An experimental study on television viewing and family communication in Tirunelveli District

S. Nelsonamndela [1] , S.G. Balasubramania Raja [2] and Ajantha Thamayanthi [3]

[1] Scholar, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Tirunelveli, Tamilnadu, India.

[2] Head of the Department, Communication, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Tirunelveli, Tamilnadu, India

[3] Asisstant Professor(T), Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Tirunelveli, Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

Families that are high on both conversation and conformity orientation are labelled consensual. Children in these families may either adopt their parents' views or escape into fantasies. Most members are emotionally divorced from their families. It is important for parents to acquire how the television controls and how it change their family communication to use the media and family communication types in better ways to achieve their own personal goals. This study attempt to build a strong knowledge structure about family communication and television viewing in Tirunelveli district. It deals with the effect of family communication skill training among the parents. For this an experimental study was conducted with ninety parents in TIrunelveli district. Pre and post survey were conducted among 45 control and 45 experimental group parents. A delayed post-test was conducted a month later. The findings of the study reveal that family communication intervention help the parents to analyse their communication structure among their family and impact of television viewing in their family using awareness and assistances.

Keywords: *family communication, television viewing, parents, mediation*

1. Introduction

This television gives us finest source of information and entertainments. TV or Television is the magnificent discovery by technologist, and there are a lot of pros and cons of watching television.

Children like to watch Television and gather knowledge through this medium. Without doubt, it is far easier on the memory of the kid to retain some idea if the narrative or lecture is accompanied by the visual. When we are saying that they should not view what is wrong, we are talking about several Adult channels which have been made accessible today. A child gathers incomplete knowledge from them and more often than not tries to repeat what he has seen being done. We place Family Communication Patterns Theory in the logical empirical paradigm because it is concerned with causal explanation of why people communicate the way they do based on cognitive orientations in family relationships. Families that are high on both conversation and conformity orientation are labelled consensual. Children in these families may either adopt their parents' views or escape into fantasies. Most members are emotionally divorced from their families. Children of these families are more likely to be influenced by external social groups. Parents heading these families are likely to be Separate-Independent or of another Mixed type of Fitzpatrick's typology. Children who watch more television are at a greater risk of experiencing a host of negative outcomes compared to children who watch less television.

The good news is that parents can modify or even prevent television-related effects by engaging in a variety of practices known as "mediation." Three forms of mediation styles have been identified—active, restrictive, and co-use. Active mediation refers to parents explaining to and discussing media or specific media content with children. Restrictive mediation includes the rules and regulations that parents institute regarding the television viewing of their children. Co-viewing occurs when parents watch television with their children. Detailed studies showed that the effect of television viewing gradually brings about some simple behavioural adaptations. The most influential threat to the young minds comes from a collective stimulation of violence.

2. Review of literature

McLeod and Chaffee (1972) [1] recommended that families differ in their preferences for and uses of these two strategies to achieve agreement, and consequently children are socialized differently in regard to the processing of information contained in media messages. Children of families that tend to use socio-orientation rely on others to interpret the meaning of media messages to them, mainly their parents or peers. Conversely, children of families that tend to use concept-orientation elaborate on the concepts and ideas contained in the messages to determine their meanings. In other words, the two strategies to achieve agreement in families are associated with different communication behaviours. McLeod and Chaffee [2] realized that the processes families use to share social reality affect the communication behaviours and practices of families, and they used this insight to construct a behavioural measurement of the underlying strategies of information processing. The instrument they developed is the Family Communication Patterns (FCP) instrument, which has been widely used in media effects research. Its relevance to family communication more generally, however, went largely unnoticed until Fitzpatrick and her colleagues started using the instrument in the late 1980 and early 1990 in their research of family communication.

