Determinants of Internet Mediation: A comparison of the reports by Dutch parents and children
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## Sample

"The sample consisted of 1,004 Dutch internet users aged between 9 and 16, as well as
one of their parents. The sample was drawn by the Dutch research organization IBT
Marktonderzoek. First, a random sample of households was drawn from addresses in the
national telephone directory, stratified by region and population density. Second, one 9- to
16-year-old internet user and one parent were approached from each of these selected
households and asked to participate in an in-home face-to-face survey between May and
August 2010. From the total of 2,638 child –parent dyads approached, 1,004 interviews
were completed." (Sonck et al., 2013, p. 100)

# Abstract

This article empirically examines if parents apply new types of mediation for the internet, using data from the Dutch EU Kids Online project. The high internet penetration in the Netherlands makes this study especially relevant because almost all parents and children use the internet. Factor analyses applied to reports by parents and children (aged 9– 16) revealed four mediation types that are comparable for both groups: active safety mediation, restrictive content mediation, restrictive technical mediation, and monitoring. Demographics (age, gender, education, family size), measures of internet usage, and parental views towards internet use were analysed as determinants of the parental mediation types.
Parents monitored younger children in particular, more often actively mediated girls and more often restricted children’s internet use in larger families. The use of virtually all mediation types was related to children’s diversity in internet use and the parents’ view on the benefits of their involvement.

# Outcome

"The data revealed that two of the three mediation styles found in previous television and
video games research were also perceived by parents and children as distinct forms of
internet mediation, namely, active and restrictive mediation. Our data also corroborated
Livingstone and Helsper’s (2008) notion that restrictive mediation comprises two different
types: content and technical restrictions. And in line with Livingstone and Helsper,
monitoring emerged as a distinct style of internet mediation" (Sonck et al., 2013, p. 108)
"In addition to these four types of internet mediation, we did not find agreement
among parents and children on co-use as a separate mediation style, or on the adapted
version, “active co-use”, as proposed by Livingstone and Helsper (2008)." (Sonck et al., 2013, p. 108)

"In line with prior research on media socialization, the results showed that parental
accounts of internet mediation were consistently higher than those of children. According
to both groups, technical tools to restrict internet use were applied the least, whilst actively
mediating internet use was the most prevalent mediation style. Active mediation was also
the style on which parent and child reports showed most differences in an absolute sense.
In relative terms, however, there was close agreement between parents and children on the
prevalence of each mediation style, indicating that the two groups concurred in their
recognition of each mediation style" (Sonck et al., 2013, p. 109)

"Parents and children not only differed in the absolute amount of mediation
perceived, but to a certain extent also in the determining factors (demographics, internet
usage, and parental views) that influence the four mediation styles. Parents and children
differed for about half the significant relationships between the mediation styles and the
determinants. This finding provides further evidence that the two groups each have their
own perceptions of parents’ internet guidance" (Sonck et al., 2013, p. 109)