Parents' Perceptions of Smartphone Use and Parenting Practices

David Jackson Johnson
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, johnsd10@unlv.nevada.edu

PARENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SMARTPHONE USE AND PARENTING PRACTICES

By

David Johnson

Bachelor of Science- Psychology
Weber State University
2014

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Master of Science- Couple and Family Therapy

Couple and Family Therapy Program
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health
The School of Medicine

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
December 2017

Thesis Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

October 23, 2017

This thesis prepared by

David Johnson

entitled

Parents' Perceptions of Smartphone Use and Parenting Practices

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science- Couple and Family Therapy
Couple and Family Therapy Program

Katherine M. Hertlein, Ph.D.   Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair   *Graduate College Interim Dean*

Carissa D'Aniello, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Brandon Eddy, M.S.
Examination Committee Member

Julian Kilker, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

Abstract

The present study is a qualitative examination aiming to gain insight into parents' perceptions of their smartphone use and the effects it may be having on their children as well as parenting practices. Participants (N=12) were smartphone using parents that consisted mostly of young college-educated females. Thematic analysis of individual interviews resulted in five primary themes: (1) Disengagement, (2) Concern for Future, (3) Change in Social Norms, (4) Boundaries, and (5) Cognitive Dissonance. These findings indicate significant effects parental smartphone use is having in the lives of study participants. These thematic findings call for additional research examining the impact parental and adult smartphone use is having in all aspects of the family including the parental subsystem of the family system.

Keywords: Parents, Smartphone, Technology

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those individuals who helped me complete this momentous project. First, I would like to thank my wife Marla for her continuous support and encouragement on this road to accomplishing my personal and professional goals. Without her I would not be the man I am today. Next, I would like to Thank Dr. Katherine Hertlein for the guidance, encouragement, and enthusiasm she offered during the course of completing this project. Her influence and mentorship has shaped and molded me into the budding researcher I am becoming. I would also like to thank Dr. Carissa D'Aniello and Dr. Steve Fife for their consistent feedback on this project and the personal interest and investment they have made to help be become a better writer throughout this journey. I would also like to thank Dr. Julian Kilker and Brandon Eddie for their service on my committee and the direction they offered as I navigated through this process. I would like to thank Chris Stewart for his friendship and support during this project and throughout this graduate program. Finally, I would like to thank Alyssa Christal and the other members of my research team for the hard work they put into this project as well as the opportunity they afforded me to learn and grow as a project leader and work through the challenges that come with that position. To all of the faculty and students in my cohort in this program, thank you for this transformative journey. It has been an unforgettable experience.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Following the advent of electricity in 1873, it took 46 years for one-quarter of the American public to adopt its use. Since then, adoption rates of other technological advances, have increased at an exponentially greater rate, with the telephone reaching one-quarter of the American public in 35 years, television in 26 years, mobile phones in 13 years, and the web in only seven years (Desilver, 2014). This accelerated rate of technology adoption continues today as evident by the increased number of users and uses of the web, as well as the proliferation of technologies like cell phones and smartphones (Pew Research Center, 2014a).

The World Wide Web currently has reached near-saturation levels of adoption among some demographic groups (Perrin & Duggan, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2014a). Researchers at the Pew Research Center (2014a) found that "87% of American adults now use the internet" and "90% of internet users say the internet has been a good thing for them", additionally "76% of internet users say the internet has been a good thing for society" (p.5). When looking closer at this trend, "58% of internet users" and "46% of all adults now say the internet would be very hard to give up" (Pew Research Center, 2014a). With such positive attitudes among internet users it is likely adoption rates will continue to increase (Pew Research Center, 2014b).

Understanding who is using the internet becomes increasingly important as consideration is given to its current adoption rate, and the likelihood increases that its use will become nearly ubiquitous with human life in the future. Researchers have found that internet use and adoption vary across demographics such as age, class, race and ethnicity, as well as community differences such as urban, suburban, and rural areas (Perrin & Duggan, 2015). Further, Perrin and Duggan (2015) found that young adults with high levels of education, and those in more affluent households were the groups that came closest to full penetration and saturation levels of

internet adoption and use. The same study also found that closely trailing the 18-29-year-old adult group (young adults), were the adults age 30-49, when measuring internet use (Perrin & Duggan, 2015). Additionally, researchers found that although "older adults have lagged behind younger adults in their adoption [of the internet], a clear majority (58%) of senior citizens use the internet (Perrin & Duggan, 2015, p.2). Thus, although digital gaps still exist, researchers are finding they are continuously shrinking (Perrin & Duggan, 2015). If this trend continues more adults across demographic lines will be users of the internet, leading to near-saturation of internet use among most adult populations within the United States.

The internet, however, is not the only new technology that is being adopted at an accelerated rate. Researchers have found "fully 91% of American adults own a cell phone" and "nearly two-thirds of Americans are now smartphone owners, and for many these devices are a key entry point to the online world" (Duggan, 2013, p. 1; Pew Research Center, 2015, p. 2). Duggan (2013) asserts that "six-in-ten cell owners access the internet on their phones" and that "among those who use the internet or email on their phones, more than a third (34%) say that they mostly access the internet from their phone" (p. 4). Lebo (2015) reports similar findings when stating that "Fewer users connect to the Internet with a computer – 88 percent in the current study, down from 94 percent in 2013. However, larger percentages go online through a mobile phone (79 percent vs. 68 percent in 2013)" (p. 29). These findings indicate that as smartphone ownership rises, mobile internet connections and access have risen in parallel. While further investigating this trend, researchers have found that

> 10% of Americans own a smartphone but do not have broadband at home, and 15% own
> a smartphone but say that they have a limited number of options for going online other
> than their cell phone. Those with relatively low income and educational attainment levels,

younger adults, and non-whites are especially likely to be "smartphone-dependent". (Pew

Research Center, 2015, p. 2)

These findings become most significant when consideration is given to the adoption rate, pervasive nature, and demographics of users of the internet and smartphones. Similarly, internet and smartphone use become even more synonymous when the array of uses and information accessed through these technologies by adults is understood.

Research on smartphone use is finding that there are a large variety of activities and information that adults are engaged in via smartphones (Anderson, 2015a; Duggan, 2013; Lebo, 2015). Aside from the most basic functions of smartphones such as talking and texting, studies have found that over half of smartphone users employed this technology to: take pictures, access the internet, send/receive email, send/receive picture/ video messages, use apps, GPS mapping services, social networking sights, take videos, watch/listen to streaming music/video, and play games (Lebo, 2015, p. 66; Miller, 2012). Further, the Pew Research Center (2015) has found that "more than half of smartphone owners have used their phone to get health information or do online banking" and "a majority of smartphone owners use their phone to follow along with breaking news, and to share and be informed about happenings in their local community" (p. 5; p. 6). With adults using smartphones in so many ways, smartphone research clearly demonstrates that, adults across many demographic domains are using smartphones in a way that demarcates a digital separation to their life, as evident by a significant portion of their life being conducted on or filtered through their smartphones (Pew Research Center, 2015; Turkle, 2011).

Research on smartphone and internet use report the largest group of adults that regularly use the two technologies range in age from 18- 49 with the 18-29-year-old sub-group using these technologies only slightly more than their older counter parts (Perrin & Duggan, 2015, p. 4;

Poushter, 2016, p. 20). Coupling this information with the trend in increasing parent age being found by family researchers it becomes evident that parents make up a large portion of internet and smartphone users. Research has shown that in 2008, 89% of U.S. births were to mothers age 20-35+, these mothers also coincide with the adult age group of highest smartphone and internet users (Perrin & Duggan, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2010; Poushter, 2016). Looking closer at the age of mothers, family researchers at the Pew Research Center (2010) found that,

> In 1990, there were more births to teenagers than to women ages 35 and older. By 2008, that had reversed-14% of births were to older women and 10% were to teens. Births to women ages 35 and older grew 64% between 1990 and 2008. (p. 3)

These findings indicate there is an increasing trend among mothers to have children later in life (Pew Research Center, 2010; Livingston, 2015). Together, the trend of parents having children later in life and the findings of researchers, indicating the same adult age group is using internet and smartphone technologies in the greatest number, indicates a correlation that needs to be further investigated by family and technology researchers. Thus, it is the purpose of this research to ascertain parents' perceptions of the effect their smartphone use has on their children.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The internet, connecting people via devices, is one of the most rapidly adopted technologies researchers are currently studying (Perrin & Duggan, 2015). The landscape of internet connectivity is currently in flux as well, as more and more people are connecting to the internet via smartphone than at any other time (Lebo, 2015). Though a healthy body of literature exists that explores dynamics between internet use among individuals and families; research addressing methods of internet access including and especially smartphone use is scares. Because smartphones are widely being used to access the internet, and culturally, smartphone and internet use are becoming more synonymous, research findings on internet use will be integrated with smartphone research within this paper to provide a broader context with which to orient the reader.

Although many parents ascribe to the adage, children come with no instruction manual, there exists a large body of research on the subject of parenting. Within this research, parenting styles are credited with influencing many aspects of the child's life; everything from the child's social attachment to trajectories of delinquent behavior have been tied to parenting styles (Doinita & Maria, 2015; Hoeve et al., 2008). Some of the latest research on parenting styles focuses on how this parenting characteristic influences technology use inside and out of the home (Leung & Lee, 2011; Nakayama, 2011; Valcke, Bonte, De Wever, & Rots, 2010; Veldhuis, Grieken, Renders, HiraSing, & Raat, 2014).

While examining the link between parenting style and delinquent behaviors of young boys, Hoeve et al (2008) found that neglectful and authoritarian parenting styles correlated with the greatest number of delinquent behaviors in the participants measured. These findings are consistent with other research that indicates that the authoritative parenting style is most often

related to positive child outcomes (Hoeve et al., 2008). When looking at the impact parenting styles have on the use of technology, similar results have been found.

Examining parent's likelihood of employing a communication technology monitoring system, Nakayama (2011) found that parents who exhibited styles characterized by a need for greater control such as Authoritarian were more likely to employ such systems, whereas children of Authoritative parents were most likely to cooperate with the use of such monitoring systems. When looking at how parents utilize and regulate technology use within the home, many studies have found that parental attributes such as parenting style influence children's use of technology. In one such study, Valcke et al. (2010) found that the largest group of internet-using children, with multiple access points, had parents that fell into the authoritative group as opposed to permissive, laissez-faire, and/or authoritarian. This study concurred with other such research, with its finding, that parents' use of internet technology had a significant factor when exploring children's use of such technologies (Leung & Lee, 2011; Valcke et al., 2010). Further, literature aimed at investigating and informing parents and technology use in the home, is often associated with problematic behavior on the part of the child.

Studies and books that attempt to examine children and youths' internet use are often trying to mitigate problematic interactions facilitated by technology use such as internet addiction, risky online behavior, cyberbullying, complications with psychopathologies such as anxiety or depression, and physical ailments such as childhood obesity (Leung & Lee, 2011; Mian, 2014; Morgan, 2013; Veldhuis et al., 2014). Much of this literature focuses on a parent's role of moderator and protector of the child's online behavior through regulation of the time a child spends on electronic devices; some of the factors influencing parents' interpretation of these roles are parental characteristics such as parenting styles (Gold 2015; Hendricks, 2015;

Leung & Lee, 2011; Lou, Shih, Liu, Guo, & Tseng, 2010; Velhuis et al., 2014). In spite of all the research aimed at exploring technologies impact on our children, Plowman, McPake, and Stephen (2010) argued that "technology is not perceived by parents to be the threat to modern childhood that is claimed" (p. 63).

If the findings of Plowman et al. (2010) are examined closer, parental engagement plays a larger part in the child's development than technology use behaviors of the child. Further research on parental engagement with a child when using technology versus not using technology found that parents were less engaged with their children when reading using digital technology than when reading in print (Korat & Or, 2010). Considering parents are being encouraged by researchers, educators, and society to monitor and act as gatekeeper to their children and their use of new technologies such as the internet and smartphones it seems relevant to wonder what role these technologies are playing in the lives of parents, and what effect they are having on children, since no one is looking over the proverbial shoulder of the parent while they are using communication technologies.