Kantor and Lehr (1975) [3] distinguished between open, closed, and random families based both on their communication behaviour and on how well these families function. Open families employ the most functional behaviours, closed families are moderately functional, and random families are the least functional families in this typology. Similarly, Olson's (1981, 1993; Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle [4], 1983; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979) Circumflex Model of Family Functioning, which is based on the two underlying dimensions of family cohesion and family flexibility, distinguishes between family types that function well (balanced families moderate on both dimensions), moderately well (midrange families extreme on one dimension, moderate on the other), and poorly (unbalanced families = extreme on both dimensions). Communication in Olson's model is a third facilitating dimension that allows families to move along the two other dimensions and is of particular relevance for family counselling that has as its goal to achieve more balanced families. The problem with typologies that distinguish between families based on functioning is that they are based on two implicit but problematic assumptions. The first implicit assumption is that a behaviour or structural property of the family is either consistently functional or consistently dysfunctional. This assumption is problematic because it ignores the context in which behaviour occurs, which can be radically different and lead to very different outcomes of the behaviour. For example, in many contexts, children benefit from strong and positive relationships with both parents. Should the parents' divorce, however, these children are more likely to experience loyalty conflicts and to suffer psychologically from the divorce than children who have formed a strong relationship with only one parent who retains custody. Thus, family characteristics or behaviours that are functional in one context might be dysfunctional in another, and vice versa. It therefore makes little sense to view functionality as a permanent attribute of families or behaviours.

Despite Meyrowitz's (1985) [5] desperate that parents are no longer "an all-powerful formative influence" (p. 238), researchers have proposed four altered ways by which the family can affect the ways children respond to mass media messages. Unintended routes include modelling behaviours that confirm or disconfirm media messages (Bandura, 1986; McKechnie, 1977; Medrich, 1979), and the influence of children's general information-seeking patterns through family communication norms (McLeod & Chaffee, 1972). More direct routes include direct controls such as rulemaking (Atkin, Greenberg, & Baldwin, 1991; Corder-Bolz, 1980) and mediating the child's viewing experience via communication about the medium (Atkin et al., 1991; Austin, Roberts, & Nass, 1990; Corder-Bolz, 1980; Desmond, Singer, Singer, Calam, & Colimore, 1985).

Sonck, Nathalie & Nikken, Peter & Haan, Jos. (2013) [6] stated that according to Van der Voort et al. the unfocused mediation (watching and discussing television together) is not an occasional activity because parents watch the same programs as their children, but a conscious form of guiding started by the child or the parent. Moreover, the

three forms of mediation are not only perceived by parents, but also by their nine to sixteen year-old children. The unfocused mediation in these families, however, turned out to refer to "discussing shows" and not to "watching together". In later studies more varieties of unfocused and evaluative mediation were found. For instance, Valkenburg et al. found the other type of unfocused mediation among parents with younger children (five up to twelve), i.e. 'conscious co-viewing' which the authors re-named 'social co-viewing'. They also found an adapted form of evaluative mediation: the 'instructive mediation'. The re-naming was necessary because Valkenburg et al. specifically inquired explaining and helping children to understand television programs and not discussing program content. Finally, two types of evaluative mediation ('active mediation') are found among parents with children aged two up to seventeen, namely: a negatively disposed (telling a television program is not right) and a positively disposed (agreeing with the offered choice on television).

When parents do make efforts to guidance children's responses to media exposure, parental mediation takes place. Parental Mediation Parental mediation refers to parent-child interactions about media and usually incorporates three types of activities: active mediation, restrictive mediation, and co-viewing. Active mediation brings up to parent-child discussions about media and media content. Restrictive mediation refers to parent-enacted rules and restrictions related to children's media use. Co-viewing refers to parents consuming media messages with their children (Nathanson, 2001; Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999). Parents who involve in reliable parental television mediation do so with the determined to impact how, and the extent to which, media exposure influences children (Rasmussen, 2013). Parents concerned with media content and its effects employ parental mediation behaviours to protect their children's well-being (Nathanson et al., 2002). Academics look parental television mediation as the portrayal of parental media literacy (Mendoza, 2009) or as the sharing of parental media literacy skills with children (Austin et al., 2015). There are, however, few studies examining the relationship between parental media literacy and parental mediation activities Attitudes Toward Media-Related Interactions with Children Because of the strength of parents' influence on children (Pequegnat & Szapocznik, 2000), many interventions designed to alter children's behaviours first attempt to change parenting behaviours, which, in turn, have been shown to alter children's attitudes and behaviours (Hutchinson & Wood, 2007). These

