

# THE REACTIONS OF THE CHILDREN TOWARDS RESTRICTIONS ON THEIR USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

(ÇOCUKLARIN BİLİŞİM TEKNOLOJİLERİ KULLANIMLARINA YÖNELİK  
KISITLAMALARA KARŞI TEPKİLERİ)

**Selim Soner SÜTÇÜ** <sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The rapid development of communication technologies has had great impact on interpersonal relations together with family and social structure. These technologies, which have made the individual activities of parents more important, have started to play an important role in the relations of parents and their children. Accordingly, this research aims to determine the reactions of students studying at secondary schools towards the restrictions imposed by their parents on communication technologies and their applications. In this study, which was designed as a survey model, procedural diversity was enabled by employing different data collection techniques and content analysis types; categorical data analysis and frequency analysis. In the analysis of the data which were collected by “open-ended question form” and “semi-structured interview”, of the content analysis types, categorical analysis and frequency analysis were utilized. The results of the study show that mothers in particular, impose restrictions on their children more and the role of the parents could vary depending on the gender of the restricted child. Students obey the rules set by their parents to a large extent and its rate is higher in girls than boys. At this point, students’ reactions to their parents are also themed according to their level obedience. While nearly half of the students say that they obey these restrictions willingly, the others say they obey because they have to. However, most of the students who do not obey the restrictions, react against the restrictions and keep on doing secretly.

**Keywords:** Technology-human interaction, Technology and restriction, Parental responsibility, Parental control, Reaction

## ÖZET

Gelişen bilişim teknolojileri, bireyler arası ilişkilerde ve beraberinde, aile ve toplumsal yapıda etkisini hızla göstermeye devam etmektedir. Ebeveynlerin bugüne kadar ki bireysel faaliyetlerinin daha da önemli hale gelmesine neden olan bu teknolojiler, ebeveyn ve çocukları arasındaki ilişkilerde önemli rol oynamaya başlamıştır. Bu doğrultuda gerçekleştirilen çalışmada, ortaöğretim kurumlarında öğrenim gören çocukların, bilişim teknolojileri ve uygulamalarına yönelik ebeveynleri tarafından getirilen kısıtlamalara karşı tepkilerinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda tarama modelinde tasarlanan çalışmada birden fazla veri toplama tekniği kullanılarak yöntemsel çeşitleme yapılmıştır. Verilerin “açık uçlu soru formu” ve “yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu” ile toplandığı çalışmanın analiz aşamasında, içerik analizi türlerinden kategorisel analiz ve frekans analizi tekniklerinden yararlanılmıştır. Gerçekleştirilen çalışma sonucunda; özellikle annelerin çocuklarına daha çok kısıtlama getirdikleri ve kısıtlamalar konusunda, kısıtlamanın getirildiği çocuğun cinsiyetine göre ebeveyn rollerinin de değişebildiği belirlenmiştir. Yapılan analizler sonucunda öğrencilerin büyük bir oranda getirilen kısıtlamalara uydukları ve kız öğrencilerin getirilen kısıtlamalara uyma oranlarının erkek öğrencilere göre daha yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu noktada öğrencilerin kısıtlamalara uyma durumları çerçevesinde, ebeveynlere karşı tepkileri de temalaştırılmıştır. Ebeveynleri tarafından getirilen kısıtlamalara uyduğunu belirten öğrencilerin neredeyse yarısı bu kısıtlamalara kendi istekleriyle uyduklarını belirtirken; diğer yarısı ise bu kısıtlamalara uymak zorunda kaldıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Diğer taraftan, yapılan kısıtlamaya uymadığını ifade eden öğrencilerin büyük bir çoğunluğunun getirilen kısıtlamalar karşısında tepki gösterdikleri ve gizlice yapmaya devam ettikleri belirlenmiştir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Teknoloji-insan etkileşimi, Teknoloji ve kısıtlama, Ebeveyn sorumluluğu, Ebeveyn kontrolü, Tepki

<sup>1</sup> Öğr. Gör. Dr., Başkent University, School of Foreign Languages, ssoner@baskent.edu.tr

