcurso de dos semanas para adolescentes 14-16 años de edad que participan

3-4hr en el transcurso de dos semanas para los padres que participan

Los procedimientos de estudio incluyen:

- **Todos los miembros de la familia de ocho años o más** se les pedirá que llene una encuesta que recoge información demográfica básica. También se les pedirá a los participantes que marquen donde hay en su casa utilizan diferentes tecnologías, como los teléfonos móviles, ordenadores portátiles, computadoras, Facebook, etc., y los niños también indicarán en donde en su casa hacen ciertas actividades como, tareas, las búsquedas de Google, mensajes de texto, etc.
    - Los niños que viven en el hogar de edades 8-13 se les permite participar en la entrevista de la encuesta y la familia con consentimiento de los padres, pero no serán entrevistados individualmente.
- **Toda la familia** será entrevistados juntos sobre como utilizan tecnologías como, el teléfono móvil, la computadora portátil, computadoras, Facebook, etc.
    - Los niños menores de ocho años también se les permitirá participar en la entrevista de la familia con el consentimiento de los padres, pero no se les pedirá que llene una encuesta o no serán entrevistados individualmente

- **A los padres** se le pide que toman fotos y / o vídeos cortos que ilustran los mensajes de la investigación y que los mande al investigador por correo electrónico o texto en el transcurso de una semana.
- **A adolescentes de 14-16 de edad también** se les pide que toman fotos y / o vídeos cortos que ilustran los mensajes de la investigación y que los mande al investigador por correo electrónico o texto en el transcurso de una semana.
- **Los padres** serán entrevistados juntos. Las fotos y / o vídeos cortos que envían por correo electrónico o texto durante el tiempo que transcurre entre la entrevista familiar y la entrevista individual de los padres serán utilizados para dirigir la entrevista. Sus fotografías y respuestas de la entrevista no serán compartidos con su hijo.
- **Los adolescentes 14-16 años de edad** serán entrevistados. Las fotos y / o vídeos cortos que envían por correo electrónico durante el tiempo que transcurre entre la entrevista familiar y la entrevista individual serán utilizados para dirigir la entrevista. Las fotos y las respuestas a la entrevista individual no serán compartidos con sus padres a menos que su hijo comparte algo que nos preocupe por su seguridad o la de otra persona.

Esta investigación es confidencial. Confidencial significa que los registros de la investigación incluirán alguna información acerca de usted / su hijo y se almacena una relación entre la identidad suya / de su niño en esta información. Parte de la información recopilada sobre usted / su hijo incluye información sobre la edad, género,

etnia, raza, estado civil, nivel de educación, el empleo, los dispositivos, como teléfonos móviles, ordenadores portátiles, ordenadores, Facebook y otras redes sociales.

Tenga en cuenta que vamos a mantener esta información confidencial. Siendo confidencial significa limitar el acceso del individuo y mantener los datos de investigación en un lugar seguro. Todas las grabaciones de entrevistas y transcripciones, imágenes digitales, y vídeos cortos serán almacenadas bajo los seudónimos y se mantendrán en una computadora por contraseña que se mantiene en la oficina bajo llave en la casa del investigador. Los contactos de los participantes y las imágenes y vídeos cortos que se envían por mensaje de texto al investigador serán almacenados por los seudónimos en el teléfono del investigador y el teléfono será protegido con contraseña y huella digital. Las copias impresas de las transcripciones de las entrevistas y imágenes también serán almacenadas bajo los seudónimos y serán almacenadas en un armario cerrado con llave en la oficina bajo llave en la casa del investigador. Los formularios de consentimiento y asentimiento se almacenarán en otro armario cerrado con llave. La lista que enlace los nombres de los participantes con los seudónimos que se utilizarán en la investigación se mantendrá en un armario cerrado con llave. Los formularios de consentimiento y asentimiento serán ubicados en un armario cerrado en la oficina de Rutgers del tutor del investigador.

El equipo de investigación y de la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad de Rutgers son las únicas que se permitirá ver los datos, excepto si lo requiere la ley. No vamos a compartir fotos o videos de su hijo de 14-16 años de edad o respuestas de la entrevista con usted, excepto en cierto caso raro en que aparece que su hijo o alguna otra persona están en peligro. En algunas situaciones, puede ser necesario para el investigador romper la confidencialidad. Si se sospecha que cualquier foto o vídeo representa la intimidación, tendremos que discutirlo con usted, y si alguien parece estar en peligro, a las autoridades apropiadas también. Si su hijo amenaza con hacer daño a sí mismo o a otra persona o informe de cualquier incidente de abuso de niños o personas mayores (o si se sospecha fuertemente), el investigador tiene la obligación de notificar a las autoridades correspondientes. Su hijo (o hijos) nunca debe tomar una foto/video que demuestra alguien desnudo. Fotos/videos que demuestran individuales menores de edad desnudos, tendrán que ser reportados a las autoridades correspondientes. Además, su hijo (o hijos) no debe decir nos cualquier información acerca de los crímenes pasados y futuros que se desconocen y / o delitos de que han sido condenadas y / o de que no han sido acusados , como tal información sobre estos crímenes pasados o futuros pueden tener que ser reportado a las autoridades correspondientes.

Si se publica un informe de este estudio, o los resultados se presentan en una conferencia profesional, se presentará los resultados del grupo. Si algo relacionado con su hijo (o hijos) se discute, se utilizará un seudónimo. Todos los datos del estudio se mantendrán durante 10 años. Después de 10 años todos los datos de la investigación serán eliminados y destruidos.

Se anticipa que participación en esta investigación habrá un riesgo mínimo. Existe un cierto riesgo de que su familia va a descubrir diferencias de opinión en la entrevista de la familia que puedan causar algún conflicto. Vamos evitar cualquier tema que parece polémico o causa malestar para minimizar este riesgo. Si un sujeto se convierte en molesto emocional, durante la entrevista de su familia o de la entrevista individual con el investigador puede pasar a una pregunta diferente, o si lo prefiere, parar la entrevista y recolección de datos. La siguiente es una lista de los servicios de asesoramiento que pueden ser contactados si un sujeto siente que es necesario.

KidsPeace / Orchard Behavioral Health
801 E Green St
Allentown, PA 18109
610-799-8910

or

450 W Chew St
Allentown, PA 18102
610-776-5465

Pinebrook Family Answers
402 North Fulton St.
Allentown, PA 18102

610-432-3919

Bethlehem Counseling Associates

2045 Westgate Drive, Suite 304, Gateway Professional Building

Bethlehem, PA 18017

(610) 865-8177

Olivewood Counseling

510 Delaware Ave

Fountain Hill, PA 18015

(610) 417-0463

Para su participación su familia recibirá una comida de pizza para comer durante la entrevista familiar. Los padres participantes también recibirán una tarjeta de regalo de $20 después de que se han enviado las imágenes y / o vídeos cortos que han sido solicitados al investigador y una tarjeta de regalo de $20 después de la finalización de la entrevista individual. Los adolescentes de 14-16 años de edad también recibirán una tarjeta de regalo de $15 después de que se han enviado las imágenes y / o vídeos cortos que han sido solicitados al investigador y una tarjeta de regalo $15 tarjeta de regalo después de su entrevista individual.