communication interventions aim to bolster protective parenting behaviours and skills by altering parents' knowledge about the risks their children face and by altering parents' attitudes about parent-child communication and other protective parenting behaviours (see, e.g., Maria, Markham, Bluethmann, & Mullen, 2015). A examination of these mediations found that programs often be successful at educating parents' attitudes toward sexual health communication and, ultimately, at collective parent-child sexual health communication (Maria et al., 2015). Such increased engagement with these protective communication behaviours appears to result from the interventions' influence on parents' attitudes toward the protective behaviours. Similarly, we should expect parents who are abler to think critically about media to have more positive attitudes toward those behaviours that they know will decrease their children's susceptibility to destructive effects of media exposure, such as parental television mediation, than those who are less able to think analytically about media. In this study, both active and restrictive mediation are considered protective parental mediation behaviours. Similar to past research, co-viewing was excluded from this study because it is relatively ineffective at protecting children from undesirable media effects (Valkenburg, Piotrowski, Hermanns, & de Leeuw, 2013) and because co-viewing is more common among parents who have a positive attitude about television (see, e.g., Austin & Pinkleton, 2001; Dorr, Kovaric, & Doubleday, 1989; Nathanson, 2001).

3. Methodology

The present study involved quantitative research (experimental method and survey). The researcher conducted a survey to understand the influence of TV viewing and need for family communication among the parent. The method used in this study was quasi experimental method. This experimental research sought to determine if the treatment on family communication pattern. television influences the behaviour of the children. The investigator selected 90 families from Tirunelveli District for pre-test and post-test. The training was given after the pre-test.

The researcher conducted a survey to understand the TV viewing pattern of children, influence of Television on children and family communication pattern of Tirunelveli district. The study was conducted among the parents. The sample of 90 parents were selected by random sampling method. Based on the data gathered by survey method of parents, an experimental study was planned.

IJASRM

4. Data analysis

4.1. Analysing Family using skill factors

Factors analysis was done on the 10 factors are believed to be analysed for family communication using skills. These factors were selected after doing extensive literature review related to the studies. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted and the initial results of tests of sampling appropriateness exhibited the following results.

In order to find out the appropriateness of this analysis Kaiser Meyar Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sephericity are used and the results are shown in Table 1(a).

Table 1 (a)
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.522
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	556.926
	df	171
	Sig.	.000

The test of Kaiser Meyer Olkin shows a measure of .522 and hence shows a sampling adequacy for the application of factor analysis. The results of Principal Component Analysis to extract the number of variables are given in Table: 1 (b)

Table.1 (b) Total Variance Explained

Components	Extraction Sums of Squared Loading		
	Total	Percentage of Variable	Cumulative Percentage
1	3.637	19.144	19.144
2	3.350	17.631	36.775
3	1.735	9.131	45.906
4	1.603	8.437	54.343
5	1.308	6.884	61.227
6	1.241	6.533	67.760
7	1.188	6.251	74.010
8	1.011	5.321	79.332

Extraction Method: Principal Components Analysis

From the Table 4.42 (b) it is clear that nine factors can be extracted together which account for 79.332 percent of the total 20 variables. Hence 19 variables are summated to 8 factors.

The table 4.42 (c) presents the Rotated Component Matrix table by using Varimax Method with 8 iterations, which is used to assign, factors which have higher loadings.