## INTRODUCTION

Widespread use and quick access to communication technologies have started to shape the individuals' interpersonal and environmental relations either directly or indirectly. These effects are mostly prevalent in school and home environment in which the young individuals spend most of their time. Individuals could show different reactions to these technologies depending on their point of view since they are perceived differently (Güldüren, Çetinkaya, & Keser, 2016). Though there are many reasons referred as social, cultural, political, intergenerational differences and digital divide are particularly emphasized. However, young people who are defined as "digital native" (Prensky, 2001a) live with a generation called as "digital immigrant" (Prensky, 2001a) who were introduced to technology later and are trying to adjust to it. The size of this effect is remarkable when considering that the students spend most of their time with their peers and teachers at school and with their parents at home (Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). The differences in the perceptions of individuals arisen from the intergenerational differences, are often emphasized in the results of the most studies (Prensky, 2001a, 2001b; Beck, & Wade, 2004; Oblinger, & Oblinger, 2005; Bayne, & Ross, 2007; Palfrey, & Gasser, 2008; Bittman et al., 2011). Digital divide which is one of the concepts to explain the differences in reactions of the individuals towards the communication technologies and their use, is also defined as the inequality encountered by the individuals in their access to Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and ICT literacy depending on demographic variables such as; gender, educational background of parents, monthly income, geographical region (Yıldız, & Seferoğlu, 2014). As can be seen in the definition, digital divide is closely interrelated with the differences in individuals' level of access to technology for different purposes and appears to be a concept trying to determine the reactions according to the amount of access. Thus, it is probable to say that the level of individuals' access to technology and time are interrelated and are also closely related to the intergenerational differences.

It is quite natural that there is difference in the perceptions and reactions of the people born in these technologies and the people who were later introduced to them. However, experimental studies indicate that the increase in the technological talents of young people is a factor leading to the divergence of the digital gap between generations (ex., Bacigalupe & Camara, 2011; Lanigan, 2009; Mesch, 2006). Particularly, the increase in the use of internet, has created a new world in which they will have difficulty in understanding their parents who belong to the generation before them thus increasing their anxiety (Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). So parents have started to develop new strategies to protect their children. In this respect, the commonly used strategies lead to (rulemaking, restrictions), both positive (explanation, discussion), and negative (disagreement, criticism) results (Austin, 1990; as cited in, Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). In the study carried out by Çetinkaya and Sütçü (2016), it was concluded that the mothers in particular, impose restrictions on their children and that girls receive more restrictions compared to boys and mobile phones are one of the commonly restricted technologies and restrictions towards the

applications could cause to the restricted use of the technology that the application works on. Also it was concluded in the same research that parents often impose restrictions on their children's use of mobile phones because of their uneasiness arisen from the time that their children spend using these technologies and thus, they may affect their educational activities, relations within the family, social lives and their health negatively. All these findings show that parents could impose restrictions on their children for certain reasons.

Parents could be in the habit of monitoring their teenage children in order to minimize the problems they may encounter (Stattin, & Kerr, 2000) and this habit is emphasized by the researchers that they could be a protective factor in the lives of the teenagers (Laird et al., 2003). Nevertheless, there aren't enough studies on the probable results of imposing restrictions besides monitoring. Children are likely to distort the authority of their parents by questioning their rules and values (Haddon, 2006; Huisman et al., 2012; Mesch, 2006; Stevenson, 2011). At this point, it should be noted that the children of our time were born into digital environments and they are far better qualified users of these technologies than their parents. Otherwise, parents who monitor or impose restrictions on their technology use, may confront more depressing problems. However, Çetinkaya and Sütçü (2016) have referred to such a risk in their study and expressed an urgent need to a study to determine the reactions of the students towards their parents' restrictions on communication technologies and its applications. The studies on the impact of technological developments on daily lives of the people, which have become one of the major interest areas of the researchers, show that the studies examining their effects on family dynamics and roles are in early stages (Aponte, 2009; Carvalho, Francisco, & Relvas, 2015; Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016; Stafford & Hillyer, 2012; Williams, & Merten, 2011). Hence, this study aims to determine the reactions of students studying at secondary schools towards the restrictions imposed by their parents on communication technologies and their applications. Within this general aim of the research, answers to the following questions were sought;

1. Have the parents imposed any restrictions on communication technologies and the use of its applications? And, if yes
2. Who imposed the restrictions?
3. Did students show any reactions to these restrictions?
4. And how did they react to these restrictions?

## **METHOD**

In this part of the study, there are explanations about the model of the research, study group, data collection and analysis of the data.

### **The model of the research**

This study was designed as a survey model, to determine the reactions of the students studying at secondary schools towards the restrictions imposed by their

parents on communication technologies and their applications. Survey models are approaches that aim to describe past or present phenomena as they are (Karasar, 2008). Both open-ended question form and semi-structured interview technique was employed to enable procedural diversity; thus the inspection, comparison and verification of different data one another were made possible (Patton, 1990).

