

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Shin, W;Lwin, MO

Title:

Parental mediation of children's digital media use in high digital penetration countries: perspectives from Singapore and Australia

Date:

2022-01-19

Citation:

Shin, W. & Lwin, M. O. (2022). Parental mediation of children's digital media use in high digital penetration countries: perspectives from Singapore and Australia. *ASIAN JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION*, 32 (4), <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2022.2026992>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/297355>

This is the pre-print version of:

Shin, W., & Lwin, M. O. (2022). Parental mediation of children's digital media use in high digital penetration countries: perspectives from Singapore and Australia. *Asian Journal of Communication* (published online), doi: [10.1080/01292986.2022.2026992](https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2022.2026992)

Parental Mediation of Children's Digital Media Use in High Digital Penetration Countries: Perspectives from Singapore and Australia

This research examines how parents in two high digital penetration nations in the Asia-Pacific region, Singapore and Australia, mediate children's use of digital media and how parental mediation practices in each country are explained by parents' media perception, digital literacy, and parental self-efficacy. We conducted surveys with parents residing in Singapore (N = 316) and Australia (N = 315). Results show that Australian parents are more actively engaged in all types of parental mediation as compared to Singaporean parents. In both countries, those who are concerned about risks associated with their children's digital media use and those who feel confident in their parenting abilities are more likely to actively engage in all types of parental mediation. Findings also show that digitally literate parents are more prone to implement discussion-based mediation than control-based mediation.

Keywords: parental mediation; digital media; youth; cross-cultural comparison,

Singapore; Australia

Introduction

Digital media can help young people connect with friends and family and obtain new ideas and knowledge (Anderson & Jiang, 2018). However, children also face numerous risks and challenges when using digital media, such as the pressure to look popular on social media, exposure to inappropriate content, cyberbullying, and privacy invasion (Chassiakos et al., 2016). Parental mediation research (Clark, 2011) suggests that parents' active involvement in media supervision can alleviate negative media influences on youth. Most prior studies on parental mediation practices and effectiveness to this point, however, have been conducted in the US or Europe. In addition, most existing parental mediation studies are based on single-country data, with a few notable exceptions (e.g., EU Kids Online). As a result, research comparing cultural differences in parental mediation practices is relatively scant. Even rarer is research comparing Western and non-Western differences in parental mediation in countries with similar digital media usage patterns.

This study aims to fill gaps in the research literature by examining parental mediation of children's digital media use in two distinct cultural contexts both with high rates of digital connectivity within the Asia-Pacific region —Singapore (non-Western culture) and Australia (Western culture) — to further advance knowledge regarding parental mediation in a fast-changing media environment. Adopting Shin and Li's (2017) approach to "digital technology," this study views children's use of computers, smartphones, and tablets as digital media use. We investigate parental mediation of children's "overall" digital media use (the total screen time spent on computers, smartphones, and tablets) rather than parental mediation of a single medium, because digital youth today tend to engage in media multitasking, using multiple digital devices concurrently (Uncapher et al., 2017). As children move across diverse digital devices to

undertake an array of media activities, it is important to examine mediation strategies adopted by modern parents to address the overall screen time consumed on multiple digital media.

This study explores three types of parental mediation: active mediation (i.e., parents explaining media content and practices and discussing them with their children), restrictive mediation (i.e., parents limiting their children's access to media), and monitoring (parents checking of children's media activities). Co-use (parent-child shared media experience) is not examined in this study, as it is difficult for parents and children to share small and personal digital devices such as smartphones. Furthermore, to enhance our understanding of parental mediation in a digital media context, we examine three parental factors as potential antecedents of parental mediation: parents' concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use (media perception), the degree to which parents understand digital technology (digital literacy), and the extent to which they feel competent in their ability to parent successfully (parental self-efficacy).

Overall, the objective of this study is twofold. First, we aim to compare strategies that parents employ in two deeply digitally connected countries in the Asia-Pacific region to mediate their children's digital media use. Second, it examines factors associated with parental mediation practices in both countries. The next sections discuss similarities and differences between Singapore and Australia in terms of their media environments and parenting practices, followed by the notions and types of parental mediation and factors motivating parental mediation.