No hay beneficios directos para la participación en este estudio más allá de la pizza y compensación monetaria, pero usted / o su hijo (o hijos) puede obtener una mejor

comprensión de las prácticas tecnológicas de su familia y los valores que subyacen a estas prácticas. No hay ningún costo para usted o para su familia para la participación en este estudio.

la participación en este estudio es voluntaria. Usted puede elegir que su hijo (o hijos) no participe, y usted puede retirar su hijo o hijos de participar en cualquier momento durante las actividades del estudio sin ningún tipo de penalización a su hijo. Además, usted o su hijo (o hijos) puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta con la que usted / su hijo no se siente cómodo. Y si, por cualquier razón, en cualquier momento, su hijo desea dejar una entrevista, o retirarse del estudio, él / ella puede hacerlo sin tener que dar una explicación.

Si usted / su hijo (o hijos) tiene alguna pregunta sobre los procedimientos del estudio, usted / su hijo (o hijos) puede contactar a mí mismo en:

Stefani.gomez@gmail.com
484-866-6309
4 Huntington St.
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

O mi tutor Marie Radford en

mradford@rutgers.edu
848-932-8797
Office: Dewitt, Room 206
4 Huntington St.

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Si usted / su hijo (o hijos) tiene alguna pregunta sobre sus derechos como sujeto de investigación, puede comunicarse con la Junta de Revisión Institucional ( un comité que revisa los estudios de investigación con el fin de proteger a los que participan ). Por favor, póngase en contacto con un Administrador IRB de la Universidad de Rutgers , Artes y Ciencias de la IRB :

Institutional Review Board

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey

Liberty Plaza / Suite 3200

335 George Street, 3rd Floor

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Phone: 732-235-9806

Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

Su hijo también se va preguntar si desea participar en este estudio. Se le dará una copia de este formulario de consentimiento para su archivo.

Por favor, indique abajo el nombre y la edad de cada niño que está dando su consentimiento para participar en el estudio. Luego firme su nombre.

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del padre / tutor legal (Imprimir ) _____

Firma del padre _____ Fecha _____

Investigador Principal Firma _____Fecha _____

**Adición de audio a la Forma del consentimiento:**

Usted ya ha aceptado que su hijo (o hijos) adolescente participe en un estudio de investigación titulado: EL USO DE LA TECHNLOGIA POR LOS ADOLESCENTES LATINOS

PARA CONSTRUIR LA INTIMIDAD EN EL CONTEXTO DE LA FAMILIA realizada por Stefani Gómez. Estamos pidiendo su permiso para permitirnos grabar cinta de audio de su hijo y que su adolecente de 14-16 años de edad tome fotos y vídeos de corta duración y los envía al investigador como parte de esta investigación. Usted no tiene permitir que su hijo se grabe o envía fotos o vídeos al investigador para participar en el estudio

Las grabaciones, fotografías, vídeos serán utilizadas por el equipo de investigación para análisis. Las grabaciones, fotografías, vídeos de audio no incluirán el nombre de su hijo (o hijos) y serán nombrados con un seudónimo. Si su hijo (o hijos) dice algo que él /ella cree que en un momento posterior puede ser hiriente y /o dañar su reputación, él/ella puede pedir al entrevistador que la grabación sea borrada, que se grabe encima de dicha información, o que cierto texto sea retirado de las transcripciones. Además, usted o su hijo (o hijos) puede pedir que el investigador destruye cualquier foto o vídeo en cualquier momento.

Su hijo será instruido para concentrarse en tomar fotos y videos cortos de espacios físicos y virtuales y para evitar tomar fotos en que cualquiera individual se puede identificar. Fotos o videos en los que su hijo puede ser identificado serán eliminados inmediatamente cuando se reciben. Su hijo (o hijos) nunca debe tomar una foto/video que demuestra alguien desnudo.  Fotos/videos que demuestran individuales menores de edad desnudos, tendrán que ser reportados a las autoridades correspondientes.

Las grabaciones y transcripciones de audio de las entrevistas y las fotografías y videos que se toman por el participante serán almacenados en un equipo protegido con contraseña en un armario cerrado con llave en la casa del investigador. Todos los sujetos serán referidos por seudónimos en las transcripciones, análisis, y en la reseña de la investigación. Después de diez años todas las grabaciones de las entrevistas, fotos, y videos se eliminarán y serán triturados todas las transcripciones.

Su firma en este formulario otorga el investigador nombrado arriba permiso para grabar a su hijo (o hijos) como se describe anteriormente y recibir fotos y vídeos de su hijo durante la participación en el estudio anteriormente mencionado. El investigador no va a usar las grabaciones o las fotos y videos que su hijo (o hijos) toma por cualquier otra razón que los indicados en el formulario de consentimiento sin su permiso por escrito.

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del niño (Imprimir) _____

Edad del niño _____

Nombre del padre / tutor legal (Imprimir) _____

Firma del padre _____ Fecha _____

Investigador Principal Firma _____Fecha _____

**ASSENT FOR MINORS' PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES**

This assent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the researcher or your parent to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand before signing this document.

1. **Ms. Gomez is inviting you to take part in his/her research study. Why is this study being done?** We want to understand how teenagers use their cell phones, laptops, computers, Facebook, and other devices.

We want to find out how the ideas families have about these technologies influence the ways teenagers use them.

**It's completely up to you!** Both you and your parents have to agree to allow you to take part in this study. If you choose to not take part in this study, we will honor that choice. No one will get angry or upset with you if you don't want to do this. If you agree to take part in it and then you change your mind later, that's OK too. It's always your choice!

2. **What will happen**:

- **(This activity is only for kids that are 8 years old and older)** First, you will fill out a survey that asks you some questions like how old you are, if you share a bedroom, and in what parts of your house you use different devices like TV, computer, laptop, cell phones and what parts of your house you do homework, search on google, go on Facebook, etc. This part should take about 10-15 minutes. (Only those over seven will fill out this survey)

- **(All kids can participate)** Then you will hangout with your family and Ms. Gomez in your home and talk about all the ways your family uses the TV, computer, laptop, cell phones, and other devices. We'll also talk about what rules your parents have for you. This conversation should take about 60-90 minutes (all family members will participate)
- **(This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)** During the meeting with your family, Ms. Gomez will set up an appointment to talk with you again, at a convenient time, sometime in the following two weeks. During this individual interview she will ask you about the ways you use different technologies, such as your cell phone, computer, laptop, and social media, such as Facebook and Snapchat during your everyday life. Before your interview you should think about what we talked about with your family and send Ms. Gomez photos or short videos that you think show the following five situations. This activity should take about an hour over the course of two weeks. (This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)

(1) Your favorite spaces to use technology

(2) Your least favorite spaces to use technology

(3) What you most like to do online or with your device

(4) How you try to create some privacy for yourself

(5) The ways that technology use is different in your family than in other families

- **(This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)** While you are taking these photos or short videos please try not to get other people in your pictures or videos, especially kids. If you think it's very important to what you want to show in your pic or video to have people in it, ask the people to face away from the camera. This part of the project should take about 30-60 minutes over the course of a week. (This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)
- **(This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)** During the appointment with Ms. Gomez to talk alone you'll talk about your photos and why you took them. Then she will ask you to fill in a map that shows where in your house different technology devices (ie. TV, laptop, desktop computer, mobile phone) are located and used. After that she will also ask you more questions about the map and how you use your devices, such as, cell phones, laptops, computers, etc. throughout the day. This meeting should be just like a conversation you would have with your friends or family and there are no right or wrong answers. The conversations should last about 60-90 minutes. (This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)
- **(Everyone)** You can skip any question you want to or stop either interview at any time. You can also ask Ms. Gomes to delete any photos or videos you change your mind about.