### Study Group

The study group of the research consists of 111 female (52.1%), 102 male (47.9%) total 213 students studying during the 2015-2016 academic year. During the sample selection of the study, convenience sampling (Dawson, & Trapp, 2004) was used by considering Turkish formal education statistics (MEB, 2014). The features of the study group ranging from 14 to 16 year old 9th. grade students studying at different schools are given in table 1.

**Table 1. Age Distribution of The Students According to Their Gender**

Age	Gender				Total	
	Girl		Boy		F	%
	f	%	f	%		
14	4	3.6.	3	2.9	<b>7</b>	<b>3.3</b>
15	96(2)	86.5	84(2)	82.4	<b>180</b>	<b>84.5</b>
16	11(1)	9.9	15	14.7	<b>26</b>	<b>12.2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: (X), information on students who had semi-structured interview.

After determining which students' use of technology was restricted, the data of them (141) were analysed and their results are given in Table 2.

After the evaluation of the open-ended forms, in line with the results, an expert group consisting of academicians from the fields of "psychological counseling and guidance" and "computer and instructional technologies" detailed the research and designated the students that could contribute to the reliability of the study. "Semi-structured interview" was made with 5 out of 8 students who were designated by the expert group consisting of three people that had studies on mother-father-adolescent attitudes.

### Data Collection

The data of the study were collected in an approach to include different data collection techniques and methods. Thus, relying on different sources of data, the elimination of the risk of systematic error was aimed (Maxwell, 1996). After obtaining the necessary permissions to carry out the research, initially the students that participated in the research were informed both written and orally about the aim and the expectations from the research during the data collection . Later on, in line with the aim of the study, students were asked "Have you been restricted in terms of communication technologies and its applications?" and depending on their answers, the following questions were asked;

Yes, I was restricted ( )

a. By whom were you restricted?

- b. Did you obey the restrictions?
- c. Did you show any reactions against the restrictions?

Students were required to give written answers to the questions to let them express their ideas freely and in a detailed way.

In accordance with the answers to the open-ended questions, phenomenologic interview which constitutes the “semi-structured interview” of the study was realised with 5 students designated by the 3 experts. Hence, how the individuals perceived, conceptualised and evaluated the phenomena and what meaning they ascribed was tried to find out (Greasley, & Ashworth, 2007). The questions in the open-ended question form were asked again and answers were thoroughly analysed.

### Analysis of The Data

In order to measure the variables, categorical analysis and frequency analysis which are forms of content analysis that signifies a systematic, unbiased and digital analysis (Wimmer, & Dominick, 2003), were employed in order to measure the variables in the texts. During categorical analysis; (1) coding of the data, (2) forming the categories, (3) arranging the categories, (4) definition and interpretation of the findings stages were followed (Corbin, & Strauss, 2007, as cited in Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). By frequency analysis, the quantitative frequency of the units were revealed and the importance and density of a particular factor were identified (Ryan, & Bernard 2000; Tavşancıl, & Aslan, 2001). In order to determine the frequency of the students’ ideas, frequency (*f*) and percentages (%) are given comparatively. Hence, qualitative data were digitalised, reliability of the data increased, biasness decreased and comparison between the data were made possible (Yıldırım, & Şimşek, 2008).

During the semi-structured interview which was made after the analysis of the answers given to the open-ended questions, the researcher tried to comprehend and interpret their feelings and ideas basing on their words (Smith, & Eatough, 2007). During the process, data related to open-ended questions and the results of the analysis were put to the control of the participants, thus verification of the findings of the research was enabled. Moreover, research questions were supported by direct quotations from interview texts where necessary. Some of the data were given as they are to enable conclusiveness (Wolcott, 1990).

## FINDINGS

The findings attained by the analysis of the data collected through open-ended questions and semi-structured interview are given in detail under headings. Furthermore, quotations from students’ own expressions are also given directly (written data=’sW”, interview data=’sM”).

**Table 2. Distribution of Gender According to The Restrictions Students Face**

Restriction Status	Gender				Total	
	Girl		Boy		<i>f</i>	%
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%		

Restricted	38	34.2	34	33.3	<b>72</b>	<b>33.8</b>
Not restricted	73	65.8	68	66.7	<b>141</b>	<b>66.2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>

While 66.2% of the 213 students in the study group stated that their parents restrict them from using communication technologies and its applications, rest of them 33.8% didn't state any.

### Findings And Recommendations Towards The Restricted Students

During the qualitative data collection by using open-ended questions, data of the 141 students who replied positively the question "Have you ever been restricted on the use of communication technologies and its applications?" were analysed. Also, the findings and recommendations related to their replies to the following questions "by whom were you restricted?" and "your reactions to these restrictions?" were included. The gender distribution of the students whose digital experiences were restricted by their parents are given in Table 3.