Research Context: Singapore and Australia

Singapore and Australia are similar in their high rates of digital connectivity and the ubiquitous nature of children's use of digital media. According to Huawei's Global Connectivity Index (2020), both countries belong to the "frontrunner" cluster that represents the most developed economies with the most advanced information and communication technology (ICT)

infrastructure in the world. The two countries have very high internet (90% in Singapore; 89% in Australia) and mobile (146% in Singapore; 127% in Australia) penetration rates, with about 80% of the populations being active social media users. (We Are Social, 2021a & 2021b).

Regarding children's use of digital media, almost all households with school-aged children (98%) in Singapore have internet access at home via computers, mobile phones, and other internet-enabled equipment (Infocomm Media Development Authority, 2019). Ninety-nine percent of children aged 7-14 are internet users in Singapore, and strong majorities use portable devices such as smartphones (93%), laptops (79%), and tablets (62%) to undertake such digital activities as using instant messaging (71%), downloading/watching movies (68%), and social networking (53%) (Infocomm Media Development Authority, 2019). Similarly, in Australia, 97% of the households with children under the age of 15 have access to the internet at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018). Computers (desktops or laptops) and mobile/smart phones are the most popular digital devices, used by 91% of internet-connected households, followed by tablets (66%) (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018). The vast majority of youths aged 12-17 actively engage in online activities to chat with friends (93%), listen to music (92%), and play games with others (77%) (eSafety Commissioner, 2021).

Both countries emphasize the importance of parents in managing children's digital media use and provide various forms of information and guidance for parents. The Ministry of Education (MOE) in Singapore has initiated cyber wellness programs integrated into the school curriculum and stresses the importance of parents playing an active role and setting a good example to complement the MOE's cyber wellness curriculum in schools (<https://www.moe.gov.sg/programmes/cyber-wellness>). The MOE also provides parenting tips: talk with children about internet use, set rules for media use, utilize parental controls on computing devices, and be a role model for good digital habits. Its portal directed specifically at

parents (<https://www.schoolbag.edu.sg/story/guide-for-parents-on-setting-parental-controls>) shares detailed tips and resources to help parents be informed regarding the risks associated with diverse aspects of children's digital media use. Similar pieces of advice are provided by TOUCH Community Service, a not-for-profit entity that operates in more than 360 schools and organizations nationwide to provide cyber wellness programs for both school children and parents (<https://www.touch.org.sg/about-touch/our-services/touch-cyber-wellness-homepage>).

Australia also puts an important emphasis on cyber wellness knowledge and information and communication technology education for both parents and children. The eSafety Commissioner, an organization set up by the Australian government with an aim to foster safe and positive online experiences among Australian netizens, has an "eSafetyparents" section on its website (<https://www.esafety.gov.au/parents>), which offers a wide range of resources for parents, including tips and downloadable guides to tackle challenges posed by digital media and the latest research about cyber safety and security. The website also recommends parental mediation strategies, with three core themes: sharing online time and keeping lines of communication open, setting rules for digital devices, and using devices and tools to monitor and manage children's digital device use (<https://www.esafety.gov.au/parents/skills-advice/online-safety-basics>). The Raising Child Network (<https://raisingchildren.net.au/>), another major information source for Australian parents funded by the government, provides similar tips and advice for parents. The network encourages parents to take an active role in protecting children from digital risks, by talking to children about digital content and safety risks, setting rules for screen use, and staying abreast of their children's online activities.

While Singapore and Australia are located in the Asia-Pacific region and share strong parallels regarding digital connectivity and the roles that parents are expected to play in children's digital media use, the two countries differ notably in terms of national culture, as

Singapore demonstrates a high degree of collectivism often associated with Asian culture whereas Australian culture leans toward a Western model of highly individualistic citizens (Hofstede Insight, n.d.). In addition to the collectivism-individualism distinction, the two countries differ substantially along other cultural dimensions such as power distance (i.e., the degree to which less powerful people in a society accept that power is distributed unequally: Singapore = 74; Australia = 38), long-term orientation (i.e., the degree to which a society focuses on the future and is willing to delay short-term gratification for long-term success: Singapore = 72; Australia = 21), and indulgence (i.e., the degree to which a society allows gratification relating to enjoying life and having fun: Singapore = 46; Australia = 71) (Hofstede Insight, n.d.).