Technology Trends

While researchers explore and document trends in technology, they are finding that growth and adoption rates of new technologies are occurring at an exponentially accelerated rate (Desilver, 2014). This trend is aptly illustrated as Birkerts (2015) laments

> The frightening and, alas confirming thing about writing an essay like this, one that looks
>
> to track and reflect upon the momentum of technological innovation, is that it is so very
>
> quickly outpaced by its subject matter. No matter how current one hopes to be, the fact is
>
> that by the time the words, any words, find their way into the world, whatever had

seemed the cutting edge will be the status quo-if not history- and all proclamations will necessarily seem dated. (p. 44)

How We Use Technology. In recent decades, the internet has been adopted and used in a variety of new ways, this expansion of uses is often referred to as the *internet of things*; visible as more devices, machines, services, and physical facilities are connected to and communicate with one another via the internet. Thermostats, refrigerators, locks, and lights are now able to connect to users via the internet. The device that often facilitates that connection with a human is a smartphone. Increasingly smartphones are being used to facilitate and intermediate virtual, physical, emotional, and psychological connections between individuals and the world around them (Turkle, 2011). Researchers are finding that the majority of people use smartphones and the internet on a daily basis in an array of social contexts such as school, work, home, and while traveling (Anderson & Smith, 2015; Lebo, 2015; Perrin & Duggan, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2015).

Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) apply the Uses-and-Gratifications Theory to assess why people use computer-mediated-communication technologies, of which, the internet and smartphones fall, found that "internet motive statements yielded five interpretable factors: interpersonal utility, pass time, information seeking, convenience, and entertainment" (p. 185). These motives for using technology correlate well with findings from smartphone and internet researchers who look at how people are using their smartphones and the internet on a daily basis (Perrin & Duggan, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2015).

Research findings on smartphone use in America indicate that "smartphones are widely used for navigating numerous important life activities, from researching a health condition to accessing educational resources" (Pew Research Center, 2015, p. 2). Additionally, smartphones

are being used to accomplish more mundane tasks such as accessing transportation needs as found by Anderson and Smith (2015) when they report that of the three transportation uses measured, turn-by-turn navigation, accessing public transit information, and hailing a taxi or car service, the majority of users, "fully 67% of smartphone owners use their phone at least occasionally to get turn-by-turn navigation while driving" (p. 2).

Uses of the internet and smartphones for everyday tasks such as fulfilling transportation needs, providing access to entertainment, tracking health and fitness information and replacing appliances such as alarm clocks, calendars, and flashlights, clearly are driven by motives such as entertainment, information seeking, pass time, and convenience (Anderson & Smith, 2015; Direito, Jiang, Whittaker, & Maddison, 2015; Lebo, 2015; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Pew Research Center, 2012).

When considering Papacharissi and Rubin's identified motive of interpersonal utility, one can see how, the use of mobile phones, social networking, and dating applications that are being used by adults of all ages to fulfil personal needs, fall into this category (Anderson, 2015b; Bergdall et al., 2012; Duggan, Lenhart, Lampe, & Ellison, 2015; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Quinn, 2013; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Looking at the role of communication technologies in forming and maintaining romantic relationships, Bergdall et al., (2012) found that cell phones, the internet, and social networking sites were used extensively by emerging adults to manage, deepen, and further explore their intimate relationships. The study concluded that "communication technology is a vital part of how young adults relate to one another", and because of this, future research must consider the implications of rapidly evolving technologies on adult populations (Bergdall et al., 2012, p. 580).

Examining attitudes and perceptions of midlife adults on their social media use, Quinn (2013) found that social media applications "are being rapidly adopted by adults at older ages, and use is emerging in use patterns different from that of youth" (p. 388). These patterns of use documented in this study indicate that internet communication technologies are used in many ways to create and maintain interpersonal relationships among individuals in the age group studied. Quinn (2013) concluded that "midlife adults use internet communication technologies to rekindle and sustain reconnections" and that these findings "not only demonstrate the breadth of uses for these technologies, but also how they might be utilized differently at various points in the life course" (p. 414).

Fewer studies have looked at how older adult's use communication technologies, possibly because they are the slowest adopters of these technologies (Perrin & Duggan, 2015). However, in her study looking at older adults' attitudes toward smartphones, Anderson (2015b) found that "82% of smartphone-owning seniors described their phone as freeing" (p. 1). Further, Anderson (2015b) asserted that, "when asked to describe their smartphone as connecting or distracting, older users are significantly more likely to choose connecting as the best descriptor" (p. 1). Although more research needs to be done to better understand how older adults use communication technologies, considering the rate at which older adults are adopting smartphone and other communication technologies, along with the findings of this study, indicating that older adults have very positive attitudes toward these technologies, it is apparent that older adults are and will continue to use smartphones and the internet (Anderson, 2015b; Perrin & Duggan, 2015).

Looking at parent's use of social media and networking sites, Duggan et al. (2015) reported that "among all U.S. adults including both parents and non-parents, 66% indicate using

some type of social media" (p. 2). This study further found that parents, especially mothers, are heavy users of social media networks, stating that 94% of Facebook-using parents surveyed, share, post or comment, with 70% reporting doing so frequently or sometimes (Duggan et al., 2015). Further this study found that parents who use social media networks often do so to connect with family and friends as well as seek social support (Duggan et al., 2015). Taking a closer look at mothers in particular Duggan et al. (2015) asserted that "mothers give and receive support on social media" as they seek and share parenting advice as well as connection (p. 2). These findings of parental social media use correlate with Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) motive for communication technology use, of interpersonal utility as they "indicate that the users are meeting a need by using the site as a source of information" as well as to gain social support from other parents (Duggan et al., 2015; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008, p. 174).

When looking at the research on the many ways communication technologies including the internet and smartphones, are being used by today's adult population it becomes clear that there are almost an innumerable amount of uses for such technologies (Lebo, 2015; Perrin & Duggan, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2015; Purcell, 2014). Thus, it becomes even more imperative to understand why adults use these communication technologies and how these technologies are impacting those around them.

Why We Use Technology. In an effort to understand why people use and adopt information technologies, Davis (1989) created the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) which primarily utilizes two variables, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, to determine the level of user acceptance for a given technology. This has been demonstrated to be a valid model of measuring and predicting the acceptance of information technology systems

11

with slight revisions to the model reflecting maturity and growth over time (King & He, 2006; Legris, Ingham, & Collerette, 2003; Lu, Yu, Liu, & Yao, 2003; Szajna, 1996; Tsai, Wang, & Lu, 2011). Although the TAM has been proven to be a useful model in understanding use behavior of information technology systems, Legris et at. (2003) conclude that because the TAM only explains 40% of the variance in use, there is a need to integrate this model "into a broader one which would include variables related to both human and social change processes" (p. 191). Further critiques of the model suggest that human characteristics such as attitudes and intentions play a large role in determining use behavior of technology; thus, it behooves researchers to consider additional models when looking to answer the question of why people use technology (Lu et al., 2003; Szajna, 1996; Tsai et al., 2011).

Another theory that has been used to explore why people use technology is the uses-and-gratification model. Rubin (2002) explains that, this model "draws a distinction between concepts that are antecedents to behavior (e.g., uses and gratifications sought) and those that are consequents of behavior (e.g., gratifications obtained)" to explain motives behind peoples' use of a given technology (as cited in Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008, p. 170). Put simply, the uses-and-gratifications theory assumes people use technology to gratify needs and wants.

While using the uses-and-gratifications model to analyze differences in motives behind the internet use of light and heavy users, Stafford (2008) states that the internet "in comparison to telephones, is something considerably more than just a communication resource", thus communication is seen as only a part of the online world as a whole (p. 13). This statement puts into context the findings that both heavy and light users of the internet report being motivated primarily by process gratifications, such as searching and surfing, with differences in the two

groups being present when looking at gratifications from social motives, like connecting with friends via websites and chatting (Stafford, 2008).

In another examination of internet use employing the uses-and-gratifications model, Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) found five motives of internet use: "interpersonal utility, pass time, information seeking, convenience, and entertainment" (p. 185). Personal characteristics and attitudes were found to correlate with specific motives for using the internet such as perceptions of media use, unwillingness to communicate, and affinity toward and satisfaction with the internet (Papachrissi & Rubin, 2000). These correlations seem to echo Rosengren's (1974) statement that, "according to uses and gratifications, communication needs interact with social and psychological factors to produce motives for communicating", and in the present study indicate, personality characteristics may play a part in determining how and why an individual uses the internet (as cited in Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000, p. 180). Extrapolating this finding, Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) conclude that "these findings highlight the potential of the internet as a social medium that can augment our socializing capabilities", thus possibly explaining the vast success of social media networks seen today (p. 193).

Applying the uses-and-gratifications model to the social media networks MySpace and Facebook, Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) results affirm earlier findings indicating that technology is often used to meet specific needs of the user, in this case, "findings indicate that users are meeting a friend need" and/or "meeting a need by using the site as a source of information" (p. 174). These results, contribute to the body of research findings that, indicate users of technologies such as the internet, social media networks, and smartphones do so to meet both social and personal needs, and use these technologies in such a way that reflects the personality, cultural, and attitudinal characteristics of the individual users at play when these

technologies are used (Kang & Jung, 2014; Nassiri, Hashembeik, & Siadat, 2012; Papcharissi & Rubin, 2000; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008).

Narrowing their field of study down to smartphone use, Kang and Jung (2014) found that this technology is being used to meet every level of Maslow's hierarchy of needs including that of self-actualization. Further, Kang and Jung (2014) conclude that "the smartphone is an individualistic medium even though it is used for social interactions and collectivistic purposes" (p. 384). This view of smartphone technology, combine with evidence that the smartphone is playing a part in meeting all conceivable forms of human needs, begs the question; what impact is this technology having on its users and the families of users?

Impact of Technology. Understanding the impact technology has, becomes increasingly important as the advancement of technology seems to take place at an ever-accelerating rate. As a result, in almost all fields of study, researchers are examining the impact technology is having on everything from ecosystems and societies to psychopathologies (Kaylor, Jeglic, & Collins, 2016; Korte, Spiteller, & Coulston, 2000; Muhammad, Zahari, & Sharif, 2013). Taking a more colloquial look at technology's impact on the human condition, Turkle (2011) asserted "we make our technologies, and they, in turn, shape us" she then goes on to conclude that "we expect more from technology and less from each other" (p. 19; p. 295). Attempting to address phenomena such as these, researchers in social science fields have thus begun their own investigation into how technology impacts us socially and relationally.

Although positive impacts of technology are what oftentimes drive adoption rates and sales, and have been documented by researchers in a variety of contexts; researchers are also finding negative impacts of technology use in both human pathologies and relationships (Blumer, Hertlein, Smith, & Allen, 2014; Hertlein & Webster, 2008). Increasingly, therapists are

seeing clients who are presenting with Internet-related concerns, thus illuminating the need for a

model to explain and predict the impact technology is having on individuals and their

relationships (Blumer et al., 2014; Hertlein & Webster, 2008). One such model attempting to

conceptualize the effect technology has on family life is the sociotechnological model (Lanigan,

2009).

In this model, are four components that attempt to explain how technologies "affect family

life: technology characteristics, individual traits, family factors, and extrafamilial influences"

(Lanigan, 2009, p. 588). Using the sociotechnological model allows researchers to examine the

impact a given technology has on an individual and family by exploring the interplay between

individual traits such as personality, goals, and attitudes; the characteristics of the technology or

its capabilities and uses; family factors such as family processes, stages of development; and

extrafamilial influences such as the workplace, marketplace or community (Lanigan, 2009). In

its attempt to be inclusive of many other models explaining technology adoption and use, the

sociotechnological model becomes very individualistic in nature, only allowing for a limited

look and understanding of how technologies affect an individual and thus their family and

extrafamilial systems. To gain a more systemic understanding of the impact technology has on

an individual, and relationships that individual is a part of, a more nuanced framework is needed.