**Table 3. Gender Distribution According to The Restrictor And Restricted**

Restrictor (Parents)	Gender				Total	
	Girl		Boy		f	%
	f	%	F	%		
Mother	35	47.9	22	32.4	<b>57</b>	<b>40.4</b>
Father	17	23.3	26	38.2	<b>43</b>	<b>30.5</b>
Mother and father	21	28.8	20	29.4	<b>41</b>	<b>29.1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100</b>

It is concluded in the research that the restrictions on the use of communication technologies and their applications are mainly imposed by mothers (40.4%) and these restrictions are directed mostly to girls (47.9%). While the percentage of the students who were restricted only by their fathers is 30.2%, fathers mostly impose restrictions on boys. However, the percentage of the students who were restricted by the agreed decision of parents is 29.1%, thus being lesser than others in terms of gender difference.

The data attained in the research show that mothers impose restrictions on girls more, whereas fathers impose restrictions on boys, meaning that parents' roles could vary according to the gender of their children. Besides the replies given to the open-ended form, this is also confirmed by students' statements during the interview. In relation to this, sW19(Girl) "*My mother grumbles about it when I use my phone but nobody says anything to my brother...*", while sM27(Girl) says "*My brother sat at the computer but my mother threatened me to take my phone away.*", sW87(Boy) "*My father often has troubles with me; when he sees my phone in my hand, he gets furious.*" As can be understood from these expressions, students have complaints about their parents' different attitudes towards them with regard to their gender.

### Findings Related to Students' Obedience to Restrictions

Students' reactions to the restrictions imposed by their parents towards the communication technologies and applications are grouped in two categories. The categories which are called as "I obeyed the restriction" and "I didn't obey the restriction" and their distribution according to gender, are given in table 4.

**Table 4. Students' Obedience to Restrictions**

Category	Gender				Total	
	Girl		Boy		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
<b>Obedience to restrictions</b>						
I obeyed the restriction	54	74.0	44	64.7	<b>98</b>	<b>69.5</b>
I didn't obey the restriction	19	26.0	24	35.3	<b>43</b>	<b>30.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100</b>

The analysis show that 69.5% of the students obeyed the restrictions while 30.5% of them didn't obey them. While 64.7% of the boys stated that they obeyed the restrictions, this rate was 74.0% in girls. As can be inferred from these findings, the rate of obedience to restrictions is higher in girls than boys. Within this framework, findings related to students' reactions towards restrictions are gathered and given under the subheadings of obedience and disobedience to the restrictions.

**Findings And Comments Regarding The Obedient Students**

51.0% of the students having restrictions by their parents state that they obey these restrictions willingly, whereas 49.0% state that they had to do so. The themes and subthemes are given in table 5.

**Table 5. Category, Theme, Subtheme and Frequencies of the Students Obedient to Restrictions**

Category	Theme	Subtheme	f	%
I obeyed the restriction willingly		I didn't react. I expected the restriction to end itself.	23	46.0
		I didn't react. We agreed mutually on the cancellation of the rules and restrictions.	14	28.0
		I didn't react. I obeyed the restrictions because I thought that the restrictions were useful for me.	13	26.0
	<b>Total</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>51.0</b>
I obeyed the restrictions	I had to obey the restriction	I reacted. However, I had to obey the restriction since I had nothing to do.	28	58.3
		I reacted. I had to obey the restriction since they took away the technology I use.	20	41.7
	<b>Total</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>49.0</b>
<b>Final Total</b>			<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>

46.0% of the students who obeyed the restriction willingly stated that they didn't react against the restriction but waited for it to end itself while 28.0% of them didn't show reactions at all but talked about it and took mutual decisions. However, 26.0% stated that they obeyed the rules because they thought they were useful for them. Findings show that most of the students obeyed the restrictions because they believed that they would end in time. Within this framework, students expressed their

reasons to obey the rules expecting that the restrictions would end in time as sW103 “...I obeyed because I expected it to be given after some time.” And Sw67 “...I didn’t react because they end the restrictions if I obey the rules. I obeyed the restrictions, so they ended them.” On the other hand, students sW51 “...we talked and agreed.” and sW77 “we agreed mutually. ...specified the rules together.” all stated that there was mutual agreement and found solution to restriction. sW112 “I reacted. ... anyway, they were right and I knew that.” and sM4 “...I didn’t react because I knew it was for my own good.”