Other cultural differences also abound between the two nations. Although both countries have colonial ties to the United Kingdom (UK), Singapore, at the heart of Asia, is typically viewed as following Eastern norms, whereas Australia maintains strong historical, economic, political, and societal links to UK and Western norms. While both countries are multicultural, Singaporeans are primarily of Asian ancestry (predominantly Chinese, Malay, Indian), while Australians primarily report having European ancestry. Cultural divergences are likely to be reflected in, and have impacts on, a wide range of behavioral domains, including parenting. Research shows that parents in Asian countries are inclined to place a greater emphasis on respect for parents and interdependence, whereas parents in Western countries such as the USA and Europe tend to value self-expression and independent behaviors in their children (Sahithya, Manohari, & Vijaya, 2019). Research also suggests that parenting styles in Singapore and Australia closely align with patterns found in other Asian and Western societies, respectively. Singaporean parents are described as more strict, controlling, and goal-oriented relative to parents in Western countries (Stright & Yeo, 2014). On the other hand, Australian parents tend to

be less prescriptive or demanding as compared to parents in Asian countries such as China (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998) and India (Sahithya et al. 2019).

Parental Mediation: Concepts and Types

As reflected in the aforementioned initiatives and resources that promote youth digital safety and cyber wellness in Singapore and Australia, parents in those countries are expected to play an active role in guiding and managing children's media use, which also represents a principal focus of parental mediation research. Parental mediation refers to strategies adopted by parents to manage and supervise children's use of media (Clark, 2011). The goal of parental mediation is generally twofold: (1) to minimize risks associated with children's media use; and (2) to maximize the positive impacts of media among children (Glazt, Crowe, & Buchanan, 2018). Since the notion of parental mediation emerged in the field of communication in the early 1980s, scholars have recognized the multidimensionality of parental mediation and identified different forms of parental mediation (e.g., Bybee, Robinson, & Turow, 1982; Nathanson, 1999; Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999). Among the parental mediation strategies that prior research has identified and examined, this study focuses on three types: active mediation, restrictive mediation, and monitoring.

Active mediation refers to communication-based parental mediation motivated by parents' intention to educate and explain diverse aspects of media use to their children. Active mediation influences children's media-related perceptions and behaviors by providing parents with opportunities to explain the rationales for their media supervision and giving children chances to share their views on parental mediation. This reciprocal communication between parents and children can help children develop critical thinking skills and accept parental mediation as a legitimate intervention (Fujioka & Austine, 2003). Restrictive mediation refers to parents' setting rules regarding children's media use and limiting their access to media.

Compared to active mediation, restrictive mediation is more a one-way street from parents to children, as media rules are set by parents and children are expected to comply with the rules without asking questions (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2005). Restrictive mediation can protect children from harmful media effects by limiting children's exposure to risks pertaining to media use (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008). However, restrictive mediation can also backfire when imposed on older children, in particular adolescents with a growing need for autonomy (Sasson & Mesch, 2014). Finally, monitoring refers to parents' checking of children's media activities. Examples of monitoring include parents' checking children's Social Networking Service (SNS) posts and keeping an eye on children's interactions with other internet users. Monitoring is different from active mediation in that the former is less likely to involve active discussions about media. It also differs from restrictive mediation in that monitoring is not necessarily driven by parents' motivation to reduce children's exposure to media. Instead, monitoring centers on parents' surveillance of children's media use to check and understand what exactly they do with media devices (Daneels & Vanwysberghe, 2017).

The themes of parenting advice provided by government- and non-governmental organizations in both Singapore and Australia generally corroborate the three parental mediation strategies: talk to/with children about digital media use (active mediation), set rules about children's device use (restrictive mediation), and check and understand the activities your children engage in online and with mobile devices (monitoring). However, little research has examined the extent to which different forms of parental mediation are practiced by parents in those two countries to manage children's overall digital media use. One study (Shin & Li, 2017) explored mediation strategies implemented by parents in Singapore to manage children's overall digital screen time spent on computers, smartphones, and tablets, finding that active and restrictive mediation was more prevalent than monitoring. However, that study examined parents

of a narrow age group of children (primary school students) in a single country. In Australia, the Office of the Children's eSafety Commissioner (2018) conducted a survey of 3,520 parents of children aged 2-17 and found that the majority of parents talk to their children about online safety (69%), set rules about children's access to internet use (81%), and monitor their children's online activities (78%). The survey focused primarily on online safety rather than overall digital media consumption, however, and, as a single-country study, it does not explain whether the findings are unique to Australia in comparison to other countries.