Taking a systemic approach to understand the impact technology has on individuals and

families, Hertlein (2012) introduced a multitheoretical model for understanding the technology in

couple and family life. This model was later refined and renamed the Couple and Family

Technology Framework (CFT Framework) (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). At its core the CFT

Framework looks at technology use in terms of ecological influences that are influenced by and

influence, changes to both structure and process (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). This framework

15

broadly sees technology adoption into people's lives as a factor that influences a multiplicity of

behaviors rather than just intentions and usage (Hetlein & Blumer, 2014). The changes to

structure that are suggested to occur by this model due to technology use are redefined rules,

redefined boundaries around the family system, and redefined roles. Similarly, the changes to

process as seen by this model are relationship initiation, relationship maintenance, and

relationship dissolution (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). Further, within the CFT Framework,

relationship maintenance is seen to affect both commitment and intimacy in the relationship

(Hertlein & Blumer, 2014).

Hertlein (& Blumer, 2014; & Stevenson, 2010) suggest seven A's in the construction of the

ecological influences within the CFT Framework. They are: "accessibility, affordability,

anonymity, acceptability, approximation, ambiguity, and accommodation" (p. 78). Each of these

ecological elements associated with technology use comes with both relationship benefits and

challenges, allowing for the technology to have both a positive and negative effect on a given

relationship (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). The common component of these as comes in that these

elements often are outside of the relationship, thus are ecological in nature and brought to the

relationship regardless of intent. It is these ecological influences that spur Bauerlein's (2011)

complaint that "the frequent phenomenon of people in public handling private matters…the tool

encourages it" (p. xii).

Changes to process and structure as a result of technology use can be seen individually,

relationally, and societally. Further examining changes to process, it becomes evident that

individual oriented process changes can take on a variety of facades (Bauerlein, 2011; Hertlein &

Blumer, 2014; Turkle, 2011). This is often seen as people are engaged with their technology

while at social events; the ability to have a constant electronic connection affects the quality of

the time they are spending as they attempt to multi task, paying partial attention to each task they are engaged in (Bauerlein, 2011; Pew Research Center, 2012; Turkle, 2011). This kind of behavior is suggested to contribute to feelings of guilt, neglect, and disengagement, as well as decrease one's ability to concentrate, experience intimacy and solitude, and while at the same time decrease their quality of work (Bauerlein, 2011; Turkle 2011). Changes to relational processes have similar affects as individual processes but now affect multiple people in a system. Bauerlein (2011) suggests a common relational process change with an illustration of a woman at a coffee shop, "with the screen disengaging her from the surroundings, others nearby have no gatekeeping power" thus affecting how others around her in a social sphere relate to her in that moment (p. xiii). Changes in relational processes can thus manifest themselves as changes in emotional closeness during communication, disengagement or distraction, as well as affect relationships as one multitasks, and allows for intimacy in the relationship (Bauerlein, 2011; Turkle, 2011). Finally, Turkle (2011) suggests that an emerging pattern of technology dependence in today's society exists. This pattern of dependence can thus be viewed as a change in societal processes due to technology use.

Changes to structure as seen individually are evident in the way technology is always on and always with us providing a constant connection to others and thus making us constantly interruptible (Bauerlein, 2011). These changes to individual structure due to technology use have caused a "revision of etiquette assumptions" and thus caused an alteration in individuals' behavior toward technology (Birkerts, 2015, p. 34). Illustrating this change in human behavior due to technology use, Bauerlein (2011) assets that "like the servant's bell, its chime or ditty is a summons" for those who adopt and use smartphone technology today (p. 212). Relationally focused, changes to structure occur as relational rules, boundaries, and roles are redefined to

make room for technologies constant companionship. At the societal level, changes to structure due to technology are evident as changes to social norms and etiquette take place (Birkerts, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2012; Rainie & Zickuhr, 2015). Birkerts (2015) illustrates this idea when stating that because of technology, "the same hours-later or day-later response that had been perfectly acceptable is now often seen as rude" (p. 34). Thus, using the CFT Framework, it becomes evident the great impact technology has on individuals, relationships, and society. This impact technology is having on humans relationally, needs to be further explored and understood.

Research Trends

Trends in research on smartphone and other new technologies in use today, focus primarily on three main relational constellations, individuals, couples, and children/adolescents. Within studies utilizing these populations, a plethora of variables exist, from technologies effect on individual psychopathologies, couples' relationship issues, and issues around risks children encounter regarding technology use (Hertlein & Webster, 2008; Morgan, 2013; Thomee, Eklof, Gustafsson, Nilsson, & Hagberg, 2007). Although this research provides a much-needed look at technologies effect on human relationships, a more thorough and systemic examination is needed.

Studies that examine technologies impact on individuals tend to focus on psychopathologies, personality characteristics, addiction, attachment, and marginalized populations such as older adults, among others. Psychopathologies that have been studied alongside technology use include depression, sleep disorders, as well as overall psychological well-being (Choi & Lim, 2016; Thomee et al., 2007). Addictions studied in the context of technology use include smartphone/technology addiction and sex addiction to name but a few

(Bain & Leung, 2015; Young, 2008). Recently, personality characteristics and attachment have been studied in conjunction with technology use to get a clearer understanding of how technology use is both affected by, and effecting individual's personality traits (Chopik & Peterson, 2014; Nassiri et al., 2012). Finally, individual population demographics such as age and ethnicity are being examined together with technology use to get a more complete picture of who is using technology and in what way they are using it; one population being more frequently targeted for study are elderly adults (Bergdall et al., 2012; Wu, Damnee, Kerherve, Ware, & Rigaud, 2015).

Research looking to examine technologies role in human relationships often focus primarily on couple relationships. Within these studies, many of them are limited in their scope to cybersex issues, infidelity, and cyber addiction (Blumer et al., 2014; Hertlein & Webster, 2008; Whitty, 2005). Further research on couples' relationships and technology use, specifically looking at online gaming behaviors, found that aspects of addiction, and relationship intimacy seem to be effected by technology use in couple relationships (Hertlein & Hawkins, 2012). Taking an overall look at research on technologies impact on couple relationships, Hertlein and Ancheta (2014) found both advantages and disadvantages in the role technology currently plays in many couple relationships. Other relationships technology effects, outside of couple relationships, have an even smaller research base.

These other types of relationships that have been researched primarily center on parent's relationships with children and their social environment. In one such study, Ozdamli and Yildiz (2014) found that parents view the use of mobile technologies to facilitate communication between their children's school and family life positively, and even feel this collaboration is a necessity. A closer look at research examining parent-child relationships and technology, reveal

19

trends focusing on children's use of technology and the mediating role parents play (Delen, Kaya, Ritter, & Sahin, 2015; Plowman et al., 2010; Valcke et al., 2010). Looking at these relationships, Genc (2014) found that a contributing factor to the variation in the role parents play in monitoring a child's technology use are parent's own perceptions. Much of this research, looking at parent-child relationships in the context of technology, are in response to research examining risks children and adolescents face as they use smartphones and other new technologies.

An additional area of concentration in technology research and its effect on people is the focus on kids at risk. Risks found to be associated with child and adolescent technology use include cyberbullying, contact with strangers, and sexual risks among others (Leung & Lee, 2011; Livingstone & Smith, 2014; Morgan, 2013). Considering technologies role in children's risk, Livingstone and Smith (2014) found that "despite the rise in children and young people's use of mobile and online technologies, there is little compelling evidence that online risks are increasing commensurately", however, they do suggest that mobile and online risks are increasingly connected to offline risks faced by today's children (p. 646). These findings along with other research being done in this area suggest that the addition of an online component of a child's life broaden the context of where children face risks in social situations (Leung & Lee, 2011; Livingstone & Smith, 2014; Morgan, 2013).

Current research trends focusing on technologies effect on relationships and children, although moving in a positive direction, dramatically fall short in their attempt to fully evaluate technologies impact on society and the family. Researchers, in their attempt to understand how smartphone and new technologies are affecting parent-child and couple relationships, as well as risks kids face as a result of technology use, have failed to consider the child-parent relationship

20

and how parents use of smartphones and new technologies might be affecting the child. In a world of smartphones in the palm of every hand, and the accelerating rate of adoption of such technologies, it seems we have neglected to consider what effect our technology use may be having on our children.

Purpose of Study

In today's technologically advanced world with smartphones and tablets serving "as portal, one moves into the virtual with fluidity and on the go" a "parent, partner, or child glances down and is lost to another place, often without realizing that they have taken leave" (Turkle, 2011, p. 160; p. 161). It seems more people, and most notably parents, have been "plunged into a state of continuous partial attention" that has been described as "continually staying busy-keeping tabs on everything while never truly focusing on anything" as a result of dividing ones' attention, keeping an eye on the physical world while taking leave in the digital made possible by the smartphones in their hands (Bauerlein, 2011, p. 91; p. 92). This divided attention, as parents attempt to multitask their way to unlimited productivity, comes with switching costs as they consciously or unconsciously switch their attention from one task to another, often from the digital world of their smartphone to the physical world where their children reside (Bauerlein, 2011; Meyer & Evans, 2001). The purpose of this study is to examine parents' awareness of potential costs of their smartphone use, by ascertaining parents' perceptions of the effect their smartphone use has on their children.

Research Question

What effects do parents perceive their smartphone use to have on their children?

21

This question was developed and refined first through personal quandary of the author followed by extensive research of both scholarly articles, public record data, and technology focused authors such as Mark Bauerlein and Sherry Turkle.

Chapter 3: Method

Philosophy

To examine the phenomena of parental smartphone use and the perceptions parents hold regarding how said use may or may not affect their children, the author has employed a Social Constructivist philosophy to this research. Creswell (2013) posits, this philosophy dictates that researchers "seek understanding of the world in which they live and work" and that individuals "develop subjective meanings of their experiences-meanings directed toward certain objects or things" (p. 24). Aligning with Creswell's views of Social Constructivist philosophy guiding research design, this study was designed to gain insight into the subjective meanings smartphone using parents create and hold regarding their smartphone use and parenting, to better understand the digital world in which we currently live. To reach this aim, I conducted individual interviews with parents who use smart phones.

Participants

Twelve parents who use smartphones participated in this study (N=12). Participants ranged in age from 26-54 years of age. All participants were the parent of at least one child under the age of 18, with the majority being female (n=10) having on average. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling. Most participants were students from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas with ten participants having attained a bachelor's degree. Study participants reported a level of comfort using smartphone technology with nine reporting being very comfortable, two highly comfortable, and one reporting being not comfortable using smartphones. Participants reported using smartphones an average of two and a half hours per day, with each use estimated to be an average of 21 minutes in duration. The most frequently

23

reported smartphone use activities in this study were social media, texting, phone calls, media consumption and capture (picture and video) GPS, and internet use (browsing, shopping, and reading news).

Design and Procedure

Given the exploratory nature of this study, the qualitative design of the study employed individual interviews of participants aimed at gaining insight into attitudes, feelings, beliefs, experiences, and reactions of participants to further the understanding of what effects parental smartphone use may be having on today's children. Individual interviews yielded common themes held between individual parent participants and were used to illustrate the collective view of smartphone use in today's parenting.

Individual Interviews. Participants were recruited to participate in individual interviews that were conducted at the Center for Individual, Couple and Family Counseling located on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus. These interviews were conducted by the author, a graduate student in the Couple and Family Therapy Program, and capped at a maximum of one hour in duration.

Prior to the individual interviews, demographic data was collected, see Appendix B. Participants were asked to respond to 20 open-ended questions from the semi-structured interview guide read by the interviewer, see Appendix C. This semi-structured interview guide was created by the author and his research chair Dr. Hertlein. Questions in the guide were inspired by the writings of Sherry Turkle and Mark Bauerlein and organized using the Couples and Family Technology Framework developed by Hertlein and Blumer (2014). These questions aimed to ascertain individual participant attitudes, practices, and opinions regarding their

24

smartphone use in the presence of their children, and follow-up questions were used to clarify information presented.