3. **What does it cost and how much does it pay?**

You don't pay anything to take part in this study. We will provide pizza for you and your family to eat during the family conversation. We will pay **14-16-year-old teens** a 15-dollar gift card to make up for the time it takes them to take the pictures and videos and we will give them another 15-dollar gift card to make up for the time it takes you to talk alone with Ms. Gomez in your individual interview. If you choose to dropout before the end of the project, you will receive the compensation for the part of the project in which you took part.

Family Interview – Pizza **(Everyone)**

Photos – $15 gift card **(This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)**

Individual interview – $15 gift card **(This activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens)**

4. **There are very few risks in taking part in this research, but the following things could happen**:

**Probably:** Nothing bad would happen.

**Maybe:** Your answers would be seen by somebody not involved in this study. We will do our absolute best to keep all of your contributions private. Your answers will be kept locked up and we will call you by a pseudonym (a different name) within the research. The people who work for us are very well trained and understand the importance of confidentiality. We will not share your photos or anything you say during your interview with your parents, except in certain rare cases. For instance, if the researchers learn

that you or someone else are in serious danger they would have to tell an appropriate family member, such as your mother, father, or caretaker or the appropriate officials to protect you and other people.

**Very unusual:** You could become upset talking about your family's technology routines or the reasons behind them. If this should occur, remember that you don't have to answer any questions you don't want to and either you or a member of the research team may choose to stop the project or the interviews at any time. While it is not likely, if you become so upset that you feel it is necessary to speak with someone, the numbers and addresses to a few counselors in the area have been provided below.

KidsPeace / Orchard Behavioral Health
801 E Green St
Allentown, PA 18109
610-799-8910
or

450 W Chew St
Allentown, PA 18102
610-776-5465

Pinebrook Family Answers
402 North Fulton St.
Allentown, PA 18102
610-432-3919

Bethlehem Counseling Associates

2045 Westgate Drive, Suite 304, Gateway Professional Building

Bethlehem, PA 18017

(610) 865-8177

Olivewood Counseling

510 Delaware Ave

Fountain Hill, PA 18015

(610) 417-0463

5. **Are there any benefits that you or others will get out of being in this study?**

All research must have some potential benefit either directly to those that take part in it or potentially to others through the knowledge gained. The only direct benefit to you may be the compensation that you receive for your participation and the enjoyment of listening to the stories and answering the questions, but you also might learn a lot about how you and your family use technology.

6. **CONFIDENTIALITY: We will do everything we can to protect the confidentiality of your records.** This research is confidential. The research records will include some information about you and this information will be stored in such a manner that some linkage between your identity and your responses exists. We will keep this information confidential by limiting other people's access to the research and keeping it in a secure

location. All digital Images, short videos, interview recordings, and transcripts that are collected will be stored under a different name and be kept on a password protected computer located in the researcher's locked home office. Your contact information and the images and short videos that you send to the researcher will be stored under a different name in the researcher's phone and the phone will be both password and fingerprint protected. Hard copies of the images and interviews will also be stored under different names and be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's locked home office. Consent and assent forms will be stored in separate locked cabinet. The linking list that links your name with the name we are calling you in the research will be kept in a different locked cabinet than the consent and assent forms located in the researcher's advisor's office at Rutgers.

7. The research team and the Institutional review board at Rutgers are the only ones that will have access to what you tell and send the researcher. However, in some situations we might have to tell someone. If any photo or video is suspected to depict bullying, we will need to discuss it with your parents and if someone seems to be in danger, the appropriate authorities, as well. If you threaten to harm yourself or another person or report any incidents of child or elder abuse (or if it is strongly suspected), then the investigator is required to notify the appropriate authorities. Also, never send any nude photos. Nude photos of minors (those under the age of 18) will need to be reported to the appropriate authorities. You should also not send any photos/videos, or tell us any information, about current, past or future crimes that are either unknown and/or crimes

that you have been convicted of and/or not been charged with or crimes that you may currently be participating in, as such information about these crimes may have to be reported to the appropriate authorities.

8. The research team and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews research studies in order to protect research participants) at Rutgers University are the only that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, generally only group results will be stated and if we do talk about you we will use a different name. All study data will be kept for 10 years.

**Do you have any questions?** If you have any questions or worries regarding this study, or if any problems come up, you may call the principal investigator Ms. Gomez at:

Stefani.gomez@gmail.com

484-866-6309

4 Huntington St.

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Or my advisor Marie Radford at

mradford@rutgers.edu

848-932-8797

Office: Dewitt, Room 206

4 Huntington St.

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

9) If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews research studies in order to protect those who participate). Please contact an IRB Administrator at the Rutgers University, Arts and Sciences IRB:

Institutional Review Board

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey

Liberty Plaza / Suite 3200

335 George Street, 3rd Floor

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Phone: 732-235-9806

Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

Your parent or guardian will also be asked if they wish for you to participate in this study. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Please sign below if you assent (that means you agree) to participate in this study.

Name of Minor Subject (Print ) _____

Age of Minor Subject_____

Minor Subject's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal Investigator Signature _____ Date _____

**Audio/Visual Addendum to Consent Form**

You have already agreed to participate in a research study entitled IN PLAIN VIEW: LATINO/A TEENS' USE OF ICTS TO CONSTRUCT PRIVACY IN THE FAMILY CONTEXT conducted by Stefani Gomez. We are asking for your permission to allow us to audiotape you as part of that research study and for you to take photos and short videos and send them to the researcher (The photo and video activity is only for 14-16-year-old teens). You do not have to agree to be recorded or to send photos or short videos to the researcher in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The photographs, videos, and recording(s) will be used for analysis by the research team.

The audio-recording(s), photos, and short videos will not include your name and will be labeled with a pseudonym. If you say anything that you believe at a later point may be hurtful and/or damage your reputation, then you can ask the interviewer to delete the recording and record over such information OR that certain text be removed from the transcripts. Additionally, you can ask the researcher to destroy any photo or video that you send her at any time.

You will be instructed to concentrate on taking photos and short videos of virtual and physical spaces and to avoid taking photos in which anyone can be identified. Photos in which you can be identified will be wither deleted or software will be used to blur your

face. Never send nude photos. Nude photos of a minor will need to be reported to the appropriate authorities.

The audio recordings of the interviews and transcripts and the photographs and videos that you take will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home and on a password protected computer and all subjects will be referred to by pseudonyms in the transcripts, analysis, and in the write up of the research. After ten years, all interview recordings, photos, and videos will be deleted and all the transcripts will be shredded.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above and for the researcher to receive photos and videos from you during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) or photographs and videos for any other reason than those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

Please sign below if you assent to allow the investigator to record you for this study.

Name of Minor Subject (Print ) _____

Age of Minor Subject_____

Minor Subject's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal Investigator Signature _____ Date _____

**Bibliography**

Agosto, D. E., & Hughes-Hassell, S. (2005). People, places, and questions: An investigation of the everyday life information-seeking behaviors of urban young adults. *Library & information science research*, 27(2), 141-163.

Agosto, D. E., & Hughes-Hassell, S. (2006a). Toward a model of the everyday life information needs of urban teenagers, part 1: Theoretical model. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57*(10), 1394-1403.

Agosto, D., & Hughes-Hassell, S. (2006b). Toward a model of everyday life information needs of urban teenagers, part 2: Empirical model. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57*(11), 1418-1426.

Agosto, D., Abbas, J., & Naughton, R. (2012). Relationships and social rules: Teens' social network and other ICT selection practices. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 63*(6), 1108-1124.

Agosto, D. & Abbas, J. (2015). "Don't be dumb—that's a rule I try to live by": A closer look at older teens' online privacy and safety attitudes. *New Media & Society,* Advance online Publication. doi:10.1177/1461444815606121

Alper, M., Katz, K. S., & Clark, L. S., (2016). Researching children, intersectionality, and diversity in the digital age. *Journal of Children and Media, 10*(1), 107-114.