Despite the lack of cross-cultural research on the levels and types of parental mediation implemented in the Asia-Pacific context, cross-cultural research conducted in other parts of the world suggests that parental mediation practices vary by culture. Kirwil's (2009) cross-cultural comparison of parental mediation of children's internet use in Europe shows that restrictive rules are preferred by parents from collectivistic childrearing cultures, whereas social co-use is preferred by parents from individualistic childrearing cultures. Mertens and d'Haenens' (2014) analysis of the EU Kids Online data demonstrates that parents in less collectivistic countries are more likely to report greater involvement in active mediation, co-use, and monitoring, as compared to parents in more collectivistic countries. Unlike Kirwil's (2009) findings, however, Mertens and d'Haenens (2014) did not find a significant association between collectivism and restrictive mediation.

In sum, culture appears to play an important role in parenting in general and parental mediation in particular. Cultural and social norms shape our values and family structures, which represent important foundations for parental mediation practices. With little research in the Asia-Pacific context and mixed findings from cross-cultural research, the present study refrains from making specific predictions regarding the levels and types of parental mediation in Singapore and Australia, although we hypothesize that:

H1. Parents of children aged 8-18 in Singapore and Australia will show differences in the way they implement parental mediation to manage their children's overall digital media use.

The Role of Media Perception, Digital Literacy, and Parenting Self-Efficacy

This study explores three parental factors as potential antecedents of parental mediation of children's digital media use in Singapore and Australia: concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use (media perception), digital literacy, and parenting efficacy.

Regarding parents' media perception, research has demonstrated that parents' views on media do affect their parental mediation practices (e.g., Lee, 2013; Shin, 2017; Warren, Gerke, & Kelly, 2002). Specifically, those who are concerned about negative media impacts on their children are more likely to engage in higher levels of parental mediation. Nikken and Jansz (2006) found that Dutch parents with negative perceptions of electronic games were more likely to implement high levels of active and restrictive mediation. Lee (2013) demonstrated that Korean parents' perceptions of negative internet impacts on their children were positively associated with their involvement in restrictive mediation. Shin (2017) showed that Singaporean parents who were concerned about their children's use of computers and smartphones were more likely to implement active mediation to manage their children's consumption of those devices.

Another factor to be examined as a potential antecedent of parental mediation is parents' digital literacy. Studies show that digitally literate parents are more likely to mediate their children's digital media use. Livingstone et al. (2017) found that digitally skilled European parents were more likely to engage in enabling mediation (a combination of active mediation, monitoring and technical control, along with child-initiated support for parental internet use). Sonck, Nikken, and de Haan (2013) demonstrated that Dutch parents' perceived internet skills were positively associated with their monitoring of children's internet use. Shin (2018) found

that the degree to which American parents felt confident in their smartphone skills was positively related to their active and restrictive mediation of children's smartphone use.

Finally, we examine the impact of parental self-efficacy on parental mediation. Parental self-efficacy (PSE) refers to the extent to which parents are competent in their abilities to parent successfully (Jones & Prinz, 2005). Prior studies have demonstrated that PSE is positively associated with active and effective parenting practices (Albanese, Russo, & Geller, 2019; Glatz et al., 2018; Jones & Prinz, 2005). Considering that parental mediation is a type of parenting practice, a meaningful association between PSE and parental mediation is expected. However, only a few recent studies have examined PSE in relation to parental mediation. Shin (2017) found a positive association between PSE and parental active mediation of children's use of televisions, computers, and smartphones in Singapore. Additionally, that study demonstrated that PSE led parents to more actively engage in active mediation of advertising presented via those technologies. Another study conducted by Shin (2018) discovered that American parents who rated high on PSE were more likely to engage in active mediation of children's smartphone use, even when the parents themselves had low smartphone-specific self-efficacy (i.e., the degree to which they feel competent in their knowledge of smartphone technologies).

Overall, prior research suggests that parents' concerns about children's digital media use, the extent to which they understand digital technology, and the degree to which they feel confident in their parenting abilities are likely to motivate parents to actively supervise and manage children's media use. These insights have been fairly consistent in studies across cultures, although the number of studies focusing on parenting self-efficacy and parental mediation is limited and few studies have examined parental digital literacy in the Australian and Singaporean contexts. We thus pose the following hypothesis:

H2. In both Singapore and Australia, (a) parents' concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use, (b) their digital literacy, and (c) their parental self-efficacy will be positively associated with the degree to which they implement parental mediation to manage their children's overall digital media use.