Analysis

Recorded data from the individual interviews was reviewed and transcribed by graduate students on the research team and the author, prior to further analysis. Preliminary thematic analysis of the transcripts occurred, and, emergent themes were identified. Preliminary thematic analysis of the transcriptions informed the qualitative values coding of the data. Emergent themes were added to the coding structure as they were identified and coded; data was cross checked between independent coders to resolve any discrepancies. Coded data was used to identify themes in the transcribed discourse that were most relevant to answering the research question.

Rigor. In order to address rigor as Anfara, Brown and Mangione (2002) suggest, codes were cross-checked to verify themes using a peer examination method to address the dependability of the study. Multiple researchers, the author, a fellow graduate student, and the committee chair, independently coded data and codes were checked for accuracy between coders in order to verify codes and the subsequent themes. Researchers engaging in the coding process for the study were both graduate MFT students and a faculty member, with a possible bias towards systemic thinking. Transferability of the current study was established though the gathering and presentation of thick, descriptive results. The code-recode strategy was employed as well as peer examination during the analysis of the data to ensure the dependability of the results. Further, credibly and confirmability of the study were addressed using triangulation as questions from the semi-structured interview guide were developed with multiple members of the research team, the author and the committee chair (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002).

25

Role of the Researcher

As the principal investigator, I, with assistance from my faculty chair, developed the semi-structured interview questions that were used to elicit participants' understanding of the phenomenon. I also facilitated the individual interview sessions. Following the data collection, I transcribed the audio recorded interviews, coded the data and conducted the thematic analysis of coded data. This process is largely subjective and subject to researcher bias. To compensate for this inherent bias, additional aid in transcription, coding, and data analysis, as well as committee oversight was provided by research team members, advisors, and my thesis committee. In addition to this, it is equally important to briefly introduce myself as the principle investigator and author of this text to address some inherent biases that have led me to investigate this particular phenomenon.

Personal History. I am a 30-year-old, heterosexual, white, married, religious, male, with two children. I am currently a graduate student working towards a master's degree in MFT. Personal values regarding individual and relational health have been instilled in me as a result of my familial and religious upbringing that undoubtedly have led me to seek an education in this field. I have long been an enthusiast of consumer-electronics and technology and have only recently began to question the effects technology is having in my life. Finding myself and my wife on our smartphones while my infant child was playing at our feet in the living room of our home sparked by interest in this inquiry and the present study ensued.

Chapter 4: Results

The goal of this study was to examine parents' perceptions of the effect their smartphone use has on their children by inquiring about parents' awareness of costs smartphone use may be having due to cognitive switching from a smartphone screen to things in the physical world around them. To accomplish this goal, questions were developed in a semi-structured interview guide and detected themes in the subsequent interviews were organized to better understand the perceptions held by parent participants. Five primary themes emerged: (1) Disengagement, (2) Concern for Future, (3) Change in Social Norms, (4) Boundaries, and (5) Cognitive Dissonance.

Disengagement

One of the most common themes reported by participants was a concern and desire for connection. This need for connection is what drives us to create and maintain relationships (Cacioppo & Patrick, 2008). Technology provides a means by which an exponentially greater number of personal connections can be initiated, formed, and maintained. Examining the level of connection participants felt with face-to-face communication versus electronically mediated communication most participants said they would prefer to engage in face-to-face communication over communication through technology. Elements such as convenience and availability aided in their decision to engage frequently in communication via smartphone. Such communication was deemed by participants as "lacking depth" or "surface level" communication. While using their smartphones for communication, entertainment, or for work or school, some participants reported being disengaged from the present moment and distracted. This distraction was not always immediately recognized by the participant, and in some cases, was pointed out to them through the actions of other parents, the actions of their children, or the actions of a younger generation. These participants that did not directly report being disengaged

because of their smartphones, and often recounted times their children, spouse, or parent friends brought the disengagement to their awareness. One such participant recounted, "it made me think when my daughter told me mommy you're always on your phone, watch me!"

Many participants in this study reported that using a smartphone left them feeling less connected or missing the deep connection afforded via face-to-face interaction. One participant, speaking of their smartphone use, reported, "you really start to disengage … I feel like it keeps people less connected." Further, study participants reported that, although technology connects people over great distances and almost instantly, the depth of the communication had over smartphone interaction was lacking when compared to face-to-face communication. A participant shared that "it's very on the surface stuff, I feel like it's very difficult to be deeper connected through technology." Thus, smartphone communication left participants feeling that there is a lack of connection or a lack of communication, despite being constantly connected and communicating via their smartphones. One participant concluded:

> I don't know if it's actually worth the costs it has in families and how they connect now, or maybe it's just a different kind of connection that people have but … I don't think people are as in-tune with people's emotions and feelings and actually actively listening to each other because they are so engrained in this immediate gratification world of technology.

Another participant reported, "we feel more connected but we're actually more disconnected by having smartphones at our fingertips … we're missing so many opportunities for human connection." This desire to stay connected to others seemed to influence participant's smartphone use behavior, which use behavior often left participants feeling distracted or even disengaged from the present. One sentiment was that "families are disconnected more because all

we do is keep in touch via Facebook or email, so we don't actually get to see each other and catch up."

Being and feeling distracted and disengaged from the present was also reported by some participants as purposely engaged in as a coping mechanism, both to avoid present stressors and to relax after a long day. One participant reported, "I usually use it as a distraction method, away from something I don't what to do." Purposeful disengagement was reported to be done in public with strangers as one participant stated, "or just to be able to ignore somebody, oh look, if you see a stranger and you don't want to make that awkward eye contact it's easy to just look down at your phone and kid of use it in that way." Another stated, "if I wanted to get out of a conversation with somebody I was with, I mean I might even fake that I have a message," as well as with family and friends, "I think I've seen parents get on phones to shut down from dealing with kids," "I know a lot of moms that just, oh I need some wine, but during those times they're on their phone too. Like it's kinda become a trend and a coping mechanism in a way." Some participants even expressed that they felt this type of behavior was needed:

> If you go to any park you'll see mothers on their smartphone and you'll hear them mommy shaming and all that but it's like, you don't know that I didn't spend six straight hours watching my kid throw a ball in a hoop and now they're occupied and I can do something else. So, I think there is a lot of judgment on mothers for escaping that way, but um I also have felt the necessity to do that.

Thus, smartphone technology was reported as being used as a means of mental escape and that the disengagement and distraction was not always seen as negative or a relational cost to technology use. This dichotomy possibly contributes to the lack of insight into personal and

relational costs this smartphone-induced disengagement may have in the lives of some participants.

Some participants were cognizant, through self-reflection, of non-fiduciary costs smartphones are having in their lives, "I feel like whenever I kind of am on my phone it distracts me. Like, just, if I'm in Facebook, Facebook is the worst one. You know, cause you're scrolling and it's just the endless scroll of feed and you never get to the bottom of it, so you could just sit there forever. I almost have to pull myself out of it like 'Oh my God'. Like I've been doing this for like 30 minutes now", and as one participant put it:

Sometimes my smartphone distracts me in class. A couple of times I have gotten off track. I'm like oh my gosh! Pay attention! You know, or I get like a text, and I'll, it's like definitely, cause then you know it throws me off, cause I'm in a lecture and it's like oh wait, where were we? What did he say? It's not a good thing when I get distracted.

Those participants who seemed to lack awareness of these costs in their own life identified the same costs such as disengagement, distraction, lack of communication, and lack of connection in the lives of others. Such as fellow parents observed in public places like parks and restaurants, the participants' own children through observation of their kids' behavior or their children pointing out problematic parental behavior, or more generally, the relationship with technology the rising generation has, as exemplified in this participants dialog:

I could use my mom as an example. She comes over to visit, to like visit the baby and stuff, and she-she's really into Weight Watchers. She's lost like 100 pounds, which is crazy, and awesome, but she'll come over, and she's like on the W-Weight Watchers like Connect. It's called Connect, it's like their version of Facebook, and she's just like really glued into her phone, and I'm like "Mom" (laughs) "Like, you wanna visit?" Because we

only see her like every other weekend or something for, you know, she comes over for a few hours, but-but she's really on her phone a lot. And I'm like, "you're missing our visiting time" and, you know, seems like sometimes when you visit with people, it's like what they do just sit in a room together and just scroll through their Facebook… It doesn't feel good as her child.

Although not all participants recognized the ways in which they disengage from the present with the use of smartphone technology, many participants shared experiences of instances of disengagement and distraction from the physical world around them when their smartphones were present "sometimes I'm not fully present, I'm doing other things on my phone", one participant recalled.

Additionally, another participant stated, "watching the kids where I'll space out … they'll be like mommy, mommy, mommy, mommy, mommy, and it's like hold on let me finish this text, I'm totally disengaged with them and in my conversation." Becoming aware of and discussing the relational costs of disengaging from the present moment with children, partners, or family and friends, seemed to lead participants to expressing a concern for current behavior that is seen, the potential for that behavior to be exhibited by children, and the effect that might have on the future. Directly addressing this one participant reported "that's when it kinda became more problematic and I put in more boundaries".

Concern for Future

While considering the social cost of smartphone use and behaviors involving smartphone use, such as disengagement and distraction, participants expressed concern for the future and for children who engage with smartphone technology today:

31

Kids aren't learning how to handle themselves… they are not learning social skills and

social decorum. Not only because the parents are on their cell phones and handling

business but because they've given their kids' cell phones or electronics or games to keep

them under control…I see it as lazy parenting.

One participant explained, "I'm trying to teach them not to get lost in their phone, be present in

the here and now…Millennials are missing that now days," "I feel like the cost to children is

high." Participants frequently made comparisons between social norms observed and followed

during their childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood, juxtaposed the technologically-laden

social norms of today, "I would be curious to see how this next generation integrates it into

marriage and parenting, verses our age, because it's new for us, whereas they've grown up with a

cell phone in their hand. So, that I think will be interesting to see how that develops." Concern

for the future was expressed frequently, by many participants, when considering the change that

has taken place in the social landscape since the proliferation of smartphone technology. Many

participants expressed concern for children in the future and the learned behavior they may be

picking up when using technology:

It's normal to come home and pick up a phone and kind of tune out… when they are

watching iPad they will completely tune out. It's like hello, hello, hello, so yeah, it's

concerning… That's normal for them, they've seen it their whole life, so that's probably

what they'll grow up to do.

When these costs of smartphone use were realized, the participants seemed to exhibit a

greater level of concern for children and the future of our society. While speaking about the

changes brought about by smartphone use and the costs of said use one participant asserted, "I

think it's only going to get more and more prevalent and I think kids just need guidance…having set parameters in place helps".

Some participants expressed developing technology-specific boundaries and rules as a result of their concern for negative behaviors being learned, engaged in, and becoming more socially acceptable. One participant reported "I'm trying to teach my kids not to get lost in their phones and to be present". The participant later reported creating a technology-specific boundary to help teach this principle, "there are no phones at the dinner table…also when watching movies together I have to say look you're either gonna watch it and be immersed in this or you need to put your phone away".

Additionally, many participants expressed a desire for their children to exhibit more pro-social behavior when dealing with smartphone and other technology in the future, than what they currently engage in and model for their children, "we build this kind of addiction to it and then our children see that and are like oh there's a game, I want my own games… so I think it kinda becomes a cycle, and they kinda repeat what we do." In an effort to avoid this, some participants reported "putting limits on time, and limits or using it for certain things," when letting their children use smartphone and other technology.