58.3% of the students said that they reacted against the restrictions but they obeyed them since they had nothing to do. 41.7% of the students; however, reported that though they reacted, they had to obey the restrictions as the technologies they used were taken away. It is clear that the students accepted the situation because they had no alternatives or nothing to do. Accordingly, sW99 “My mother took away my mobile phone. I got angry but it was futile... So I had to obey.” Besides, sW1 “...even if I react, there won’t be any change, I had to obey” implying that they wouldn’t be able to change the current situation.

### ***Findings and Comments Regarding The Disobedient Students***

74.4% of the students whose use of communication technologies and its applications were restricted by their parents but didn’t obey, stated that they went on ignoring. 25.6% of the students, on the other hand, ignored the restrictions and went on using overtly. Accordingly, the themes and subthemes are given in table 6.

**Table 6. The Reactions of the Students Who Joined the Research**

Category	Theme	Subtheme	f	%
I didn’t obey the restriction	I went on using secretly	I kept using making up excuses. (Ex. I played games under cover of studying.)	9	31.0
		I bypassed it by using another technology. (ex. Using mobile phone instead of computer)	7	24.1
		I used it in another place as I couldn’t use it when I was with them (Internet cafe, friend’s house, etc.)	6	20.7
		I went on using other people’s (friend, neighbour) Technologies as mine was taken away.	4	10.3
		As the technology I used was taken away, I bought a new one and started to use it secretly.	3	6.9
		As the technology I used was taken away, I kept using it secretly.	3	6.9
	<b>Total</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>74.4</b>
	I went on using it publicly	I bypassed the restriction by another technology and went on using when I was with them.	7	63.6
		The technology I used was taken away. I bought a new one and went on using it publicly.	4	36.4
	<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>25.6</b>
<b>Final Total</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>100</b>	

21.0% of the students who said they didn’t obey the restrictions and went on using secretly, also said they made up excuses and went on using the technologies and their applications. As can be seen in sW12’s words “telling that I would study my



*lesson, I was sitting at my computer and playing games. When I heard a noise I would minimise the tab and open up a Word document.*” studying lessons is the top excuse. 24.1% of the students who didn’t obey the restrictions secretly, stated that they bypassed the restrictions by another technology. sW41, *“they unplugged the Ethernet cable. I went on using Facebook on my mobile phone”* implying that he went on using restricted application by using another technology. 20.7% of the students stated that they didn’t use the restricted technology or the application when they are with their parents, instead went on using it at another place. As sW23 mentioned *“I would find an excuse and go to ... Or I go to an Internet cafe with...”* some of the students who don’t obey the restrictions, bypass them by going to their friends’ house or to internet cafes. Similarly, 10.3% of the students stated that they used other people’s technologies since theirs were taken away. sW48 *“I borrowed my friend’s old phone and used it”*, and sW20, *“I connected to our neighbour’s WIFI”* both stated how they didn’t obey the restrictions secretly. 6.9% of the students stated that because the technology they used was taken away, they bought new ones and used secretly. As stated by sW45 *“they disconnected the Internet... I bought an Internet package with my pocket money.”* the students who bypassed the restrictions, all said they did the same with their pocket money. 6.9% of the students who didn’t obey the restrictions secretly, however, since their technology was taken away, they obtained this technology secretly. A male student expressed the risk he took by his words *“My father would keep the laptop in their bedroom. Sometimes, I would take the computer under their bed and play games. I would put it back before they got up. It was a big risk but worthed for it.”* 63.6% of the students who told that they didn’t obey the restrictions and ignored them publicly, went on using another technology. With their statements, sW14 *“As I entered Facebook, they took away my computer but I entered it by using my mobile phone. My mother knew this because she is also my friend on Facebook.”* and sW6 *“I was using my tablet computer while I was by their side...”* they expressed that they disregarded the restrictions and parents were aware of this. 36.6% of the students who showed their reactions overtly, told that because their technology was taken away, they bought a new one and used it publicly. In relation to the reaction which especially given by the students whose mobile phones were taken away, a male student expressed his experience as (sW113, sM3) *“they took away my mobile phone. I bought a second hand phone together with the money I borrowed from my friends and my pocket money. ...I used it by their side... They got angry but they couldn’t overcome my stubbornness.”*

## **DISCUSSIONS, RESULTS AND RECOMMEDATIONS**

### **Results**

In this research which aims to determine the reactions of students studying at secondary schools towards the restrictions imposed by their parents on communication technologies and their applications was conducted with the involvement of 213 secondary education students. While identifying the attitudes of the 141 students, who were determined to have restrictions, semi-structured interview were conducted with 5 students besides open-ended forms. Hence procedural

diversity was aimed by using different data collection techniques (Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). During the analysis of the data, of the content analysis types, categorical analysis and frequency analysis were employed.