Method

Participants and Procedure

An online survey was conducted with parents residing in Singapore and Australia in 2017. We engaged Qualtrics, an international research firm, to recruit survey participants in both countries. The sample was drawn from Qualtrics' online panels of adults in the two countries. Two separate questionnaires were created, and respondents in each country were directed to the questionnaire corresponding to their country. The two questionnaires were identical except for a few demographic questions (e.g., income, education, ethnicity, regions) to reflect local differences in population classifications. In both countries, individuals invited to take part in the survey were first required to answer two screening questions before participating: (1) whether they were a parent of a child aged 8-18; and (2) whether their child aged 8-18 spent some time on a computer, tablet, or smartphone. Examples and definitions of the three devices (computer, tablet, and smartphone) were provided.

In Singapore, a total of 622 accessed the questionnaire, generating 316 (51%) usable responses. In Australia, a total of 546 individuals accessed the questionnaires, of which 315 (58%) provided responses that were usable after screening and quality checks. Singaporean and Australian respondents were comparable in terms of the key demographic characteristics, as presented in Table 1.

<Table 1 is about here>

Measures

Before answering questions related to digital media and parental mediation, respondents were given the definition of digital media as follows: “For the purpose of this study, digital media refers to computers, tablets, and smartphones. The Computer category includes both PCs and laptops. One’s use of a computer encompasses all online and offline activities on the device, such as using the internet, sending emails, and doing work. The Tablet category, also known as a Tablet PC, is a wireless, portable computer with a touchscreen interface (e.g., iPad, Galaxy tab, etc.). It is typically smaller than a notebook computer but larger than a smartphone. The Smartphone category represents a mobile phone that performs many of the functions of a computer, typically having a touchscreen interface, internet access, and an operating system capable of running downloaded apps.” Then, half of the qualified individuals were asked to think about their youngest child, and the rest were asked to think about their oldest one when answering the survey questions, if they had more than one child whose age was 8-18 using digital media. The questionnaire measured the following constructs.

Parental mediation of digital media use was measured by asking participants to rate how often they engaged in different forms of parental mediation regarding their children’s use of digital media. *Active mediation* was measured using seven items assessing parents’ helping on and talking about proper ways of using digital media (e.g., “I explain why certain contents are appropriate/inappropriate for my child.”). *Restrictive mediation* was measured using six items that assessed parents’ restriction and control of children’s digital media use (e.g., “I restrict the types of websites my child can visit or mobile apps s/he can use.”). *Monitoring* was measured using four items assessing parents’ checking of children’s digital media activities (e.g., “I keep an eye on my child while s/he is using digital media.”). The measurement items were adapted from prior research on children’s use of digital media and parental mediation (Family Online Safety Institute, 2014; Livingstone et al., 2014) and assessed on 5-point scales anchored on

“never” (1) to “always” (5). Item scores corresponding each mediation style were averaged to create composite scales for active mediation, restrictive mediation, and monitoring.

Parents’ concerns about risks associated with children’s digital media use was measured by requesting parents to indicate the extent to which they were concerned about various risks of their child’s digital media use, using 14 items derived from studies examining risks and concerns associated with children’s digital media use (e.g., Family Online Safety Institute, 2014; O’Keeffe, Clarke-Pearson, & Council on Communications and Media, 2011). Examples items are “exposure to sexually explicit content,” “contacting or communicating with strangers,” and “bullying others.” The items were measured on 5-point scales, anchored on “not at all concerned” (1) to “extremely concerns” (5). The scores were averaged to construct a composite scale.

Parental digital literacy was measured by asking parents whether they knew how to undertake various activities on binary scales (1 = “yes”; 0 = “no”). Eighteen items were adapted from prior digital literacy studies (e.g., Livingstone et al., 2017; Sonck et al., 2011). Example items include “compare different websites to decide if information is true,” “block messages from someone I don’t want to hear from,” and “put/post messages, images, videos or music.” The number of “yes” indications (1) was summed to form a composite scale of parental digital literacy.

Parental self-efficacy was assessed using five parenting efficacy items adapted from the Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) inventory (Gilmore & Cuskelly, 2009) on 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). An example item is “I would make a fine model for a parent to follow in order to learn what s/he would need to know to be a good parent.” The item scores were averaged to construct a composite scale.

Descriptive statistics for the measurements are displayed in Table 2.