Change in Social Norms

Participants in this study frequently expressed differences in social norms resulting from the proliferation of smartphone and other technology. Overall, parent participants reported feeling that they are expected to be available always, both day and night:

> I feel like it is because it creates this sense of urgency that would not have been there ten
>
> years ago, when it wasn't has convenient. Because before you'd be like oh well ill just
>
> get to it when I get into work, if I don't have access to it. Or oh I'll get back to you

tomorrow when that's my time to respond to people but now it feels like this sense of

urgency and maybe it's just a personal thing where I feel obligated to respond now more

than I would have before.

This expectation was reported to be viewed as a change in social norms, which has taken place

within the lifetime of the participants, "when I was growing up we didn't have cellphones and

you just left a message on a machine and people got back to you when they could," "now I feel

like I've got to be available 24/7 and I've got to text back right away or I'm ignoring someone

and being rude." One participant said, "I feel like a jerk if I didn't, or I feel like I, you know, I

don't like ignoring people … I just don't like the thought of a text just sitting on my phone

waiting." Another participant stated, "I don't want to keep people waiting … if you get a text and

you don't respond in three or four hours you're purposefully ignoring it." This participant

continued to assert that there is a "social construct that everybody is available within four hours

… people are supposed to be much more accessible now." This feeling of needing to always be

available whether it be for work, friends, or children, was reported to be associated with a

persistent sense of urgency experienced by participants, "I feel like I have to respond you know,

it's like, it puts that urgency behind it." Another participant responded, "I kind of have an inner

fear, like I have a duty to respond to things … and respond to them right away, so its urgency I

guess."

Participants alluded to a profound sense of urgency, which is felt and present today that

may not have been just a decade ago. One participant reported, "if someone from thirty years ago

was watching this they'd be like what is happening? ... If we were flash frozen and then some

future civilization came back they would just see us all sitting and looking at our phones." This

sense of urgency reported by participants was particularly prominent in the contexts of potential

emergencies, work, and school. In regard to hearing their smartphone, a participant reported, "I would really have a sense of urgency if I heard it. Like, oh I need to pick it up." Findings from this study indicate that many participants created a mental hierarchy of communication methods to help determine the level of urgency that is socially expected to be felt, depending on who was initiating the communication and in what form the communication was sent. Although, many participants reported using some sort of hierarchical scheme to manage the sense of urgency felt when a communication was initiated, there was not a uniform hierarchy that was present fully. Thus, each individual participant expressed feeling different levels of urgency under different circumstances and it seems the only way to truly elevate the sense of urgency is to engage in the initiated communication by checking the text or email notification or answering the ringing phone.

Therefore, it seems that in order to alleviate the sense of urgency felt by participants more attention is being directed to attending to rings, dings, and alerts notifying the user of incoming information, as one participant put it, "if it rings or chirps or anything, it like breaks my whole Zen moment." Participants reported directing their attention in the form of checking behaviors, "I am checking email or a voicemail or something or just checking my own status update." Some participants even reported checking their smartphone, even when they have not been prompted to do so from a notification, "I might like once an hour, once every two hours just press the light on my phone to see if I got any messages." This constant checking behavior is reinforced repeatedly and continually draws one's attention away from the physical here-and-now and into the digital world of smartphones, "I found that I'm checking it more because I carry it," causing some participants to become concerned with this behavior and attempts to mitigate or stop it were reported.

Boundaries

Rules and boundaries around technology use were reported by many participants as being created and upheld to lessen the negative relational effects of smartphone use. Speaking about their child's smartphone use, one participant said, "I realized that she's wanting to do it at home when we are supposed to have family time, so that's when it kinda became more problematic and I put in more boundaries." Another participant reported, "family time is where it's kinda invasive … having the set parameters in place helps." This study found that older parent participants reported creating and using technology-specific rules and boundaries more frequently and more deliberately to protect significant times such as meal times, before bed, and "family time" in general:

> We've got a strict policy at home that when we're having dinner or during the dinner hour no phones are at the table and in fact they are away from the table, so you can't even see things pop up. So, everything goes on the pie plate, all phones are on the pie plate…also, when we are watching movies together as a family nobody can have their smartphone.

Although the rules and boundaries specific to technology use differed from participant to participant, all boundaries and rules were reported as intended to help stay connected to the present and deepen the relationships with people physically present. Turning off notifications, using do-not-disturb functions, physically containing or distancing oneself from the smartphone, were all reported methods for creating boundaries around smartphone use, "I've got nighttime parameters…at eight o'clock at night its gone, phones aren't allowed in bedrooms … and my phone is turned off at nine pm." Another participant stated, "I have to physically remove myself … I turn off all notifications on my phone … and I use an old school planner, calendar, to kind

of remind me of my appointments." To further protect meal times, one participant reported "we implemented a no technology rule during meals, and so, that's helped a lot," "we just don't do technology during meals." Speaking of the results of setting and keeping boundaries around technology use one participant stated that after implementing the rule "no technology during meals, me and my son have had some really great conversations that I realized I was missing out on." Some participants reported taking technology-specific boundaries a step further: "we implemented like the no technology rule when we're together," in an effort to negate any possible cost to familial relationships.

Despite the creation and enforcement of rules and boundaries regarding smartphone use, most participants could, relatively quickly and with ease, find examples and times in their lives where smartphones were intrusive in their personal lives. "I was trained to respond right away because of work … I've learned boundaries … now I don't respond right away … just because I have a phone and I seen the message does not mean I am going to respond right away." Another participant stated, "I feel like my solitude sometimes is infringed on by my phone," while another participant said, "at night … I have to put it on do-not-disturb because I find that I get actually irritated … sometimes I've just had to put it away or put it on do-not-disturb or silent just to avoid that." Speaking about her smartphone intruding on her relationship with her husband one participant stated, "The level of intimacy has decreased, I'm going to say yes … unless we both make an effort to put down our phones … its habit to pick up our phone, not habit to sit and talk to each other."

To reduce the intrusion on personal and family time while still getting vital information during times deemed as emergencies, this study found that participants individually created and used a hierarchical guide system to determine when a communication needed to be attended to.

Commenting on this hierarchy, one participant stated, "a text is kind of like, or an email…it's like, you can get back to me whenever, that's kind of the hierarchy I give." They went on to say "if someone calls like three times, it's like, alright, they need to get ahold of me … like, when my mom calls me and I'll go, oh I'll call her back and then she calls three more times, it's like she's telling me I really need you to answer." Although the use of some sort of hierarchy was reported by many participants to help screen incoming interruptions from their smartphone, there was not a unified or agreed upon standard by which these boundary systems were created or used. Some participants reported using the mode of the communication sent to determine the level of importance the information contained within, held, "for me it would probably be a phone call cause if it wasn't serious they would probably just send me a text," one participant stated. Another went on to say, "emergency people should call not text me about an emergency." Other participants reported using methods such as having prior knowledge as to who is calling and why, "if I know one of my family members is, you know sick, or in the hospital, or gonna have a baby, or, you know someone needs help, then I'm more apt to check my phone, and respond promptly," or simply just who it is that is trying to communicate with them, "it just kinda depends on who it is," "if one of my kids is calling me … I know if they're calling me something is up." Through the creation and use of personal boundaries such as a hierarchy to screen incoming information as well as rules to protect times in which families can deepen and strengthen their relationships with one another, participants of this study were found to be addressing issues of raising a family in this modern smartphone age.

Cognitive Dissonance

Finally, a theme of cognitive dissonance was found in both participants who reported having technology-specific boundaries and those who did not. The dichotomous nature of

smartphone use, carrying both benefits and costs presents a unique challenge, as many participants who acknowledged smartphone use carries a heavy relational cost, also reported engaging in smartphone use to relax and deliberately disconnect from stressors around them, "I get home and I want to relax, it's been a long day and I want to check in with my friends … I relax by getting on my phone." While addressing the task of mentally evaluating and managing the pros and cons of smartphone use, one participant stated, "It's a balance … I need to be conscious of it I think." The task of mentally balancing the costs and benefits of smartphone use, although reported as challenging by participants who were cognizant of them, was not shared by all participants, as some participants seemed to view costs of smartphone use as only applying to others, "I am old and I didn't grow up with cell phones so I don't think it's ever totally disengaged me," Regardless of their level of personal insight into the issue of their own smartphone use, participants seemed to experience cognitive dissonance in various forms. This disconnect manifested itself most often in two ways, participants either reported a narrative in which they struggled to manage the effect smartphone use was having in their personal and family life, then when later asked directly if it was a problem reported it not being an issue for them, or, participants identified a group of people who they felt experienced a problem managing smartphone technology, but claimed to not be a part of said group in any way. Thus, it was found the cognitive dissonance that was used most frequently could be summed up in either of these two themes of "them not me" or "yes, but not really."

Yes, But Not Really. Participants who engaged in cognitive dissonance in this way seemed to have some level of insight and knowledge of the personal and relational costs associated with their smartphone use, but when confronted about these costs directly, reported to not be affected by said costs. The marker for this type of cognitive dissonance was a level of

incongruence between participants' statements within the interview. One example of incongruent statements came when asked about times the participant's parenting abilities may have been compromised as a result of their smartphone use, the participant responded, "I'm sure there have probably been one or two occurrences but none that I can actually recall where they have been significant," indicating that this missed time is not significant. Later, when speaking about the potential for these times of parental disengagement causing a child to feel neglected or abandoned, the participant stated, "I think it does, I think when your face is more looking at a phone than seeing them and kind of enjoying the things that they are enjoying and seeing what they're seeing, it does take away from those moments together, and those memories." These two statements seem to oppose each other, on the one hand the participant defends their smartphone use by asserting that time missed in the present moment and spent on a smartphone is not significant, but then when thinking about the effect this time may have on children present, they state that they feel it takes away from moments together and memories that could be significant. In another example of cognitive dissonance, the participant speaking about a time they felt guilty about using their phone in the presence of their child said:

> There's probably one time that I can actually remember that I was on my phone that ok, what she didn't know is that I was trying to download a soundtrack for her but she didn't perceive it that way, and that's fair, so she's like mommy are you on your phone? You're not listening to me, cause she wanted my attention and usually I'm pretty good about it but it stuck out to me that she said that. Like, oh I hadn't noticed that she picked up on that even though it was a different scenario but I wasn't giving her my attention.

Shortly after recounting that experience, the participant tried to quail their feelings of guilt when they stated, "in that moment yeah, later on I was like well it's for you and she kinda cheered up

but I did feel guilty." This participant's description illustrates how even within a personal experience of the negative effects of smartphone usage, they engage in cognitive dissonance that justifies their smartphone use and the associated relational cost.

Another example of this type of cognitive dissonance being used, happened when a participant was asked when, if ever, their smartphone intruded on their life. One participant stated, "It never really intrudes on my family life," but also recalled a time during a family meal when, speaking about their daughter stated, "she would be eating and her head would be down like that, so we had to kibosh that at the dinner table." Once again, although this participant could easily recall a moment a smartphone intruded on their family life when asked directly about it, denied it being an issue. When asked when it is appropriate to interrupt a face-to-face conversation for an incoming communication via smartphone, many participants reported that only situations deemed as emergencies would that be appropriate. A participant shared, "unless it is an emergency or a sick kid it doesn't really, I'm not really involved or invested in it," but when recalling day-to-day times of smartphone use reported that issues involving work or school, "I have to really discipline myself to pull away because there is always stuff to do in school and there is always stuff that you could be doing with work, so I really have to focus … especially at home." In this example, the participant reports that unless it is an emergency the smartphone can wait, but when recalling experiences from their life they admit that when it comes to work or school they must actively try very hard to disengage from smartphone use and pay attention to what is happening in their home and with their family.

Smartphones were reported by participants to negatively affect many subsystems of the family including parent-child relationships as well as couple relationships. One participant recalled times at night before bed when, "a couple times per week … I'll be in bed just watching

our phones instead of talking to each other." When asked if there were other times in their lives

smartphones robbed them of intimacy or solitude the participant reported "no", however, later

reported "when friends are having issues and they feel like they just have access to you 24/7 …

sometimes it feels burdensome." Indicating that there are multiple contexts and instances in

which smartphones are carrying relational costs to their children and spouses, but when asked

directly the participant engages in cognitive dissonance and reports there is no cost. Possibly one

of the most blatant uses of cognitive dissonance was exhibited when a participant stated, "I think

you're always paying attention to your children even when you're not paying any attention to

your children."