Table 1 (c) Rotated factor matrices-analysing Family Communication using skills

Factors	Components							
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Communication pragmatics plays vital role	**.759**	-.361	.237	-.089	-.062	-.133	.043	-.061
Everyone understands what everyone needs.	**.756**	-.432	.282	-.068	-.101	-.078	.060	-.069
Family members are active listeners	**.749**	-.368	.234	-.079	-.086	-.155	.067	-.072
Paying attention to non-verbal messages	**.663**	.315	-.142	.034	-.125	.060	.095	.006
Positive thinker in my family	.235	**.727**	.019	.046	-.131	-.033	-.033	.040
My family conformity orientation	.313	**.635**	-.117	-.023	.029	.004	-.134	.017
Conflicts creates more closeness	.102	**.624**	-.247	.118	-.058	.110	-.077	.032
relationship healthier.	.014	.303	**.558**	.420	.275	-.188	-.035	.052
My family is pluralistic	-.217	.418	**.523**	-.154	.415	-.170	.153	.090
honest and open with one another.	-.098	.295	**.521**	-.032	.059	.377	.158	-.309
time in the front of Television	.249	-.313	-.239	**.581**	.191	-.187	-.034	.260
Issues because of miscommunication	.159	-.045	-.158	-.470	**.609**	-.084	.359	.128
Practice communication frequently	.409	-.013	.032	.312	**.588**	.253	.058	-.335
Parents always connect their children with their perspective	.119	-.429	-.052	.220	.021	**.656**	-.072	-.202
Solving the communication problems of my Children	.185	-.165	-.363	-.424	.318	**.520**	-.168	.276
Exaggeration, but may destroy the family harmony	.174	-.151	-.150	-.116	.319	-.300	**.678**	.001
the expression of respect affection and concern	.046	-.176	-.372	.474	.050	-.030	**.570**	.292
Children are adopting the Parents Behaviour	.267	.023	.346	-.371	-.194	.227	.170	**.664**
Instrumental and affective communication with my Children	.052	.104	-.455	.325	-.036	-.341	.338	**.523**

Source: Field Survey

Table clearly shows that in the first column the variables namely, 'communication pragmatics plays vital role", 'everyone understands what everyone needs', 'family members are active listeners', 'paying attention to non-verbal messages', 'have higher loadings of .759, 756, .749 and .663 respectively and it can be suggested that factor one is the combination of these eight factors and have the variance of 19.144 percent and it can be named as 'Understanding of message'.

From the second column it can be seen that the variables of 'positive thinker in my family' .727, 'My family conformity orientation'.635, 'Conflicts creates more closeness' .624, have higher loadings with a variance of 36.775 and it can be combined and called as 'positive relationship'.

The third column shows that the factors 'Communication helps my family to keep the relationship healthier' .558, 'My family is pluralistic' .523, 'family Individuals are honest and open with one another.' .521 have higher loadings with a variance of 45.906 and it can be combined and called as 'Healthy communication'.

The fourth factor namely 'Spending most of the time in the front of Television' .581, to be called as 'Television viewing'.

From the fifth column it can be seen that the variables of 'Issues because of miscommunication' .609, 'Practice communication frequently' .588 have higher loadings with a variance of 61.227 to be called as 'communication issues'.

In the sixth column 'Parents always connect their children with their perspective' .656, 'Solving the communication problems of my Children's' .520 have higher loadings with a variance of 61.227 to be called as 'Understanding of children'.

In the seventh column 'Exaggeration is used to easing the mental tension, but may destroy the family harmony' .678, 'Communication is the expression of respect affection and concern' .570 have higher loadings with a variance of 74.010 to be called as 'family coherence'.

In the eight column 'Children's are adopting the Parents Behaviour' .664, 'Instrumental and affective communication with my Children's.' .523 have higher loadings with a variance of 74.010 to be named as 'parent children relationship'.