<Table 2 is about here>

Results

Sample Characteristics

As displayed in Table 1, the final sample consisted of slightly more female than male parents in both countries. Among the respondents recruited in Singapore, Chinese was the most dominant ethnicity, which is also the largest ethnic group in the country. Among the respondents recruited in Australia, the majority reported that Australia was the country that they most strongly associated themselves for their ethnicity. The median annual income among the sample fell in the \$100,000-149,000 range in both countries, and more than half of the respondents held a Bachelor's degree or above (Singapore = 62.3%; Australia = 54.3%). In Singapore, the median household income is approximately S\$110,000 (Department of Statistics Singapore, 2018), and 31.6% of the adult population hold at least a Bachelor's degree or equivalent (The World Bank, 2018). Thus, the profile of the Singaporean parent sample was similar to the Singaporean population in terms of income, but it included those with a higher average level of education than the general population. In Australia, the median household income is approximately A\$84,000 (Fitzsimmons, 2018), and 31.7% of the adult population hold at least a Bachelor's degree or equivalent (The World Bank, 2018). Thus, the Australian parent sample included respondents from higher-income households with a higher average level of education than the general population.

Hypothesis Testing

H1 predicted that parents in Singapore and Australia would practice parental mediation differently. To test H1, we first compared the composite scores of active mediation, restrictive mediation, and monitoring between the two countries using independent t-tests. Results indicate that Australian parents were more actively engaged in all types of parental mediation: their

composite scores for active mediation ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.86$), restrictive mediation ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 0.82$), and monitoring ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.99$) were all significantly greater than the respective scores for Singaporean parents in terms of active mediation ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.76$), restrictive mediation ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.02$), and monitoring ($M = 2.95$, $SD = .90$), all at $p < .05$.

We then conducted a series of hierarchical regression analyses with the composite scores of the three types of parental mediation to examine further whether the country has significant effects on parental mediation even after controlling for parent-child characteristics. For each analysis, control variables (parent and child demographic characteristics, parent media perception, digital literacy, and parental self-efficacy) were entered into the first block, and the country as a dummy independent variable entered into the second block. The results presented in Table 3 confirm that country differences persist after controlling for the variables we have in the data.

<Table 3 is about here>

In order to acquire a nuanced understanding of parental mediation practices, we also performed an additional series of independent t-tests to compare specific parental mediation strategies adopted by Singaporean vs. Australian parents. Table 4 presents the results.

<Table 4 is about here>

Australian parents outperformed Singaporean parents in all active mediation domains, except for “having a conversation about the amount of time children spend on digital media.” Additionally, Australian parents were more likely than Singaporean parents to implement restrictive mediation by controlling the types of websites/apps their children visit and use, the types of people they can interact with through digital media, the types of personal information their children can disclose, and the types of digital activities in which they engage. Lastly, Australian parents were more proactive in implementing all types of monitoring strategies as

compared to Singaporean parents. In view of the significant differences in the three summated parental mediation scales as well as a number of specific parental mediation strategies, the results support H1.

Regarding the relationship between three parental factors and parental mediation in Singapore versus Australia (H2), we predicted that parents' concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use (media perception) (H2a), digital literacy (H2b), and parental self-efficacy (H2c) would be positively associated with parental mediation in both countries. To test the hypothesis, we conducted a series of hierarchical regression analyses with the composite scales of active mediation, restrictive mediation, and monitoring in each country as dependent variables. For each analysis, control variables (parent and child demographic characteristics) were entered into the first block, and three parental factors were entered into the second block. Our choice of the control variables was based on prior studies on parental mediation of children's digital media use (e.g., Livingstone et al., 2011; Livingstone et al., 2015; Sonck et al., 2013), which suggest that parent and child characteristics can have substantial impacts on parental mediation practices.

Table 5 displays the results.

<Table 5 is about here>

In both countries, concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use are positively associated with all three forms of parental mediation. This supports H2a. Regarding the role of parents' digital literacy, our findings show that digitally literate parents are more likely to engage in active mediation in both countries. However, digital literacy is not associated with restrictive mediation in either country. Moreover, while digital literacy is a positive but weak predictor for Singaporean parents' engagement in monitoring, it is not significantly associated with Australian parents' monitoring. Thus, H2b is fully supported for active

mediation, not supported for restrictive mediation, and partially supported for monitoring.

Finally, parental self-efficacy is positively associated with all types of parental mediation in both countries, all at $p < .001$ level. Thus, H2c is fully confirmed.