　　　Them Not Me. This form of cognitive dissonance seemed to indicate little or no level of

insight on behalf of the participant pertaining to personal or relational costs smartphone use was

having in their lives. This cognitive dissonance was frequently evidenced by participants

identifying costs of smartphone use applying to groups of other people but not themselves, thus,

marked by a "them not me" attitude. Some examples of participants using this cognitive

dissonance theme include participants reported seeing parents disengage from the present and

into their smartphones while at the park with their children; one participant when speaking about

this kind of experience stated, "I knew someone who was at the park and they looked up and

their kid was gone. I mean she had just gone over the hill thank God but, when you realize you

haven't paid attention that full time she was pretty freaked out by that." When asked if they had

ever disengaged at the park or in a similar way, the participant simply stated "no, I put my phone

down for that." Another participant, while addressing the costs of smartphone use, stated, "it's a

different generation or a different time, cause when I was … when my kids were younger we

didn't have those smartphones like they do now." This participant seemed to discount the

possibility of being subject to the same parent-child relationship costs, just because they did not raise a small child in the age of smartphones, despite having and using a smartphone now with children in the home. Speaking of society in general, one participant stated:

> I think a lot of people's lives are consumed by the online electronic world…I feel like we've let it consume our society, and a lot of our society depends on technology and depends on being connected and plugged in, to an extent that some people feel like that's how they connect best with others is over the phone.

In this statement, it appears that the participant views the costs of smartphone and technology use and the changing norms that are associated with it, but only minimally includes themselves in the group for which this an issue. Finally, one participant concluded, "for me the costs don't necessarily outweigh the benefits cause I try to manage and mitigate it." Although it may be possible this participant's efforts to mitigate the negative effects of smartphone use on their family may be working, the way in which they make this statement leaves no chance for error in estimation and seems to be used to excuse the participant from a group who may be affected by smartphone use in an adverse way.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In accordance with other studies, the current study found that participants used smartphones in a variety of contexts including, to seek information, provide entertainment, fill unoccupied time, and to fulfill needs such as for work and school (Papacharissa & Rubin, 2000). Participants of this study reported engaging in smartphone use to create and maintain social relationships, capture and store pictures and videos, listen to music, and read books and articles, among other activities often reported by members of these age groups (Kang & Jung, 2014; Lebo, 2015). These findings appear to indicate that parents of this study use smartphones much the same way as the general population of people in their age groups (Lebo, 2015).

Findings of this study further align with previous research exploring why individuals use technology. Participants of the current study frequently reported convenience as a significant factor when using their smartphones in a variety of contexts and to accomplish many tasks. Convenience as well as a reported desire for connection, attention, and to purposefully disengage from the present could all be considered gratifications sought by users, if using the Uses and Gratification theory as a lens to understand participant's smartphone use (Kang & Jung, 2014; Nassiri, Hashembeik, & Siadat, 2012; Papcharissi & Rubin, 2000; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Further, when examining wants and needs reported by participants in this study, it appears there is a strong element of social connection as well as perceived social expectations as a result of changing social norms that contributes to individuals' use of smartphone technology (Papcharissi & Rubin, 2000; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008).

Examining the impact smartphone use may be having on parent-child relationships, it is important to note the findings of parental disengagement from participants of the present study. Hertlein and Blumer (2014) in their CFT framework outline aspects of affordability and

accessibility that can influence technology promoting closeness or distance with in relationships. Findings of the current study align well with the constructs of accessibility and affordability in the CFT framework, providing a clear understanding of how those constructs play out in the lives of the participants of this study. Namely, that because smartphones are so accessible many parents have and use them in their daily lives. Additionally, by virtue of having a smartphone on one's person at all times the technology affords the user the opportunity to engage with elements and social circles not physically present. Thus, the accessibility and affordability of smartphone technology promote the user to disengage from the present, when the user is a parent it appears that the child is often the one left alone in the physical here and now. Recognizing that children are often the ones who are most affected by their parents taking leave in the digital world of their smartphones for extended periods of time, begs the question what implications this new parental behavior might be having on the emotional attachment that is forming as the child grows.

Although this study did not initially take into account or address Attachment Theory, findings of the present study seem to suggest that parental smartphone use may have critical implications on the formation of children's attachment styles. As made evident in Quiroga and Hamilton-Giachritsis (2016) study on childhood attachment style formation, many factors go into the formation of attachment bonds and ultimately attachment styles. Considering participants from the present study recounted instances with their own children vying for parental attention, one participant reported of her kids, "and their like mommy, mommy, mommy, mommy, mommy! And they're working hard to get my attention". Additionally, another participant of the present study recounted issues with her own mother, now in her later years of life using a smartphone and causing her, as an adult child, to feel neglected. The participant recalled "she comes over to visit…and she's just like really glued into her phone…It doesn't feel good as her

45

child". These experiences from the lives of participants of this study make a compelling argument for the role smartphone use could be having on attachment in children as well as in adults.

Considering the intergenerational aspects of Attachment Theory, it is important to note the accounts of concern as well as observations made by participants of the present study that have intergenerational implications (Merz, Schuengel, & Schulze, 2008). These accounts and concern were often related to learned behaviors of children regarding smartphone use and the way in which they relate and interact with peers and adults. The concern expressed by parent participants of the present study indicate an intergenerational aspect to implications that may involve attachment in the way that children and others are currently relating and may relate to others in the future as technology use becomes more saturated in populations around the world.

Based on the apparent connection Attachment Theory and parental smartphone use may have as indicated in this study, combine with the intergenerational aspects of attachment it becomes important to integrate a transgenerational theory of conceptualization and treatment to address the intricate facets of this phenomena. Elements of Contextual Family Therapy, specifically the third and fourth dimensions of the theory, systems of transactional patterns and relational ethics respectively, appear to address the issues that proceed as a result of the intersection of parental smartphone use and attachment (Le Goff, 2001). Although the application of Contextual Family Therapy generally takes a historical look into past generations, when applied in the context of the present study the theory may aid clinicians and researches alike in conceptualizing implications on future generations current parental smartphone use may have (Le Goff, 2001).Using Contextual Family Therapy as a framework or model, one can see that the relational behaviors involving smartphone use could and may have potential lasting

46

effects on how future generations relate to one another both in romantic relationships as well as in parent-child relationships(McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). These relational affects have the potential to last years, affecting many generations and possibly contributing to clinically significant problems that will be addressed by future couple and relational therapists (Le Goff, 2001; McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). Issues in relationships regarding connection, disengagement, and potential feelings of neglect could all reasonably be addressed using a Contextual Family Therapy lens and aid in the process of promoting understanding between generations affected by issues spurred by parental smartphone use (Le Goff, 2001).

Themes of change in social norms as well as boundaries within the current study can be further examined and understood using the CFT framework (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). These thematic findings seem to practically illustrate the theoretical CFT framework. Allowing clinicians and family researchers to understand how the changes in social norms as a result of the proliferation of smartphone technology may be causing some parents to create and maintain technology specific boundaries to protect their familial relationships while simultaneously allowing the family to benefit from the use of smartphone technology. As hypothesized by the CFT, findings from this study seem to indicate that when technology-specific boundaries are used in the family system negative changes in social norms that have taken place seem to have less of an effect on the parent-child relationship (Hertlein & Blumer, 2014).

Although research examining the use of boundaries as a means to mitigate negative effects of technology use has been limited in its scope, primarily to research on gatekeeping children's access, and use of technology, there are many studies looking at adult or couple relationships in this manner (Fletcher & Blair, 2014; Katz, Felix, & Gubernick, 2014; Leung & Lee, 2011; McDaniel & Coyne, 2016; Morgan, 2013). Taking into account the findings of

47

studies looking at the role of boundary creation and use within the context of adult and couple relationships it is important to consider what aspects of these findings may be applicable to parent-child relationships. First and foremost, the importance of the use of boundaries to maintain the relationship is stressed in other such studies and findings of the present study seem to indicate this importance of the use of boundaries is applies across relational constellations to include the parent-child relationship (Fletcher & Blair, 2014; McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). Further looking at technology-specific boundaries, McDaniel and Coyne (2016) assertion that interference from technology, affects conflict over technology use, thus influencing relationship and personal well-being could be expanded from couple relationships and applied to parent-child relationships as well. Applying this concept to the parent-child relationship may look very different especially in the area of conflict over technology use considering the power difference inherent in the parent-child relationship (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). However, notwithstanding these differences, it is clear that using technology-specific boundaries can have positive effects on the relationship. Additionally, it appears that when these boundaries are in use there is an increased potential for parents to be less anxious and concerned about the future and the negative impacts smartphone use may have on future generations.

Understanding the likelihood of smartphone-using parents to engage in cognitive dissonance while still harboring concern for their kids and society in the future will aid clinicians treating parents, children, and families. Further, a clinician using the CFT framework can challenge the cognitive distortions used by parents to help bring to parents' awareness the cognitive dissonance they engage in when justifying their smartphone use in the presence of their children (Gilbert, 1998; Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). Findings of this study indicate that many parents experience cognitive dissonance when reconciling smartphone use and patenting

practices. With more and more clinicians seeing technology related concerns brought up in therapy, this cognitive dissonance found in the present study could be an area of clinical exploration and treatment (Axsom & Cooper, 1985; Hertlein & Blumer, 2014; Hertlein & Webster, 2008). By challenging cognitive distortions and utilizing boundary creation and maintenance clinicians may aid patent-clients in making changes to the role smartphone technology has in the presenting family system (Axsom & Cooper, 1985; Carroll, Olson, & Buckmiller, 2007; Hertlein & Blumer, 2014). Finally, by decreasing cognitive dissonance engaged in by parents through clinical intervention using a Structural Family Therapy or Cognitive-Behavioral Family Therapy lens, parental-engagement could potentially be increased. These changes in a family system could have lasting implications for future technology use, family structure and functioning, as well as significant attachment implications.

Limitations and Future Research

Given the exploratory nature of this study there are inherent limitations to the results of the study and implications those findings hold. Limitations of the present study primarily include limitations of the sample of participants. The sample of this study appear to be very homogenous in nature, consisting of mostly young, educated, females. Thematic differences may have been found if the sample had had more male participants or the participants of the study had less formal education. Another limitation of the study is the level of comfort participants reported when using smartphone technology. Of the twelve participants of the study, eleven reported being at least very comfortable using smartphone technology with only one participant reporting being not comfortable using a smartphone. Greater diversity in the participant sample could have dramatically altered thematic results.

Given the results of the current study as well as the limitations of those findings, more research is necessary to develop a greater understanding of the affect parental smartphone use is having on child and other familial relationships. Much of the research looking at smartphone use focuses on sub-groups of the population such as children, teens, and young adults leaving the parental sub-group relatively unexamined. Thus, there is a great need for family science researchers to take a closer look at the effects smartphone technology is having on many family constellations including patent-child relationships and couple relationships among others. Given that such little research currently exists in this area, combined with the findings of the current study, there is a need for future research to take a qualitative examination of these findings possibly through the development of a survey to gain a broader understanding that could be derived from a larger sample size.

Considering the implications parental disengagement and cognitive dissonance around smartphone use, parents may be engaging in, it is important for future research to investigate potential implications on attachment, use of this technology may be having. Further examination into the implications smartphone use has on the parental subsystem also needs to occur due to the tendency for smartphone users to purposely disengage as well as use smartphones to relax and unwind. These behaviors as well as themes of boundary creation and maintenance around smartphone use call for a closer examination of this phenomena in order to strengthen familial relationships especially parent-child relationships and relationships between parents.