Altman, I. (1975). *The environment and social behavior: Privacy, personal space, territory, and crowding.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Altman, I., & Chemers, M. M. (1980). *Culture and environment*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ames, M. G., Go, J., Kaye, J. J., & Spasojevic, M. (2011, March). Understanding technology choices and values through social class. In Proceedings of the ACM 2011 conference on Computer supported cooperative work (pp. 55-64). ACM.

Ammari, T., Kumar, P., Lampe, C., & Schoenebeck, S. (2015, April). Managing children's online identities: How parents decide what to disclose about their children online. Paper presented at the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1895-1904). New York, NY. ACM.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York, NY: Verso Books.

Austin, E. W. (1993). Exploring the effects of active parental mediation of television content. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 37*(2), 147-158.

Austin, E. W., Bolls, P., Fujioka, Y., & Engelbertson, J. (1999). How and why parents take on the tube. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 43*(2), 175-192.

Austin, E. W., Knaus, C., & Meneguelli, A. (1997). Who talks to their kids about tv: A clarification of demographic correlates of PM patterns. *Communication Research Reports, 14*(4), 418-430.

Bacon, K. (2016). Children's Use and Control of Bedroom Space. *Families, Intergenerationality, and Peer Group Relations*, 1-21.

Beatty S.E. & Talpade. S. (1994) Adolescent influence in family decision-making. *Journal of Consumer Research 21*, 332–341.

Borzekowski, D. L., & Robinson, T. N. (2007). Conversation, control, and couch-time: The assessment and stability of PM styles and children's TV and video viewing. *Journal of Children and Media, 1*(2), 162-176.

Banerjee, T., & Lynch, K. (1977). *Growing up in cities: studies of the spatial environment of adolescence in Cracow, Melbourne, Mexico City, Salta, Toluca, and Warszawa*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press; Paris: UNESCO.

Baumrind, D. (1993). The average expectable environment is not good enough: A response to Scarr. *Child Development*, 64(5), 1299-1317.

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.

Baumrind, D. (1989). The permanence of change and the impermanence of stability. *Human Development, 32*(3-4), 187-195.

Beatty, S. E., & Talpade, S. (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension. Journal of Consumer Research, 21(2), 332-341.

Bilal, D., Erdelez, S., Beheshti, J., & Todd, R. J. (2012). *Learning to discover: Youth information literacy in the "i" digital age.* Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 49(1), 1-2.

Bosman, J., Bayraktar, F., & d'Haenens, L. (2015). Children's Digital Media Practices within the European Family Home: Does Perceived Discrimination Matter? *Journal of Children and Media, 9*(1), 77-94.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bovill, M., & Livingstone, S. (2001). Bedroom culture and the privatization of media use [online]. London: LSE Research Online. Retrived from

boyd, d. (2006). Friends, friendsters, and Myspace top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. *First Monday, 11*(12). Retrieved from http://firstmonday.org/article/view/1418/1336

boyd, d. (2007). Why youth (heart) social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, identity, and digital media* (pp. 119-142). Cambridge, MA: MIT press Cambridge, MA.

boyd. (2010). Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.) *Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites* (pp. 39-58) New York: Routledge.

boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

boyd, d & Marwick, A. (2011, September). Social privacy in networked publics: Teens' attitudes, practices and strategies. Paper presented at A Decade in Internet Time: Symposium on the Dynamics of the Internet and Society, Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=1925128

Brown, J. D., Childers, K. W., Bauman, K. E., & Koch, G. G. (1990). The influence of new media and family structure on young adolescents' television and radio use. *Communication Research, 17*(1), 65-82.

Brown, A., Lopez, G., & Lopez, M. H. (2016). Digital divide narrows for Latinos as more Spanish speakers and immigrants go online. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Brush, A. B., & Inkpen, K. M. (2007). Yours, mine and ours? sharing and use of technology in domestic environments. In J. Krumm, G. D. Abowd, A. Seneviratne & T. Strang (Eds.), *Unicomp 2007: Ubiquitous computing* (pp. 109-126) Springer.

Bryce, J. W., & Leichter, H. J. (1983). The family and television: Forms of mediation. *Journal of Family Issues, 4*(2), 309.

Burke, M., Adamic, L.A., & Marciniak, K. (2013). Families on Facebook. Paper presented at the Seventh International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, Palo Alto, CA.

Burnett, G. (2015). Information worlds and interpretive practices: Toward an integration of domains. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 3(3), 6-16.

Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semi-structured interviews problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *42*(30), 294-320.

Case, D. (2007). *Looking for information. A survey of research on information needs, seeking and behavior.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Chatman, E. A. (1991a). Channels to larger social world: Older women staying in contact with greater society. *Library & Information Science Research, 13*(3), 281-300.

Chatman, E. A. (1991b). Life in a Small World: Applicability of Gratification Theory to Information-Seeking Behavior. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 42*(6), 439-449.

Chatman, E. A. (1996). The impoverished life-world of outsiders. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 47*(3), 193-206.

Chatman, E. A. (1999). A theory of life in the round. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 50*(3), 207-217.

Chatman, E. A. (2000). Framing social life in theory and research. *The New Review of Information Behaviour Research, 1*(December), 3-17.

Child, J.T., & Westermann, D.A. (2013). Let's be Facebook friends: Exploring parental Facebook friend requests from a Communication Privacy Management (CPM) perspective. *Journal of Family Communication, 13*(1), 46–59.

Christofides, E., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2012). Hey Mom, what's on your Facebook? Comparing Facebook disclosure and privacy in adolescents and adults. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3, 48-54.

Clark, L. S. (2009). Digital media and the generation gap. *Information, Communication & Society, 12*(3), 388-407.

Clark, L. S. (2011). Parental mediation theory for the digital age. *Communication Theory, 21*(4), 323-343.

Clark, L. S. (2013). *The Parent App: Understanding families in the digital age*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Clark, L. S., & Sywyj, L. (2012). Mobile intimacies in the USA among refugee and recent immigrant teens and their parents. *Feminist Media Studies, 12*(4), 485-495.

Clarke, B. H. (2009). Early adolescents' use of social networking sites to maintain friendship and explore identity: Implications for policy. *Policy & Internet, 1*(1), 55-89

Connaway, L.S. & Radford, M. L. (2017). *Research Methods in Library and Information Science*, 6th Ed., Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Correa, T. (2014). Bottom-up technology transmission within families: Exploring how youths influence their parents' digital media use with dyadic data. *Journal of Communication*, 64(1), 103-124.

Correa, T., Straubhaar, J. D., Chen, W., & Spence, J. (2015). Brokering new technologies: The role of children in their parents' usage of the internet. *New Media & Society*, 17(4), 483-500.

Costigan, C.L. & Cox, M.J. (2001). Fathers' participation in family research: Is there a self-selection bias? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15f, 706-720.

Courtois, C., Mechant, P., Paulussen, S., & De Marez, L. (2012). The triple articulation of media technologies in teenage media consumption. *New Media & Society, 14*(3), 401-420.

Cranor, L., Durity, A.L., Marsh, A., & Ur, B. (2014). Parents' and teens' perspectives on privacy in a technology-filled world. Paper presented at the Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS), Menlo Park, CA.

Cresswell, T. (2004). *Place: an introduction*. Blackwell Publishing: Malden, MA.

Croghan, R., Griffin, C., Hunter, J., & Phoenix, A. (2008). Young people's constructions of self: Notes on the use and analysis of the Photo-Elicitation methods. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 11*(4), 345-356.

Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identity.* University of Chicago Press.

Darling, N., Cumsille, P., Caldwell, L. L., & Dowdy, B. (2006). Predictors of adolescents' disclosure to parents and perceived parental knowledge: Between-and within-person differences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(4), 659-670.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487–496.

Dervin, B. (1992). From the mind's eye of the user: The sense-making qualitative-quantitative methodology. *Qualitative Research in Information Management, 6*, 1-84.

Dervin, B. (1999). On studying information seeking methodologically: the implications of connecting metatheory to method. *Information Processing & Management*, 35(6), 727-750.

Dervin, B., & Nilan, M. (1986). Information needs and uses. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology,* 21, 3-33.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The ‘‘what” and ‘‘why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.

Dias, P., Brito, R., Ribbens, W., Daniela, L., Rubene, Z., Dreier, M., ... & Chaudron, S. (2016). The role of parents in the engagement of young children with digital technologies: Exploring tensions between rights of access and protection, from ‘Gatekeepers’ to ‘Scaffolders’. *Global Studies of Childhood*, *6*(4), 414-427.

DiClemente, R. J., Wingood, G. M., Crosby, R., Cobb, B. K., Harrington, K., & Davies, S. L. (2001). Parent-adolescent communication and sexual risk behaviors among African American adolescent females. *The Journal of Pediatrics, 139*(3), 407-412.

DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Celeste, C., & Shafer, S. (2004). From unequal access to differentiated use: A literature review and agenda for research on digital inequality. *Social inequality*, 355-400.

Domenech Rodriguez, M. M., Donovick, M. R., & Crowley, S. L. (2009). Parenting styles in a cultural context: Observations of “protective parenting” in first-generation Latinos. *Family Process*, *48*(2), 195-210.

Dourish, P. (2001). *Where the Action Is: The Foundations of Embodied Interaction.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT press.

Durand, J., Telles, E., & Flashman, J. (2006). The demographic foundations of the Latino population. *Hispanics and the future of America*, 66-99.

Elias, E. & Lemish, D. (2011). Between three worlds: Host, homeland, and global media in the lives of Russian immigrant families in Israel and Germany. *Journal of Family Issues, 32*(9), 1245-1274.

Eklund, L., & Helmersson Bergmark, K. (2013). Parental mediation of digital gaming and internet use. In FDG 2013-The 8th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games (pp. 63-70).

Engels, R. C., Finkenauer, C., & van Kooten, D. C. (2006). Lying behavior, family functioning and adjustment in early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(6), 949-958.

Erickson, L. B., Wisniewski, P., Xu, H., Carroll, J. M., Rosson, M. B., & Perkins, D. F. (2015). The boundaries between: Parental involvement in a teen's online world. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 67*(6), 1384-1403.

Facer K, Furlong J, Furlong R and Sutherland R (2003). *Screenplay: Children and Computing in the Home.* New York: Routledge.

Fidel, R. (2008). Are we there yet?: Mixed methods research in library and information science. Library & Information Science Research, 30(4), 265-272.

Fisher, K. E., Durrance, J. C., & Hinton, M. B. (2004). Information grounds and the use of need-based services by immigrants in Queens, New York: A context-based, outcome evaluation approach. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 55(8), 754-766.

Foss, E., Druin, A., Yip, J., Ford, W., Golub, E., & Hutchinson, H. (2013). Adolescent search roles. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 64*(1), 173-189.

Frijns, T., Keijsers, L., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2010). What parents don't know and how it may affect their children: Qualifying the disclosure–adjustment link. *Journal of Adolescence, 33*(2), 261-270.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic books.

Goffman, E. (1972). *On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction*. London, UK: Allan Lane.

Gomez, S., Booth, K., & Katz, V. (2011, May). Multiple configurations: Exploring Latina/o adolescents mediated lives. Paper presented at *Multiple Childhoods/Multidisciplinary Perspectives: Interrogating Normativity in Childhood Studies,* Camden, NJ.

Gonzales, A. (2016). The contemporary US digital divide: from initial access to technology maintenance. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(2), 234-248.

Grant, I. C. (2006). Online privacy: An issue for adolescents. *Paper presented at Child and Teen Consumption Conference,* Copenhagen,

Grinter, R. E., Palen, L., & Eldridge, M. (2006). Chatting with teenagers: Considering the place of chat technologies in teen life*. Paper presented at Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI), 13*(4), (pp. 423-447). New York, NY. ACM

Guilamo-Ramos, V., Dittus, P., Jaccard, J., Johansson, M., Bouris, A., & Acosta, N. (2007). Parenting practices among Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers. *Social Work*, 52(1), 17-30.

Haddon, L. (2003). Domestication and mobile telephony. *Domesticat*, 43–56.

Haddon, L. (2006). The contribution of domestication research to in-home computing and media consumption. *The Information Society, 22*(4), 195–203.

Haddon, L. (2011). Domestication analysis, objects of study, and the centrality of technologies in everyday Life. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 36*(2), 311-323.

Halgunseth, L. C., Ispa, J. M., & Rudy, D. (2006). Parental control in Latino families: An integrated review of the literature. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1282-1297.

Hammer, T.J., & Turner, P.H. (1990). *Parenting in contemporary society.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital na(t)ives? Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation". *Sociological inquiry*, 80(1), 92-113.

Hargittai, E., Connell, S., Klawitter, E. F., & Litt, E. (2014, March). Persisting Effects of Internet Skills on Online Participation. Paper presented at Research Conference on Communications, Information and Internet Policy Arlington, Virginia.

Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality: Differences in young adults' use of the Internet. *Communication Research, 35*(5), 602-621.

Havighurst, R. J. (1972). *Developmental tasks and education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Hawi, N. S., & Rupert, M. S. (2015). Impact of e-Discipline on children's screen time. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 18(6), 337-342.

Hawk, S., Keijsers, L., Hale, W., & Meeus, W. (2008). Mind your own business! Longitudinal relations between perceived privacy invasion and adolescent-parent conflict. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*(4), 511–520.

Hayes, L., Smart, D., Toumbourou, J. W., & Sanson, A. (2004). Parenting influences on adolescent alcohol use. *Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies*, 1-104.

Hazel, N. (1995). Elicitation techniques with young people. *Social Research Update, 12*(4)

Herring, S.C. (2008). Questioning the generational divide: Technological exoticism and adult construction of online youth identity. In D. Buckingham, ed., *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media* (pp. 71-94). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hogan, J. A. (2001). Development of behavior systems. In *Developmental psychobiology* (pp. 229-279). Springer US.

Hoover, S. M., Clark, L. S., & Alters, D. F. (2004). *Media, home, and family*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ishii, K. (2006). Implications of mobility: The uses of personal communication media in everyday life. *Journal of Communication, 56*(2), 346-365.

Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. G., . . .Tripp, L. (2008). *Living and learning with new media: Summary of findings from the digital youth project.* The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Ito, M. (2005). Mobile phones, Japanese youth, and the re-placement of social contact. *Mobile communications* (pp. 131-148) Springer.

Izrael, P. (2013). Religiousness, values, and PM of children's television viewing in Slovakia. *Journal of Children and Media, 7*(4), 507-524.

Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., & Franklin, R. E. (2010). Diversity, inclusion, and underrepresented populations in LIS research. *The Library Quarterly, 80*(2), 175-181.

Järvelin, K. (2011, January). IR research: systems, interaction, evaluation and theories. Paper presented in Special Interest Group on Information Retrieval (SIGIR) (pp. 17-31). New York, NY, ACM.