Several control variables are significantly associated with parental mediation variables. Child's age is negatively associated with parent's implementation of restrictive mediation and monitoring in both countries. While female parents are more likely than male parents to engage in all three forms of parental mediation in Singapore and active mediation in Australia, child's gender is not associated with parental mediation in either country. Parent's education is positively related to restrictive mediation in Singapore and monitoring in both countries. However, household income has no association with parental mediation. In terms of ethnicity, Chinese parents in Singapore are less likely to engage in parental mediation as compared to parents of other ethnic backgrounds in the country.

Discussion

In communities witnessing the rising use of and reliance on digital media among children, concerns relating to children's digital media consumption have escalated. However, little is known regarding parents' management of children's "overall" digital media use and total screen time, despite the fact that children often engage in media multitasking. Moreover, prior research has relied heavily on single-country data, gathered primarily in the West. By examining parental mediation practices in two economically and digitally advanced but culturally different countries in the same region, we set out to advance knowledge regarding how parents manage digital youth's overall screen time in two different cultures.

Our results indicate significant differences between the two cultures in the way parents implement parental mediation strategies. Australian parents reported higher levels of all types of parental mediation as compared to Singaporean parents, taking more steps to help and explain

various aspects of digital media (active mediation), to control their children's use of digital media (restrictive mediation), and to pay close attention to their children's use of digital devices (monitoring). Looking at the specific strategies adopted by parents, the only areas of parental mediation with no cultural differences were content and time restrictions and conversations regarding time spent on digital media.

These findings suggest that culture plays an important role in determining how parents mediate children's screen activities. Based on our earlier discussion of the Eastern and Western cultural orientations in Singapore and Australia, respectively, these differences appear to drive divergent approaches to parental mediation. In Singapore, parallel with Asian parents' emphasis on academic pursuits (Ang et al., 2009), and perhaps the perception of technology as an assistant in the acquisition of knowledge, parents appear to be less concerned about issues concerning children's use of digital media, and subsequently practice less monitoring and mediation. In Australia, conversely, our findings reveal that parents play more active roles in managing what their children do online. This appears to be reflective of an Australian cultural emphasis on wholistic child upbringing and the importance of psychosocial development among children (Leung et al., 1998). The finding may also be attributed to Australian parents' preference for an authoritative parenting style (Haslan et al., 2020; Russell, Hart, Robinson, & Olsen, 2003). Being both demanding and responsive, authoritative parents set rules for conduct and consistently monitor their children's behavior while respecting children's autonomy and engaging in communication with children. These authoritative parents are more likely to actively engage in parental mediation as compared to permissive, authoritarian, and uninvolved parents (Carlson & Grossbart, 1998; Eastin, Greenberg, & Hofschire, 2006).

While the degree to which parents engage in parental mediation practices differed by culture, there were also similarities in the way three parental factors (media perception, digital

literacy, and parental self-efficacy) affected parental mediation. First, in both countries, parents' concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use (media perception) predicted all three types of parental mediation. The constantly changing digital media landscape presents numerous new risks to children, and parents are concerned about it. Addressing the threats that emerge with an escalation in digital technology use, concerned parents seem to seek means of protecting their children, utilizing various forms of parental mediation strategies to maximize the effects and effectiveness of parental media intervention.

Similar to media perception, parental self-efficacy (PSE) predicted all three types of parental mediation in both countries. In other words, parents who are confident in their parenting abilities are more likely to talk to their children about digital media, control their children's use of digital devices, and closely monitor their children's digital activities. While our findings corroborate two previous studies examining PSE and active mediation (Shin, 2017, 2018), the current study has added knowledge by investigating the relationship between PSE and a wider range of parental mediation strategies and revealing that self-efficacy plays a crucial role in parental management and supervision of children's digital media use. Efficacy perceptions lead individuals to be more proactive about their pursuits and to go on with them despite potential difficulties (Bandura, 1997). This finding is consistent with results from prior research revealing that parents with high PSE actively engage in active mediation even when they are not confident about their media-related skills (Shin, 2018).

An interesting finding is that digital literacy is significantly related to active mediation (in both countries) and monitoring (in Singapore), but not to restrictive mediation. The non-significant relationship between digital literacy and restrictive mediation found in our study corroborates what Livingstone et al. (2017) found in Europe. Their EU Kids Online survey revealed that the more parents were digitally skilled, the more they preferred enabling mediation

(a combination of active mediation, monitoring and technical control, along with child-initiated support for parental internet use) to restrictions. Regarding that finding, Livingstone et al. (2017) argued that enabling mediation could be a more demanding strategy; digitally literate parents may deem active mediation and monitoring to be less demanding as they feel confident in their knowledge and skills in digital technology. Because they are already digital literate and understand how to manage their children's media use through conversation and monitoring, digitally literate parents may not need to restrict their children's consumption of digital media.