Conclusion

The intention of this study was to examine parents' awareness of the potential relational costs their smartphone use may be having on their children. This was accomplished by ascertaining parents' perceptions of the effect their smartphone use has on their children in a

qualitative research design. Findings of this study provide clinicians, family researchers, and the lay reader a detailed description of how parents perceive their smartphone use affects their family. The results were congruent with theorized concepts found in the Couple and Family Technology Framework. Though understanding the psychological effects of smartphone use, current efforts of parents to mitigate negative effects of its use, and the role family therapy models can take to address problems associated with technology use within families, family therapists and researchers are benefited with expanded knowledge and understanding of individual parents' experiences. The results of this study add to the collective knowledge on families and technology use and may impact the way future research and clinical treatment is conducted in a positive way.

UNLV

UNLV Social/Behavioral IRB - Exempt Review
Exempt Notice

DATE: January 19, 2017

TO: Katherine Hertlein
FROM: Office of Research Integrity - Human Subjects

PROTOCOL TITLE: [988878-1] PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF SMARTPHONE USE AND
                     PARENTING PRACTICES

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
EXEMPT DATE: January 19, 2017
REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # 2

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this protocol. This memorandum is notification that the protocol referenced above has been reviewed as indicated in Federal regulatory statutes 45CFR46.101(b) and deemed exempt.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence with our records.

PLEASE NOTE:
Upon final determination of exempt status, the research team is responsible for conducting the research as stated in the exempt application reviewed by the ORI - HS and/or the IRB which shall include using the most recently submitted Informed Consent/Assent Forms (Information Sheet) and recruitment materials. The official versions of these forms are indicated by footer which contains the date exempted. If your project involves paying research participants, it is recommended to contact Carisa Shaffer, ORI Program Coordinator at (702) 895-2794 to ensure compliance with subject payment policy.

Any changes to the application may cause this protocol to require a different level of IRB review. Should any changes need to be made, please submit a **Modification Form**. When the above-referenced protocol has been completed, please submit a **Continuing Review/Progress Completion report** to notify ORI - HS of its closure.

If you have questions, please contact the Office of Research Integrity - Human Subjects at IRB@unlv.edu or call 702-895-2794. Please include your protocol title and IRBNet ID in all correspondence.

Office of Research Integrity - Human Subjects
4505 Maryland Parkway . Box 451047 . Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-1047
(702) 895-2794 . FAX: (702) 895-0805 . IRB@unlv.edu

- 1 -   Generated on IRBNet

52

Appendix B

Demographics Survey

1. Age

2. Gender

3. Number of Children

4. Relationship Status

5. Level of Education

6. Comfort Level Using Technology

7. Number of Hours on Smartphone per Day

8. Smartphone Activities Participated In

9. Duration of Use

Appendix C

Individual Interview Discussion Questions

1. To what extent do you feel emotionally closer to others, when you communicate via electronic device? To what extent do you feel emotionally closer to others, when you communicate via face to face interaction?

2. When have there been times, if at all, when you felt guilty after spending time on your phone when your child/ children are present? When might a child feel neglected or abandoned as a result of a parent's cell phone use?

3. Think of the last time you missed an important moment you were physically present for, but immersed in your smartphone at the time?

4. When have there been times your parenting abilities were compromised as a result of your smartphone use?

5. Sometimes people get so disengaged from the present and into their smartphones that they end up having problems functioning, for example when driving, or carrying on a conversation. Describe a time, if at all, your smartphone screen has disengaged you from the present?

6. Have you ever noticed while multitasking where one task is involving a smartphone affected the quality of your work? During this time of multitasking with a smartphone, did it have a positive or negative effect on your work?

7. Describe a time, if at all, that you have perceived a difference in the intimacy felt between electronically mediated communication held between you and a family member, and real-life or face to face communication with that same family member?

8. What familial and relationship costs are associated with "switching costs" when we try to pay attention to kids' physical actions and our smartphones?

9. Thinking about parents you know, describe a time, if ever, that smartphones have impacted a parent's ability to concentrate? (includes effects of multitasking)?

10. To what extent do you feel you have time for intimacy or solitude with your smartphone present? Describe a time, if ever, that you feel your smartphone has robbed you of times of intimacy or solitude?

11. Thinking of parents you know, how have you seen today's parents get caught in a smartphone dependency pattern? If so how is this effecting their children and familial relationships?

12. Considering parents you know, describe a time, if at all, when you have seen that connectivity via smartphone disrupts their everyday life?

13. When is it appropriate, if at all, to interrupt a face to face conversation for an incoming voice call? Text message? Email?

14. Describe, if at all, the change in social norms as a result of the proliferation of cell phones/ smartphones is (acceptable) (worth the cost) (benefits of cellphones exceed the cost)?

15. Describe a time, if at all, when the open availability afforded you via your smartphone was intrusive, or a burden?

16. Describe a time, if at all, where you have justified your cell phone use at a social event centered on your child?

17. How much of one's life is online vs the physical here and now?

18. When, if ever, do you feel that your smartphone is intruding on your family life?

19. To what extent do the notifications, messages, emails, and phone calls run your life or take away your sense of agency as you increasingly rely on the capabilities of your smartphone? (I can't remember anything without a reminder on my phone)

20. Describe, if at all, in what way you see your child exhibiting behaviors involving smartphone use that have been learned as a result of your smartphone use behavior; when considering this learned behavior are you worried that some of the behavior is not appropriate?

References

Anderson, M. (2015a, April 1). *6 facts about Americans and their smartphones*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/04/01/6-facts-about-americans-and-their-smartphones/#content

Anderson, M. (2015b, April 29). *For the vast majority of seniors who own one, a smartphone equals 'freedom'*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/04/29/seniors-smartphones/#content

Anderson, M., & Smith, A. (2015, April 14). *The smartphone: An essential travel guide*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/04/14/smartphone-essential-travel-guide/#content

Anfara, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, *31*(7)*, 28-38.

Axsom, D., & Cooper, J. (1985). Cognitive dissonance and psychotherapy: The role of effort justification in inducing weight loss. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 149-160.

Bauerlein, M. (2011). *The digital divide.* (Eds.). New York: Penguin Group.

Bergdall, A. R., Kraft, J. M., Andes, K., Carter, M., Hatfield-Timajchy, K., & Hock-Long, L. (2012). Love and hooking up in the new millennium: Communication technology and relationships among urban African American and Puerto Rican young adults. *The Journal of Sex Research, 49*(6), 570-582.

Bian, M., & Leung, L. (2015). Linking loneliness, shyness, smartphone addiction symptoms, and patterns of smartphone use to social capital. *Social Science Computer Review, 33*(1), 61-79.

Birkerts, S. (2015). *Changing the subject: Art and attention in the internet age.* Minneapolis, MN: Gray Wolf Press.

Blumer, M., Hertlein, K., Smith, J., & Allen, H. (2014). How many bytes does it take? A content analysis of cyber issues in couple and family therapy journals. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 40*(1), 34-48.

Cacioppo J. T., & Patrick W. (2008). *Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Carroll, J.S., Olson, C.D., & Buckmiller, N. (2007). Family boundary ambiguity: A 30-year review of theory, research, and measurement. *Family Relations, 56*(2), 210-230.

Choi, S., & Lim, M. (2016). Effects of social and technology overload on psychological well-being in young South Korean adults: The mediatory role of social network service addiction. *Computers in Human Behavior, 61,* 245-254.

Chopik, W., & Peterson, C. (2014). Changes in technology use and adult attachment orientation from 2002 to 2012. *Computers in Human Behavior, 38,* 208-212.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319-340.

Delen, E., Kaya, F., Ritter, N., & Sahin, A. (2015). Understanding parents' perceptions of communication technology use. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 7*(4), 22-36.

Desilver, D. (2014). *Chart of the week: The ever-accelerating rate of technology adoption.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/14/chart-of-the-ever-accelerating-rate-of-technology-adoption/#content

Direito, A., Jiang, Y., Whittacker, R., & Maddison, R. (2015). Smartphone apps to improve fitness and increase physical activity among young people: Protocol of the apps for improving fitness (AIMFIT) randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health, 15*(635), 1-12.

Doinita, N.E., & Maria, D.N. (2015). Attachment and parenting styles. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 203,* 199-204.

Duggan, M. (2013). *Cell phone activities 2013*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/09/19/cell-phone-activities-2013/

Duggan, M., Lenhart, A., Lampe, C., & Ellison, N.B. (2015). *Parents and social media*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved October 21, 2015, from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/07/16/parents-and-social-media/

Fletcher, A. C., & Blair, B. (2014). Maternal authority regarding early adolescents' social technology use. *Journal of Family Issues*, 35(*1*), 54-74.

Genc, Z. (2014). Parents' perceptions about the mobile technology use of preschool aged children. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 146*, 55-60.

Gilbert, P. (1998). The evolved basis and adaptive functions of cognitive distortions. *British Journal of Medical Psychology, 71*, 447-463.

Gold, J. (2015). *Screen-smart parenting: How to find balance and benefit in your child's use of social media, apps, and digital devices.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Hendricks, C. (2015). Ten ways to help parents navigate technology with children. *Children & Libraries: The Journal of the Association for Library Service to Children 13*(2), 36-37.

Hertlein, K. (2012). Digital dwelling: Technology in couple and family relationships. *Family Relations, 61,* 347-387.

Hertlein, K., & Ancheta, K. (2014). Advantages and disadvantages of technology in relationships: Findings from on open-ended survey. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(Art. 22), 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/hertlein22.pdf

Hertlein, K., & Blumer, M. (2014). *The couple and family technology framework.* New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Hertlein, K., & Hawkins, B. (2012). Online gaming issues in offline couple relationships: A primer for marriage and family therapists (MFTs). *The Qualitative Report, 17*(Art. 15), 1-48. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/hertlein.pdf

Hertlein, K., & Webster, M. (2008). Technology, relationships, and problems: A research synthesis. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 34*(4), 445-460.

Hoeve, M., Blokland, A., Dubas, J.S., Loeber, R., Gerris, J.R.M., & van der Laan, P.H. (2008). Trajectories of delinquency and parenting styles. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36,* 223-235.

Kang, S., & Jung, J. (2014). Mobile communication for human needs: A comparison of smartphone use between the US and Korea. *Computers in Human Behavior, 35,* 376-387.

Katz, R. L., Felix, M., & Gubernick, M. (2014). Technology and adolescents: Perspectives on the things to come. *Education Information Technology*, 19, 863-886. Doi: 10.1007/s10639-013-9258-8

Kaylor, L., Jeglic, E.L., & Collins, C. (2016). Examining the impact of technology on exhibitionistic behavior. *Deviant Behavior,* 1-11. doi: 10.1080/01639625.2016.1169828

King, W. R., & He, J. (2006). A meta-analysis of the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management, 43,* 740-755.

Korat, O., & Or, T. (2010). How new technology influences parent-child interaction: The case of e-book reading. *First Language, 30*(2), 139-154.

Korte, F., Spiteller, M., & Coulston, F. (2000). The cyanide leaching gold recovery process is a nonsustainable technology with unacceptable impacts on ecosystems and humans: The disaster in Romania. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 46*(3), 241-245.

Lanigan, J. (2009). A sociotechnological model for family research and intervention: How information and communication technologies affect family life. *Marriage & Family Review, 45*(6), 587-609.

Lebo, H. (2015). *The 2015 digital future report: Surveying the digital future.* California: University of Southern California. Retrieved February 12, 2016, from http://www.digitalcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/2015-Digital-Future-Report.pdf

Legris, P., Ingham, J., & Collerette, P. (2003). Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management, 40,* 191-204.

Le Goff, J. F. (2001). Fundamentals of thory and practice revisited: Boszormenyi-Nagy and

    contextual therapy: An overview. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 22(*3*), 147-157. Doi:

    10.1002/j.1467-8438.2001.tb00469.x

Leung, L., & Lee, P. S. N. (2011). The influences of information literacy, internet addiction and

    parenting styles on internet risks. *New Media & Society, 14*(1), 117-136.