Thus 19 factors are summary into eight variables and are given altered labels by using factor analysis. 'Understanding of message', 'Positive relationship', 'Healthy communication', 'Television viewing', 'Communication issues', 'Understanding of children', 'Family harmony', 'Parent children relationship'. It has been acknowledged and played a worthy part in analysing family communication.

4.2. T- test

4.2.1. The pre-test and post-test analysis of experimental and control group

The survey examined the effects of Parents on dependent variables such as Family communication. Mean scores for pre and Post tests were calculated for each item. T. tests were used to compare the effect of family communication skills.

Table 2
The t-test result of two groups post and pre –test scores related to analysis of Family Communication skills

Analysis of Family Communication	Test	Experimental[a]		Control[b]				Sig (2—tailed)
		M	SD	M	SD	MD	t	
Understanding message	Post	4.7	1.4	2.1	0.46	3.1	14.5	0
	Pre	2.3	0.66	2.2	0.44	2.9	0.71	0.65
Positive relationship	Post	4.3	0.64	1.9	0.38	2.9	14.3	0
	Pre	2.1	0.36	1.3	0.4	3.3	0.07	0.57
Healthy communication	Post	4.5	0.9	2.1	0.49	3.1	14.2	0
	Pre	2.5	0.78	1.9	0.5	2.9	0.15	0.48
TV Viewing	Post	4	0.63	2.5	0.33	3	15.3	0
	pre	3.2	0.74	2.1	0.4	3.2	0.24	0.45
Communication issues	Post	4.8	0.72	1.9	0.44	2.9	0.53	0
	Pre	2.7	0.7	1.6	0.49	2.6	11.6	0.37
Understanding of children	Post	4.8	0.73	1.1	0.37	3.1	0.28	0
	Pre	2.8	0.78	1.1	0.34	3.1	0.7	0.12
Family coherenc	Post	4.2	0.73	2	0.34	3	15.1	0
	Pre	1.9	1	1.3	0.52	2.9	0.76	0.39
Parent children relationship	Post	4.9	0.72	2.8	0.44	2.6	12.8	0
	Pre	2.8	0.76	2	0.49	3.1	0.37	0.59

Source: Primary data

$P \leq .05$ [a]n = 50, [b]n = 50, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

From the above table the post-test mean score of experimental and control group are M = 4.73, and M = 2.17. The average mean score value M = 3.17. The 'P' value is less than .05. This shows that there is a significant difference between the two groups, on understanding messages after giving training to the parents.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on positive relationship are M = 4.31 and M = 1.97, the mean difference is 2.97, p < .05. This shows there is a significant difference between the two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing the positive relationship among the family members.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on healthy communication are M = 4.56 and M = 2.17, the mean difference is 3.17, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing healthy communication in the family.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on television viewing are M = 4.04 and M = 2.57, the mean difference is 3.04, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing time spending by the family in front of television.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on communication issues are M = 4.85 and M = 1.91, the mean difference is 2.91, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing communication issues between the family members.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on understanding children are M = 4.89 and M = 1.13, the mean difference is 3.13, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing parents towards understanding children through communication.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on family coherence are M = 4.25 and M = 2.04, the mean difference is 3.04, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing member's coherence.

In the analysis of post-test, the mean score value of experimental and control group on parent children relationship are M = 4.93 and M = 2.88, the mean difference is 2.60, 'p' value is less than .05. This shown that there is a significant difference between two groups. From this the training is helpful in developing relationship between parent and children.

From the above table it is clear that the family communication skills of the family member are increased after the training, while comparing the post control and experimental group. The training is important to increase communication among the family.