While 66.2% of the students who constituted the study group of the research, reported that their use of communication technologies and their applications were restricted, 33.8% of them, however, reported no such restrictions at all. Though the students' distribution according to their gender who had restrictions are rather close to each other, there are differences among to parents who imposed restrictions. As also stated both in the replies of the students to the open-ended questions and during the interview, this case was further supported by the results of the analysis of all the data. The results indicate that mothers place restrictions more than fathers and they mainly place restrictions on their girls while fathers place restrictions on boys more than their mothers. However, as for the restrictions placed by the mutual decision of parents, no meaningful difference was observed proportionally and the results were quite close to each other, which shows that the roles of the parents change also depending on the gender of their children. The results coincide substantially with the study carried out by Çetinkaya and Sütçü (2016) and they are often emphasized in other studies as well. Alvarez et al., (2013) stated that mothers are the decision makers on the Internet use of their children and fathers become the decision makers in families with boys, also when placing the restrictions, parents could act differently depending on the gender of their students. This is also supported by other studies carried out by (Richards et al., 2004; Laird, Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 2003; Smetana, & Darris, 2002; Xu et al., 2005 Valcke et al., 2010; Valcke et al, 2011; Van Roaij, & Van Den Eijnden, 2007) stating that parents' roles change depending on the gender, and also explains the differences in the roles of parents according to the gender of the children.

### **Findings Regarding The Students' Obedience To Restrictions**

Students' reactions to the restrictions imposed by their parents towards the communication technologies and applications are grouped in two categories as; "I obeyed the restriction" and "I didn't obey the restriction." The analysis show that the majority of the students obey the restrictions and girls' rate of obedience is higher than boys. At this point, students' reactions to parents depending on their obedience to these restrictions are themed.

While nearly half of the students who reported that they obey the restrictions placed by their parents willingly, the other half reported that they had to obey them. All of the students who reported that they obeyed willingly showed no reaction against the restrictions but showed three different attitudes. Most of them waited for the restrictions to end itself while some of them talked to their parents and took decisions mutually. The other group, since they were aware of the fact that the restrictions were useful for them, they obeyed them without showing any reactions.

Unlike the students who obeyed the restrictions willingly, all of the students who had to obey the restrictions reported that they showed reactions. However, majority of these students, as they thought they had nothing to do, only reacted against

the restrictions but obeyed them as well. Those students who reported that they reacted against the restrictions and didn't obey them, also reported that they had to obey the restrictions because the technologies they used were taken away. Since they didn't have another option or couldn't find any alternatives, students who reacted and objected to the restrictions had to accept the current situation.

The majority of the students who stated that they didn't obey the restrictions, also told that they reacted against the restrictions and went on using the technology secretly. It is understood that students who ignored the restrictions and went on using them secretly, mostly made up excuses to use the communication technologies and their applications. Particularly, studying came into prominence and by the help of this excuse they reached the restricted technologies and went on doing the activities which were the reasons of their restrictions, in the background.

Some of the students who reported that they didn't obey the restrictions secretly, bypassed the restriction by using another technology. This type of action, which was seen particularly in the restriction of Internet based applications, occurred by using mobile phone instead of the computer or vice versa. Some of the students who reported that they didn't obey the restrictions, on the other hand, told that they went on using away from their parents (at an Internet cafe or a friend's house). Most of the students who went on using their technologies secretly were the ones who reported that their technologies were taken away. These students reported that they bypassed the restrictions by using the technologies that belonged to others (a friend or a neighbour, etc.), buying the new ones or by secretly taking the technology from where it was kept.

A substantial number of students who reported that they didn't obey the restrictions, however, also told that they reacted against the restrictions by ignoring them overtly and that they did this mostly by using another technology. This was also seen in students who didn't obey the restrictions secretly and bypassed it. But the most important difference between them is parents are aware of the disobedience and it is not a secret. Another type of reaction was seen among the students who disobeyed the restriction overtly. These students reported that since their parents took away their technologies, they bought new ones and went on using publicly.