Livingston, G. (2015, January 15). *For most highly educated women, motherhood doesn't start*

    until the 30s. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved June 2016 from

    file:///C:/Users/Student/Desktop/Educated%20Mothers.htm

Livingstone, S., & Smith, P. (2014). Annual research review: Harms experienced by child users

    of online and mobile technologies: The nature, prevalence and management of sexual and

    aggressive risks in the digital age. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 55*(6),

    635-654.

Lu, J., Yu, C. S., Liu, C., & Yao, J. E. (2003). Technology acceptance model for wireless

    internet. *Internet Research, 13*(3), 206-222.

McDaniel, B. T. & Coyne, S. M. (2016). "Technoference":The interference of technology in

    couple relationships and implications for women's personal and relational well-being.

    Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 5(*1*), 85-98.

Merz, E., Schuengel, C., & Schulze, H. (2008). Inter-generational relationships at different ages:

    An attachment perspective. Aging & Society, 28, 717-736.

    Doi:10.1017?So144686X08007046

Meyer, D., & Evans, J. (2001). Executive control of cognitive processes in task switching.

    Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 27(4), 763-

    797.

Mian, N. D. (2014). Little children with big worries: Addressing the needs of young, anxious children and the problem of parent engagement. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 17,* 85-96.

Miller, G. (2012). The smartphone psychology manifesto. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*(3), 221-237.

Morgan, H. (2013). Malicious use of technology: What schools, parents, and teachers can do to prevent cyberbullying. *Childhood Education, 89*(3), 146-151.

Morrison-Beedy, D., Cote-Arsenault, D., & Feinstein, F. N. (2001). Maximizing results with focus groups: Moderator and analysis issues. *Applied Nursing Research, 14*(1), 48-53.

Muhammad, R., Zahari, M., & Sharif, M. (2013). Impact of technology advancement on the Malaysian ethnics festival foods and its foodways. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 85,* 454-463.

Nakayama, M. (2011). Parenting style and parental monitoring with information communication technology: A study on Japanese junior high school students and their parents. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27,* 1800-1805.

Nassiri, Z., Hashembeik, N., & Siadat, S. (2012). The relationship between type and amount use of mobile phone and personality characteristics of students. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 4*(3), 113-120.

Ozdamli, F., & Yildiz, E. (2014). Parents' views towards improve parent-school collaboration with mobile technologies. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 131,* 361-366.

Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44*(2), 175-196.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Perrin, A., & Duggan, M. (2015). *Americans' internet access: 2000-2015.* Washington, D.C.:

    Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from

    https://mzkrha.dm2304.livefilestore.com/y3mjcbGF77AlzaNdd0gqyXmJq3TatgMtPdRO

    ngqO2Je0RRUUtdjjjpFyN3t0s0dlWusVWOY9MahKp1uD46hzXjslQHaChG_ARTZY1

    cQBvQ84UjbuXdStQ0_-

    rIiQrpnQqA7h1UbeUszKIlRb1lnrPP2WA/Americans'%20Internet%20Access%202000-

    2015.pdf?psid=1

Pew Research Center. (2010, August 19). *The new demography of American motherhood.*

    Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved June 2016 from

    https://mzkrha.dm2304.livefilestore.com/y3m5qPTzi7VftiYzjUtwMrtqYjSQPyqbdx6VhI

    -JBriHkGEVI2DaBE1qPlxWHEFq__U-

    wnR3FaVJsnN25IRuAhDAcNOURE9CEBDst_ouUzlbP641Oq4A8VnL6tH_y11MZkG0

    7TQo8yf7ARVh-9gKDT_YA/new-demography-of-motherhood.pdf?psid=1

Pew Research Center. (2012, November 30). *The best (and worst) of mobile connectivity.*

    Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 2015 from

    file:///C:/Users/Student/Desktop/The%20best%20and%20worst%20of%20mobile%20co

    nnectivity.pdf

Pew Research Center. (2014a, February 27). *The web at 25 in the U.S.* Washington, D.C.: Pew

    Research Center. Retrieved November 2015, from

    http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/02/25/the-web-at-25-in-the-u-s

Pew Research Center. (2014b, April 17). *U.S. views of technology and the future.* Washington,

    D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from

    http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/04/17/us-views-of-technology-and-the-future/

Pew Research Center. (2015, April 1). *U.S. smartphone use in 2015.* Washington, D.C.: Pew

    Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from

    http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/01/us-smartphone-use-in-2015/

Plowman, L., McPake, J., & Stephen, C. (2010). The technologisation of childhood? Young

    children and technology in the home. *Children & Society, 24,* 63-74.

Poushter, J. (2016, February 22). *Smartphone ownership and internet usage continues to climb in*

    emerging economies. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved June 17, 2016,

    from

    file:///C:/Users/Student/Desktop/pew_research_center_global_technology_report_final_f

    ebruary_22__2016.pdf

Purcell, K. (2014). *Technology's impact on workers*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

    Retrieved June 17, 2016, from http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/12/30/technologys-

    impact-on-workers/

Quinn, K. (2013). We haven't talked in 30 years! *Information, Communication & Society, 16*(3),

    397-420.

Quiroga, M.G., Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2016). Attachment styles in children living in

    alternative care: A systematic review of the literature. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 45, 625-

    653. Doi: 10.1007/s10566-015-9342-x

Raacke, J., Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and

    gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior,*

    11(2), 169-174.

Rainie, L., & Zickuhr, K. (2015, August 26). *Americans' views on mobile etiquette.* Washington,

    D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 1, 2015, from

file:///C:/Users/Student/Desktop/Americans'%20Views%20on%20Mobile%20Etiquette.p

df

Stafford, T. F. (2008). Social and usage-process motivations for consumer internet access.

Journal of Organizational and End User Computing, 20(3), 1-21.

Szajna, B. (1996). Empirical evaluation of the revised technology acceptance model.

Management Science, 42(1), 85-92.

Thomee, S., Eklof, M., Gustafsson, E., Nilsson, R., & Hagberg, M. (2007). Prevalence of

perceived stress, symptoms of depression and sleep disturbances in relation to

information and communication technology (ICT) use among young adults- an

explorative prospective study. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23,* 1300-1321.

Tsai, C. Y., Wang, C. C., & Lu, M. T. (2011). Using the technology acceptance model to analyze

ease of use of a mobile communication system. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39*(1),

65-70.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together.* New York: Basic Books.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas Institutional Analysis & Decision Support. (2015). University

student profile-Fall 2015 [Data file]. Retrieved from

https://ir.unlv.edu/IAP/Reports/Content/UniversityStudentProfile_Fall2015.aspx

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,* 454-464.

Veldhuis, L., van Grieken, A., Renders, C.M., HiraSing, R.A., & Raat, H. (2014). Parenting

style, the home environment, and screen time of 5-year-old children; the 'be active, eat

right' study. *PLOS One, 9*(2), 1-9.

Whitty, M. (2005). The realness of cybercheating men's and women's representations of

    unfaithful internet relationships. *Social Science Computer Review, 23*(1), 57-67.

Wu, Y., Damnee, S., Kerherve, H., Ware, C., & Rigaud, A. S. (2015). Bridging the digital divide

    in older adults: A study from an initiative to inform older adults about new technologies.

    Clinical Interventions in Aging, 10, 193-201.

Young, K. (2008). Internet sex addiction risk factors, stages of development and treatment.

    American Behavioral Scientist, 52(1), 21-37.

Curriculum Vitae

David J. Johnson

Email: davidjacksonjohnson@gmail.com

Education

M.S.	2017	Marriage and Family Therapy	University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV
B.S.	2014	Psychology	Weber State University, Ogden, UT

Presentations

April 16, 2014   "Implementing Social Skills Through Olympic Events"
         Presented by David Johnson, Lacey Miller, Anthony Romero,
         Alexandra Werner, Kallie Spackman
         Community Engaged Learning Symposium
         Weber State University- Ogden, UT

April 16, 2014   "Increasing Academics at Youth Impact"
         Presented by Anthony Romero, Lacey Miller, Kallie Spackman,
         David Johnson, Alexandra Werner
         Community Engaged Learning Symposium
         Weber State University- Ogden, UT

Research Experience and Certifications

Oct. 2015-Present   Thesis: *Parents' Perceptions of Smartphone Use and Parenting*
         Practices
         Advisor: Katherine Hertlein, Ph.D.
         University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May 2016   "Protection of Human Subjects"
         Social/Behavioral IRB Certificate
         Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Publications

Johnson, D.J., Farrow, B., Stewart, C.M., Hertlein, K.M. Reconciling Desire: Theoretical and Clinical Perspectives on Conceptualizing the Context of Rape Fantasies in Sex Therapy. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Johnson, D.J., Hertlein, K.M. Parents' Perception of Smartphone Use and Parenting Practices. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Teaching Experience and Certifications

May 2017	Graduate College Teaching Certificate Program (GCTCP)
	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
	Workshops Attended:
	• "Transparency in Learning and Teaching In Higher Education"
	    Presented by: Mary-Ann Wilkelmes, Ph.D.
	• "Advising and Mentoring Graduate Students"
	    Presented by: Katherine Hertlein, Ph.D., Doris Watson, Ph.D., and Jessica Word, Ph.D.
	• "Problem-based Learning"
	    Presented by: Andrew Freeman, Ph.D., Stephen Dahlm, Ph.D., and Mark Sandoval
	• "Green Dot Training"
	• "Title IX Training"

May 3, 2017	Guest Lecturer, MFT 428-Introduction to MFT Duties: Lesson planning and implementation, lecture University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 1, 2017	Guest Lecturer, HON 410-Seminar in MFT Duties: Lesson planning and implementation, lecturing University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Feb. 13, 2017	Guest Lecturer, HON 410-Seminar in MFT Duties: Lesson planning and implementation, lecture University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dec. 16, 2016	Guest Lecturer, MFT 428-Introduction to MFT Duties: Lesson planning and implementation, lecture University of Nevada, Las Vegas

| Nov. 2016 | Invited Panelist, MFT 428- Introduction to MFT, Graduate Student Panel |
| | University of Nevada, Las Vegas |

Jan. 2014-	Student Youth Mentor
April 2014	Duties: Lesson planning, implementation
	Psychology Department Practicum at Youth Impact
	Weber State University- Ogden, UT

Clinical Experience

May 2017- Present	Student Intern Therapist
	Kayenta Therapy Centers
	Supervisors: Kathy Shovlin, LMFT, Coreen Haym, LMFT
	Las Vegas, NV

May 2016-May 2017	Student Therapist
	Center for Individual, Couple, and Family Counseling
	Supervisors: Gerald R. Weeks, Ph.D., Steven T. Fife, Ph.D.
	University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Additional Clinical Training

March 11, 2017	"Suicide Risk Assessment"
	Professional Training Workshop
	Presented by Coreen Haym LMFT
	University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Nov. 5, 2015	"An EFT Approach to Infidelity"
	Professional Training Workshop
	Presented by Susan Johnson Ph.D.
	University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dec. 2, 2014	"Psychotherapy"
	Professional Training Workshop
	Presented by Steven A. Szykula, Ph.D.
	Weber State University- Ogden, UT

Professional Affiliations

| 2015-Present | Student Member |
| | American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy |

2015-Present	Student Member
	Nevada Association for Marriage and Family Therapy
2016-Present	Student Member
	National Council on Family Relations
2016-Present	Professional Member
	Delta Kappa Zeta- International Marriage and Family Therapy Honor Society

Relevant Professional Experience

Jan. 2015- July 2015	Direct Care Staff
	Youthtrack-Utah
	Brigham City, UT

Volunteer Experience

April 2014- May 2014	Smiles for Central America
	Tegucigalpa, Honduras

Academic Awards and Grants

Fall 2016- Fall 2017	UNLV Graduate Access Grant, Recipient
	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
April 2014	Certificate of Excellence in Teaching and Building Relationships, Recipient
	Weber State University