Jiow, H. J., Lim, S. S., & Lin, J. (2016). Level up! Refreshing PM theory for our digital media landscape. *Communication Theory*, 27(3), 309-328

Julien, H. E. (1999). Barriers to adolescents' information seeking for career decision making. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 50*(1), 38-48.

Julian, T.W., McKenny, P.C., & Mckelvey, M.W. (1994). Cultural variations in parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American parents. *Family Relations Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 43, 30–37.

Katz, V. S. (2010). How children of immigrants use media to connect their families to the community: The case of Latinos in south Los Angeles. *Journal of Children and Media, 4*(3), 298-315.

Katz, V. S. (2014). Children as brokers of their immigrant families' health-care connections. *Social Problems, 61*(2), 194-215.

Katz, V. S., & Gonzalez, C. (2016). Toward meaningful connectivity: using multilevel communication research to reframe digital inequality. Journal of Communication, 66(2), 236-249.

Keijsers, L. & Laird, R. D. (2010). Introduction to special issue. Careful conversations: Adolescents managing their parents' access to information. *Journal of Adolescence, 3*(2), 255-259.

Kelly, P. (2003) Growing up as risky business? Risks, surveillance and the institutionalized mistrust of youth. *Journal of Youth Studies, 6*(2), 165-180.

Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology, 36*(3), 366-380.

Kirwil, L. (2009). PM of children's internet use in different European countries. *Journal of Children and Media, 3*(4), 394-409.

Kutner, L. A., Olson, C. K., Warner, D. E., & Hertzog, S. M. (2008). Parents' and sons' perspectives on video game play: A qualitative study. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(1), 76-96.

Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2003). Change in parents' monitoring knowledge: Links with parenting, relationship quality, adolescent beliefs, and antisocial behavior. *Social Development, 12*(3), 401-419.

Lally, E. (2002). *At Home with Computers*, Oxford: Berg

Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Univ of California Press.

Latham, A. (2008). Research, performance, and doing human geography: some reflections on the diary-photograph, diary-interview method. In T. Oakes & P. L. Price (Eds.) *The cultural geography reader* (pp. 68-75). New York, NY: Routledge

Ledbetter, A. M., Heiss, S., Sibal, K., Lev, E., Battle-Fisher, M., & Shubert, N. (2010). Parental invasive and children's defensive behaviors at home and away at college: Mediated communication and privacy boundary management. *Communication Studies, 61*(2), 184-204.

Lee, S. (2013). Parental restrictive mediation of children's internet use: Effective for what and for whom? *New Media & Society, 15*(4), 466-481.

Lee, S. & Chae, Y. Balancing participation and risks in children's Internet use: The role of Internet literacy and PM. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15*(5), 257-262.

Lemish, D. (2008). The mediated playground: Media in early childhood. In K. Drotner, & S. Livingstone (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Children, Media and Culture* (pp. 152-167). Los Angeles, London: Sage.

Lenhart, A. (2005). *Protecting teens online.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project. March 17, 2005, Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2005/Protecting-Teens-Online.aspx on February 26, 2016.

Lenhart, A. (2012). *Young adults, mobile phones, and social media: Technology and the transition to adulthood.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project, May 7, 2013, Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/05/07/young-adults-mobile-phones-and-social-media-technology-and-the-transition-to-adulthood/ on February 26, 2016.

Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., & Zickuhr, K. (2010). *Social media & mobile internet use among teens and young adults.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project, February 2, 2010 Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media//Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Social_Media_and_Young_Adults_Report_Final_with_toplines.pdf on February 26, 2016.

Lenhart, Duggan, Perrin, Stepler, Rainie, & Parker, (2015). *Teen, Social Media, & Technology Overview.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.

Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/04/PI_TeensandTech_Update2015_0409151.pdf on December 2, 2015.

Liau, A. K., Khoo, A., & Ang, P. H. (2008). Parental awareness and monitoring of adolescent internet use. *Current Psychology, 27*(4), 217-233.

Lim, S. S. (2008). Technology domestication in the Asian homestead: Comparing the experiences of middle class families in China and South Korea. *East Asian Science, Technology and Society, 2*(2), 189-209.

Lincoln, S. (2014). "I've Stamped My Personality All Over It" The Meaning of Objects in Teenage Bedroom Space. Space and Culture, 17(3), 266-279.

Lindahl, K.M., & Malik, N.M. (1999). Marital conflict, family processes, and boys' externalizing behavior in Hispanic American and European American families. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 28, 12–24.

Ling, R. (2004). *The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phone's Impact on Society*. San Francisco, CA: Elsevier Publishing.

Ling, R., & Thrane, K. (2001). It actually separates us a little bit, but I think that is an advantage: The management of electronic media in Norwegian households. Paper presented at *Icust,* 1-17.

Ling, R., & Yttri, B. (2006). Control, emancipation and status. In R. Kraut, M. Brynin & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Computers, phones and the internet: Domesticating information technology* (pp. 219-234).

Lingel, J. (2011). Information tactics of immigrants in urban environments. *Information Research, 16*(4).

Livingstone, S. (2002). *Young people and new media*. London: Sage.

Livingstone, S. (2006). Children's privacy online: Experimenting with boundaries within and beyond the family. In R. Kraut, M. Brynin & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Computers, phones, and the internet: Domesticating information technology* (pp. 128-144). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Livingstone, S. (2007a) From family television to bedroom culture: Young people's media at home. In E. Devereux (Ed.), *Media Studies: Key issues and Debates* (302-321). London: Sage.

Livingstone, S. (2007b). Strategies of parental regulation in the media-rich home. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*(2), 920-941.

Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2008). PM of children's Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 52*(4), 581-599.

Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K., O'Neill, B., & Donoso, V. (2012). Towards a better Internet for children: Findings and recommendations from EU Kids Online to inform the CEO coalition. London, UK: The London School of Economics and Political Science.

Lloyd, A. (2010). Framing information literacy as information practice: site ontology and practice theory. *Journal of Documentation,* 66(2), 245-258.

Lloyd, A. (2012). Information literacy as a socially enacted practice: Sensitising themes for an emerging perspective of people-in-practice. *Journal of Documentation, 68*(6), 772-783.

Lombana-Bermudez, A. A. (2015). Networked and disconnected: Latino/Hispanic immigrant youths, digital media, and assimilation into the US. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Lopez, M. H., & Dockterman, D. (2011). US Hispanic country-of-origin counts for nation, top 30 metropolitan areas. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from http://blackradionetwork.com/images/userfiles/PEWhispanicupdate.pdf on September 25, 2017.

Louie, J. (2003). Media in the lives of immigrant youth. *New directions for youth development, 2003*(100), 111-130.

Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization within the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In P.H. Mussen & E.M. Hetherington (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology; Vol. 4. Socialization, personality and social development (4th ed, pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley

McDevitt, M., & Butler, M. (2011). Latino youth as information leaders: implications for family interaction and civic engagement in immigrant communities. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 7(2).

Madden, M., Cortesi, S., Gasser, U., Lenhart, A., & Duggan, M. (2012). *Parents, teens, and online privacy*. Washington, DC: PEW Internet and American Life Project, November 20, 2012, Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2012/11/20/parents-teens-and-online-privacy/ on February 26, 2016.

Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Cortesi, S., & Gasser, U. (2013). *Teens and mobile apps privacy.* Washington, DC: PEW Internet and American Life Project, August 22, 2013, Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/08/22/teens-and-mobile-apps-privacy/ on February 26, 2016.

Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Cortesi, S., Gasser, U., Duggan, M., & Smith, A. (2013). *Teens, social media, and privacy.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project, May 21, 2013, Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/05/21/teens-social-media-and-privacy/ on February 26, 2016.

Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Duggan, M., Cortesi, S., & Gasser, U. (2013). *Teens and Technology 2013,* Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project, March 13, 2013, Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/03/13/teens-and-technology-2013/ on February 26, 2016.

Marwick, A. E. (2008). To catch a predator? the MySpace moral panic. *First Monday, 13*(6), June 2, 2008, Retrieved from http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2152/1966 on February 26, 2016.

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d., m. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society, 13*(1), 114-133.

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d., m. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society, 16*(7), 1051-1067.

Marwick, A. Murgia-Diaz, D. & Palfrey, J. (2010). Youth, privacy and reputation (Literature review). Berkman Center Research Publication no. 2010-5. April 12, 2010, Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/stefa/Documents/Proposal/Marwick,%20Murgia-Diaz,%20&%20Palfrey_2010_Teens%20and%20Privacy-lit%20review.pdf on February 26, 2016.

Marzan, G. (2009). Still Looking for that Else where: Puerto Rican Poverty and Migration in the Northeast. *Centro Journal, 21*(1).

Mascheroni, G. (2014). Parenting the mobile Internet in Italian households: Parents' and children's discourses. *Journal of Children and Media, 8*(4), 440-456.

Mehra, B., & Braquet, D. (2007). Process of information seeking during "queer" youth coming-out experience. In M. K. Chelton , & C. Cool (Eds.), *Youth information*

*seeking behavior II: Context, theories, models, and issues* (pp. 93-131). Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press.

Meyers, E. M., Fisher, K. E., & Marcoux, E. (2009). Making sense of an information world: The Everyday-Life information behavior of preteens. *The Library Quarterly, 79*(3), 301-341.

Mitchell, M. C., & Egudo, M. (2003). A review of narrative methodology (No. DSTO-GD-0385). DEFENCE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ORGANIZATION EDINBURGH (AUSTRALIA) LAND OPERATIONS DIV.

Montemayor, R. (1983). Parents and adolescents in conflict: All families some of the time and some families most of the time. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 3*(1-2), 83-103.

Moore, R. C. (1986). The power of nature: Orientations of girls and boys toward biotic and abiotic play settings on a reconstructed schoolyard. *Children's Environments Quarterly, 3*(3), 52-69.

Morley, D. (1992). *Television, audiences and cultural studies*. London: Routledge

Morley, D., & Silverstone, R. (1990). Domestication communication: Technologies and meanings. *Media, Culture, and Society, 12*, 31-55.

Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 220-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods, 1*(2), 13-22.

Morrison, M. & Krugman, D. (2001). A look at mass and computer mediated technologies: Understanding the roles of television and computers in the home. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45(1), 135–161.

Moscardelli, D. M., & Liston-Heyes, C. (2004). Teens surfing the Net: How do they learn to protect their privacy?" *Journal of Business and Economics Research 2*(9), 43-56.

Nahl, D. (2004). Measuring the affective information environment of web searchers. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 41(1), 191-197.

Nathanson, A. I. (1999). Identifying and explaining the relationship between PM and children's aggression. *Communication Research, 26*(2), 124-143.

Nathanson, A. I. (2002). The unintended effects of PM of television on adolescents. *Media Psychology, 4*(3), 207-230.

Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2006). PM of children's videogame playing: A comparison of the reports by parents and children. *Learning, Media and Technology, 31*(2), 181-202.

Nissenbaum, H. (2004). Privacy as contextual integrity. *Washington Law Review, 79*(1), 101-158.

Notten, N., & Nikken, P. (2016). Boys and girls taking risks online: A gendered perspective on social context and adolescents' risky online behavior. *New Media & Society*, *18*(6), 966-988.

Nucci, L. (1997). Culture, universals, and the personal. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 1997(76), 5-22.

O'Connor, T. M., Hingle, M., Chuang, R. J., Gorely, T., Hinkley, T., Jago, R., ... & Thompson, D. A. (2013). Conceptual understanding of screen media parenting: report of a working group. *Childhood Obesity*, *9*(1), 110-118.

Oolo, E., & Siibak, A. (2013). Performing for one's imagined audience: Social steganography and other privacy strategies of estonian teens on networked publics. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 7*(1).

Oosting, W., IJsselsteijn, W. A., & de Kort, Y. A. W. (2008, November). Parental perceptions and mediation of children's digital game play at home: A qualitative study. *Paper presented at CSCW2008 Conference the workshop on Designing for families*, San Diego, CA.

Orne, M. T. (2009). Demand characteristics and the concept of quasi-controls. In R. Rosenthal and R. L. Rosnow (Eds.), *Artifacts in Behavioral Research* (pp. 110-137). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Padilla-Walker L.M.: "My mom makes me so angry!" Adolescent perceptions of mother–child interactions as determinants of adolescent emotions. *Social Development 17*, 306-325.

Padilla-Walker, L. M., Christensen, K. J., & Day, R. D. (2011). Proactive parenting practices during early adolescence: A cluster approach. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*(2), 203-214.

Padilla-Walker, L. M., Coyne, S. M., Fraser, A. M., Dyer, W. J., & Yorgason, J. B. (2012). Parents and adolescents growing up in the digital age: Latent growth curve analysis of proactive media monitoring. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 1153–1165.

Palen, L., & Dourish, P. (2003). Unpacking privacy for a networked world. *Paper presented at SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems,* Fort Lauderdale, Florida (pp. 129-136), NY, New York:ACM.

Palfrey, J., Sacco, D., boyd, d., & Debonis, L. (2008). *Enhancing child safety and online technologies: Research advisory board report for the internet safety technical task force,*. Cambridge, MA: Final report of the Internet safety technical task force at Harvard University.

Park, H.S., & Bauer, S. (2002). Parenting practices, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and academic achievement in adolescents. *School Psychology International*, 23, 386–305.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, K. E., & Rice, R. E. (2013). Digital divides from access to activities: Comparing mobile and personal computer Internet users. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(4), 721-744.

Petronio, S. (1994). Privacy binds in family interactions: The case of parental privacy invasion. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark Side of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 241-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Petronio, S. (2012). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure*. NY: Suny Press.

Pettigrew, K. E. (1999). Waiting for chiropody: Contextual results from an ethnographic study of the information behaviour among attendees at community clinics. *Information Processing & Management, 35*(6), 801-817.

Phinney, J. S., Kim-Jo, T., Osorio, S., & Vilhjalmsdottir, P. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-parent disagreements: Ethnic and developmental factors. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*(1), 8-39.

Plowman, L. (2015). Researching young children's everyday uses of technology in the family home. *Interacting with Computers*, *27*(1), 36-46.

Pred, A. (1984). Place as historically contingent process: Structuration and the time-geography of becoming places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 74(2), 279-297.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Rainie, L., & Fox, S. (2012). *Just-in-time information through mobile connections.* Washington, DC*: Pew Research Center's Internet American Life Project,* Retrieved from http://lbmacanada.com/files/200-PIP_Just_In_Time_Info.pdf on September 25, 2017

Read, P., Shah, C., S-O'Brien, L., & Woolcott, J. (2012). 'Story of one's life and a tree of friends' – understanding millennials' information behaviour in social networks. *Journal of Information Science, 38*(5), 489-497.

Rideout, V., Foehr, U., & Roberts, D. (2010). *Generation M2: Media in the lives of 8-to 18-year-olds.* A Kaiser Family Foundation study.

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11*(1), 25-41.