When the results of the study are evaluated as a whole, it is noted that children are often inclined to react to their parents' restrictions. Besides verbal reactions, students can also develop reactions towards the applications. It shouldn't be disregarded that these reaction could yield to some other problems. However, most of the the students who report that they react to restrictions, seem to tell lies either secretly or act in a kind of rebellious way overtly. When this situation persists, it may become common and lead to pervesive problems in child-parents relations in the long term. Though the studies on this topic are limited in number, particularly the results of the studies on the use of Internet and parents' attitudes indicate that parents could set up rules for their children, bring them under control or place restrictions in different ways. (Ex., Eastin, Greenberg, & Hofschire, 2006; Mitchell, et al., 2005; Valcke, et al., 2010; Çetinkaya, & Sütçü, 2016). Studies also show that control methods (active regulation, restrictive regulation and using the Internet together) have

differences in themselves (Özdemir, Kuzucu, & Ak, 2016). Restrictions could be both an effective (Ramirez et al, 2010) and ineffective method (Lee, & Chae 2007) or evoke a sense of wonder (Nathanson, 2002) and lead to worse conditions. Accordingly, the importance of parents' attitudes and management of the process shouldn't be overlooked. There are many methods which are used to prevent the access to the technology supported information resources. However, new generation were born in the digital age and can learn these technologies quickly and use them actively. Even though the access to these technologies can be hindered or restricted, students can develop ways to overcome them in time.

### Recommendations

Parents who are in a effort to protect their children against the negative effects of technology, could place restrictions to minimise them. Hence, recommendations generated according to the results of the study which aimed to determine students' reactions towards the restrictions imposed by their parents on their use of communication technologies and their applications are;

Recommendations for parents:

- The study showed that students are inclined to react against the restrictions. Parents should take the necessary measures against the activities which could get worse accordingly.
- In case of restriction, by informing the child about the reason of the restriction, his awareness must be created.

Recommendations for researchers:

- The effects of these restrictions on their academic life must be researched.
- A research to determine the expectations of parents from their restrictions on their children should be made.

### REFERENCES

- Alvarez, M., Torres, A., Rodriguez, E., Padilla, S., & Rodrigo, M. J. (2013). Attitudes and parenting dimensions in parents' regulation of Internet use by primary and secondary school children. *Computers & Education*, 67, 69-78.
- Aponte, R. (2009). The communications revolution and its impact on the family: Significant, growing, but skewed and limited in scope. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45, 576–586.
- Austin, E. W. (1990). Effects of family communication on children's interpretation of television. In J. Bryant & J. A. Bryant (Eds.), *Television and the American family* (pp. 377—395). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, inc.
- Bacigalupe, G., & Lambe, S. (2011). Virtualizing intimacy: Information communication technologies and transnational families in therapy. *Family Process*, 50, 12–26.

- Bayne, S., & Ross, J. (2007). The 'digital native' and 'digital immigrant': A dangerous opposition. *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE)*, Brighton, Sussex, UK.
- Beck, J. C., & Wade, M. (2004). *Got game: How the gamer generation is reshaping business forever*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bittman, M., Rutherford, L., Brown, J., & Unsworth, L. (2011). Digital natives? New and old media and children's outcomes. *Australian Journal of Education*, 55(2), 161-175.
- Carvalho, J., Francisco, R., & Relvas, A. (2015). Family functioning and information and communication technologies: How do they relate? A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45, 99-108.
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. C. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Çetinkaya, L., & Sütçü, S. S., (2016). Parents' Restrictions on Their Children's Use of Information Technologies and Their Reasons. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1), 18-36.
- Dawson B, & Trapp R. G. (2004) *Probability & related topics for making inferences about data*. Basic & Clinical Biostatistics. 4rd Edition, McGraw-Hill Medical Publishing Division, Chapter 4, 69-72.
- Eastin, M., Greenberg, B., & Hofschire, L. (2006). Parenting the Internet. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 486-504.
- Güldüren, C., Çetinkaya, L. & Keser, H., (2016). Ortaöğretim Bilgi Güvenliği Farkındalık Ölçeği (BGFÖ) Geliştirme Çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, 15(2), 682-695.
- Greasley, K., Ashworth, P. (2007). The Phenomenology of "approach to studying": The University Student's Studies within the Lifework. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32, 819-843.
- Haddon, L. (2006). The contribution of domestication research to in-home computing and media consumption. *The Information Society*, 22, 195-203.
- Huisman, S., Catapano, S., & Edwards, A. (2012). The impact of technology on families. *International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community*, 2, 44-62.
- Karasar, N. (2008). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi (18.Baskı)*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- Laird, R.D, Pettit, G. S., Bates, J.E., & Dodge, K. A. (2003). Parents monitoring relevant knowledge and adolescents' delinquent behavior: Evidence or correlated developmental changes and reciprocal influences. *Child Development*, 74(3), 752-768.
- Lanigan, J. D. (2009). A sociotechnological model for family research and intervention: How information and communication technologies affect family life. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45, 587-609.