5. Findings

5.1. TV viewing pattern of the Children's

- A majority 47.4 % of the respondents have watch TV programmes up to less than one hours during week days.
- The respondents of 28.4 % watch TV programmes up to 2-3 hours and 26.5 % watch TV programme for about 1-2 hours during weekends.
- A majority 36.0 % of the respondents prefer to watch TV Alone. 34.9 % like to view TV with Children's.
- A majority 40.6 % of the respondent's view TV programme for entertainment. 38.5 % view TV programme for time pass. 21.0 % of the respondent's view TV for gaining knowledge.
- A majority 65.8 % of the respondent's view TV programmes while eating.
-

5.2. Content of TV programme

- Majority 31.7 percent respondents like to view News, 16.3 % of the respondents like to view Reality Shows, 13.7 % of the respondents like to view Songs and Serials.
- Majority 33.9 % of the respondents like to see the programs in English other than mother tongue.
- Majority 32.2 % of the respondents do not allow their children to view television programmes with contents like Glamour's, violence, Drug abuse, Intimate scene and scenes with filthy words.
- Majority 15.0 % of the respondents like to simply watch other news like local/district news and 13.1 % of the respondents like to view Education and awareness.

5.3. Understanding the content of the programme

- Majority 30 % of the respondents in both ways Positive and Negative about perception of TV programmes. 25.8 % in negative way aspects.
- Majority 25.9 % of the respondents do not know the intention of the TV programmes 25.1 % understand the meaning, 24.4, 24.6 do understand often and sometimes respectively.
- Majority 21 % the respondent's children's like to imitate as Politicians.
- Majority 26.7 % of the respondents improve their knowledge and keeps up with current trends from TV programmes.

3.4. Post-test of control group and experimental group

1. There is significant difference in the understanding of television of Skill related among the control group and experimental group.
2. There is significant difference in the understanding of television content among the control group and experimental group.
3. There is significant difference in the understanding of diverse in media environment among the control group and experimental group.
4. There are significant differences in the understanding of Media Changing the family Communication among the control group and experimental group.
5. There is significant difference in the understanding of Media developing the family communication among the control group and experimental group.
6. There is significant difference in the understanding of Purpose of Parental

Television Mediation among the control group and experimental group.

6. Conclusion

For the future young generation, Parents have a responsibility to do some changes in their family communication patterns and television mediating style. Due to the mixed culture and history its necessity to preserve these morals and imbibe only the qualities of other cultures. Nowadays parents are spending less hour with their children's and only the place they spend together is in front of the television. So, the television is the deciding factor in the family communication in this scenario the parents ideal and doesn't mediate any messages about the television programs to the children's.

The outcome shown that the respondents indeed perceive television programme which influence them both in positive and negative way. This study too evidenced that the family communication is affected by the television viewing patterns. The understanding of the messages makes positive relationship in the family. Healthy communication practices make the family relationship healthier and which leads to the family harmony. Relationship and communicating with the parents are very important to understand the children perspective towards the real and their desires. Violence are the decider factor for the analysis of the children's behavior. The information and exposure provided by television can impact an extensive range of attitudes and behaviour beyond providing entertainment in the family occurrence.

References

[1] Chaffee, Steven, Jack M. McLeod, and Charles t. Atkin (1971), Parental Influences on Adolescent Media Use," American Behavioral Scientist, 14 (January-February), 323-340.

[2] McLeod, Jack and Steven H. Chaffee (1972), The Construction of Social Reality," in The Social Influence Process. ed. J. T. Tiedeschi, Chicago: AldineAtherton, 50-99.

[3] Craig M. Allen PhD & Chung M. Lee MS (1993) Family of Origin Structure and Intra/Extrafamilial Childhood Sexual Victimization of Male and Female Offenders, Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 1:3, 31-46, DOI: 10.1300/J070v01n03_03

[4] Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. Family Process, 18(1), 3-28.

[5] Meyrowitz, J. (1985). No sense of place: The impact of electronic media on social behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.

[6] Sonck, Nathalie & Nikken, Peter & Haan, Jos. (2013). Determinants of Internet Mediation:. Journal of Children and Media. 7. 96-113. 10.1080/17482798.2012.739806.