Sandelowski, M. (1991). Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Journal of nursing scholarship*, *23*(3), 161-166

Savolainen, R. (1995). Everyday life information seeking: Approaching information seeking in the context of "way of life". *Library & Information Science Research, 17*(3), 259-294.

Savolainen, R. (2007). Information behavior and information practice: Reviewing the "Umbrella concepts" of Information-Seeking studies. *Library Quarterly, 77*(2),

Seamon, D. (1980). Body-subject, time-space routines, and place-ballets. *The human experience of space and place*, 148-165.

Shin, W. & Huh, J. (2011). PM of teenagers' video game playing: Antecedents and consequences. *New Media & Society, 13*(6), 945-962.

Seiter E (2008) Practicing at home: Computers, pianos, and cultural capital. In: McPherson T (ed.) Digital Youth, Innovation, and the Unexpected. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 27–52.

Siibak, A., & Murumaa, M. (2011). Exploring the 'nothing to hide' paradox: Estonian teens' experiences and perceptions about privacy online. *Social Science Research*

*Network*, Retrieved on February 26, 2016 from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1928498

Silverman, D. (2006*). Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. (2nd ed). London: Sage.

Silverstone, R. (1991). From audiences to consumers: The household and the consumption of communication and information technologies. *European Journal of Communication, 6*(2), 135-154.

Silverstone, R. & Haddon, L. (1996). Television, Cable and AB Households: A Report for Telewest, University of Sussex.

Silverstone, E. Hirsch, E. & Morley, D. (1991). Listening to a Long Conversation: An Ethnographic Approach to the Study of Information and Communication Technologies in the Home. *Cultural Studies*, *5*(2), 204-27.

Silverstone, E. Hirsch, E. & Morley, D. (1992). Information and communication technologies and the moral economy of the household. In *Consuming Technologies: Media and Information in Domestic Spaces,* eds. R. Silverstone and E. Hirsch, E., pp.15-31, London: Routledge

Silverstone, R., Morley, D., Dahlberg, A., and Livingstone, S., (1989). Families, technologies and consumption: the household and information and communication technologies. CRICT discussion paper, Centre for Research into Innovation, Culture & Technology, Uxbridge, UK.

Smetana, J. G. (2008). It's 10 O'Clock: Do you know where your children are? Recent advances in understanding parental monitoring and adolescents' information management. *Child Development Perspectives, 2*(1), 19–25.

Smetana, J. G. (2017). Current research on parenting styles, dimensions, and beliefs. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 15, 19-25.

Smetana, J. G., & Asquith, P. (1994). Adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and personal autonomy. *Child Development, 65*(4), 1147-1162.

Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 255-284.

Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child development, 73*(2), 563-580

Smith, A. (2015). *Searching for work in the digital era.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/11/19/searching-for-work-in-the-digital-era/ on September 25, 2017.

Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review*, *30*(1), 74-99.

Sorbring, E., & Lundin, L. (2012). Mothers' and fathers' insights into teenagers' use of the internet. *New Media & Society, 14*(7), 1181–1197.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*(5), 1266-1281.

Subramaniam, M. M., & Jaeger, P. T. (2010). Modeling inclusive practice?: Attracting diverse faculty and future faculty to the information workforce. *Library Trends, 59*(1), 109-127.

Suchman, L. A. (1987). Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication. Cambridge university press.

Taylor, S., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Thompson, K. M. (2009). Remembering Elfreda Chatman: A champion of theory development in library and information science education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science,* 119-126.

Todd, R. J. (1999). Utilization of heroin information by adolescent girls in Australia: A cognitive analysis. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 50*(1), 10.

Travlou, P., Owens, P. E., Thompson, C. W., & Maxwell, L. (2008). Place mapping with teenagers: locating their territories and documenting their experience of the public realm. *Children's Geographies, 6*(3), 309-326.

Tripp, L. M. (2011). 'The computer is not for you to be looking around, it is for schoolwork': Challenges for digital inclusion as Latino immigrant families negotiate children's access to the internet. *New Media & Society*, *13*(4), 552-567.

Tripp, L. M., & Herr-Stephenson, R. (2009). Making access meaningful: Latino young people using digital media at home and at school. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*(4), 1190-1207.

Tuan, Y. F. (1991). Language and the making of place: A narrative-descriptive approach. *Annals of the Association of American geographers, 81*(4), 684-696.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). *Population estimates.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00

U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Newsroom.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2016/cb16-ff16.html

Valkenburg, P. M., Krcmar, M., Peeters, A. L., & Marseille, N. M. (1999). Developing a scale to assess three styles of television mediation:"Instructive mediation,""restrictive mediation," and "social coviewing". *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 43*(1), 52-66.

Veliz-Moran, E. (2016). Variations in Adolescent Disclosure Among Latinas. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies*, *8*(1), 39-54.

Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation.* London, Routledge

Vickery, J. R. (2015). 'I don't have anything to hide, but…': The challenges and negotiations of social and mobile media privacy for non-dominant youth. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(3), 281-294.

Wang, R., Bianchi, S. M., & Raley, S. B. (2005). Teenagers' internet use and family rules: A research note. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(5), 1249-1258.

Ward, K. (2005). Internet consumption in Ireland: Towards a 'connected' life. In *Media, Technology and Everyday Life in Europe*, Ed. R. Silverstone, pp. 107-123, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Warren, R. (2005). PM of children's television viewing in low income families. *Journal of Communication, 55*(4), 847-863.

Warren, R., Gerke, P., & Kelly, M. A. (2002). Is there enough time on the clock? parental involvement and mediation of Children's television viewing. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 46*(1), 87-111.

Weaver, S. E., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Hans, J. D., & Malia, S. E. (2001). Challenges family scholars may face in studying family diversity: A focus on Latino families, stepfamilies, and reproductive technology. *Journal of Family Issues, 22*(7), 922-939.

Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods.* London, Sage.

West, A., Lewis, J., & Currie, P. (2009). Students' Facebook 'friends': Public and private spheres. *Journal of Youth Studies, 12*(6), 615-627.

Wiegand, W. A. (1999). Tunnel vision and blind spots: What the past tells us about the present; Reflections on the twentieth-century history of American librarianship. The *Library Quarterly, 69*(1), 1-32.

Williamson, K. (1998). Discovered by chance: The role of incidental information acquisition in an ecological model of information use. *Library & Information Science Research, 20*(1), 23-40.

Woodfall, A. & Zezulkova, M. (2016). What 'children' experience and 'adults' may overlook: Phenomenological approaches to media practice, education and research. *Journal of Children and Media, 10*(1), 98-106.

Yardi, S., & Bruckman, A. (2011). Social and technical challenges in parenting teens' social media use. Paper presented at The *2011 Annual Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems,* pp. 3237-3246. Yardi, S., & Bruckman, A. (2012). Income, race, and class: Exploring socioeconomic differences in family technology use. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems,* pp. 3041-3050.

Youn, S. (2009). Determinants of online privacy concern and its influence on privacy protection behaviors among young adolescents. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 43*(3), 389-418.

Yu, L. (2012). Towards a reconceptualization of the 'information worlds of individuals'. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *44*(1), 3-18.

Yu, L., & Zhou, W. (2016). Information inequality in contemporary Chinese urban society: The results of a cluster analysis. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(9), 2246-2262.

Zaman, B., Nouwen, M., Vanattenhoven, J., De Ferrerre, E., & Looy, J. V. (2016). A qualitative inquiry into the contextualized PM practices of young children's digital media use at home. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 60*(1), 1-22.

Zambrana, R. E. (2011). *Latinos in American society: Families and communities in transition.* Cornell University Press.