- Lee, S. J., & Chae, Y. G. (2007). Children's Internet use in a family context: Influence on family relationships and parental mediation. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(5), 640-644.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. California: SAGE Publications.
- MEB (2014). *Millî Eğitim İstatistikleri, Örgün Eğitim 2013-2014*. T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı, Ankara. <http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/www/milli-egitim-istatistikleri-orgun-egitim-2013-2014/icerik/95> adresinden erişildi.
- Mesch, G. (2006). Family characteristics and intergenerational conflicts over the internet. *Information, Communication & Society*, 9, 473-495.
- Mitchell, K., Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2005). Police posing as juveniles online to catch sex offenders: Is it working? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17(3), 241-267.
- Nathanson, A. I. (2002). The unintended effects of parental mediation of television on adolescents. *Media Psychology*, 4, 207-230.
- Oblinger, D., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). *Educating the Net Generation*. Washington, DC: Educause.
- Özdemir, Y., Kuzucu, Y., & Ak, Ş. (2016). Examining Compulsive Internet Use of Adolescents Based on Adolescents' and Parents' Reports, *Elementary Education Online*, 15(2), 330-343.
- Palfrey, J., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. NY: Basic Books.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Prensky, M. (2001a). Digital natives, digital immigrants, part 2: Do they really think differently? *On the Horizon*, 9(6), 1-6.
- Prensky, M. (2001b). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-5.
- Ramirez, E., Norman, G. J., Rosenberg, D. E., Kerr, J., Saelens, B. E., Durant, N., Sallis, J. F., (2011). Adolescent screen time and rules to limit screen time in the home. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48(4), 379-385.
- Richards, M. H., Miller, B. V., O'Donnell, P. C., Wasserman, M. S., & Colder, C. (2004). Parental monitoring mediates the effects of age and sex on problem behaviors among African American Urban Young Adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(3), 221-233.
- Ryan, G., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Smith, J. A., & Eatough, V. (2007). Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. In E. Lyons ve A. Coyle (Eds.). *Analysing Qualitative Data In Psychology*. (pp. 35-50). Los Angeles: SAGE Pub.
- Smetana, J. G., Metzger, A., & Campione-Barr N. (2004). African American Late Adolescents' Relationships With Parents: Developmental Transitions And Longitudinal Patterns. *Child Development*, 75(3), 932-947.

- Stafford, L., & Hillyer, J. D. (2012). Information and communication technologies in personal relationships. *Review of Communication, 12*, 290–312.
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental Monitoring: A Reinterpretation. *Child Development, 71*(4), 1072-1085.
- Stevenson, O. (2011). From public policy to family practices: Researching the everyday realities of families technology use at home. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27*, 336–346.
- Tavşancıl, E., & Aslan, E. A. (2001). *İçerik Analizi ve Uygulama Örnekleri*. Ankara: Epsilon Yayınları.
- Valcke, M., Bonte, S., De Wever, B., & Rots, I. (2010). Internet Parenting Styles and the Impact on Internet Use of Primary School Children. *Computers & Education, 55*(2), 454-464.
- Valcke, M.; Wever, D. B., Van Keer, H., & Schellens, T. (2011). Long-term study of safe Internet use of young children. *Computers & Education, 57*(1), 1292-1305.
- Van Rooij, A. J., & Van den Eijnden, R. J. J. M. (2007). Monitor Internet and Youth 2006 and 2007. *Developments in Internet Use and the Role of Parenting*. <http://bit.ly/cFUX09> [Erişim Tarihi: 11.09.2014].
- Williams, A. L., & Merten, M. J. (2011). iFamily: Internet and social media technology in the family context. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 40*, 150–170.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2003). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction (7th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). On seeking-and rejecting-validity in qualitative research. (Ed.) E. W. Eisner. & A. Peshkin *Qualitative Inquiry in Education the Continuing Debate* (pp. 121-152). New York: Teachers Collage Press.
- Xu, Y., Farver, J. A. M., Zhang, Z., Zeng, O., Yu., L., & Cai, B. (2005). Mainland Chinese parenting styles and parent-child interaction. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*(6), 524-531.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri (6.Baskı)*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldız, H., & Seferoğlu, S. S. (2014). İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Sayısal Uçurum Düzeyleriyle İlgili Görüşlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 29*(3), 220-235.