The present study has important implications for parents, media educators, and policy makers. Given that parents are the primary socialization agents and caregivers for children in most societies, it is important to understand what parents do to minimize harms pertaining to children's digital media use while maximizing opportunities brought by digital technologies. Our findings point to important differences in parenting approaches even across countries that are similar in terms of economic development and digital connectedness. The findings imply that parental mediation of children's' online digital activities cannot be taken for granted as a uniform behavior internationally. Both government- and non-governmental organizations need to pay close attention to cyber safety and wellness among youth at national levels and to develop local initiatives and policies to encourage and guide culturally-relevant parental mediation. For instance, in Singapore, where active mediation is relatively less common and collectivism is high, it may be useful to establish peer-led parental social media initiatives to educate and guide parents on the culturally-relevant online topics they can discuss with children. In Australia, however, self-guided modules that are assessed by individuals may work best in assisting parents.

Several limitations merit discussion. First, although the data set is robust, the data is not fully representative of the entire population of Singapore and Australia, which limited the

generalizability of the findings. The analysis allows us to compare between the two countries but not to drill further to examine population sub-groups within each country. Future research should expand the dataset to increase generalizability and examine differences between sub-populations in each country. Second, while we have collected data which allows for a comparison across cultures, more country samples can strengthen and contribute to understanding the cross-cultural parental mediation landscape. Future inclusion of more countries in the research will also be beneficial for understanding parents' behaviors across cultural contexts. Third, the range of children's age examined in this study (8-18) is quite broad. The importance of parental mediation is likely to diminish as children grow older and pursue more autonomy (Lee, 2013) and evolve in terms of parental mediation strategies deployed (Lwin, Stanaland & Miyazaki 2008). This is reflected in our results showing the negative associations between children's age and restrictive and monitoring mediation. However, our cross-cultural comparisons in parental mediation practices presented in Table 4 did not distinguish varied developmental characteristics of children of different ages.

Further, we assessed the level of parental digital literacy using a binary scale. We used a binary scale because many of the measurement items in this study could be better assessed with a binary scale rather than a 5-point Likert scale. However, since multiple-category scales allow researchers to capture nuances in responses (Scott, Ummer, & LeFevre, 2021), we suggest future research consider adopting rating scales to gauge diverse dimensions of parental digital literacy. Finally, our data reflect parents' views only. Having a matching dataset made up of responses from children would provide a wider research lens for parent-child matched analyses, and would thus provide deeper insights. Future research should therefore endeavor to collect data from both parents and children as well as other immediate family members where possible.

References

- Albanese, A., Russo, G., & Geller, P. A. (2019). The role of parental self-efficacy in parent and child well-being: A systematic review of associated outcomes. *Child: Chare, Health & Development*, 45(3), 333-363.
- Anderson, M., & Jiang, J. (2018). Teens, social media & technology 2018. *Pew Research Center* (May 31, 2018). Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/05/31/teens-social-media-technology-2018/>
- Ang, R. P., Klassen, R. M., Chonh, W. H., Huan, V. S., Wong, I. Y. F., Yeo, L. S., & Karwshuk, L. L. (2009). Cross-cultural invariance of the academic expectations stress inventory: Adolescent samples from Canada and Singapore. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 1225-1237.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2018). 8146.0 – Household use of information technology, Australia, 2016-2017. Retrieved from <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/8146.0>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Self-control*. New York: Freeman.
- Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2005). Parental mediation of undesired advertising effects. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 49(2), 153–165.
- Bybee, C. R., Robinson, D., & Turow, J. (1982). Determinants of parental guidance of children's television viewing for a special subgroup: Mass media scholars. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 26(3), 697–710.
- Carlson, L., & Grossbart, S. (1998). Parental style and consumer socialization of children. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(1), 77-94.
- Chassoakos, Y. R., Radesky, J., Christakis, D., Moreno, M.A., Cross, C., & Council on Communications and Media (2016). Children and adolescents and digital media. *Pediatrics*, 138(5), e20162593.

- Clark, L. S. (2011). Parental mediation technology for the digital age. *Communication Theory*, 21(4), 323-343.
- Daneels, R., & Vanwynsberghe, H. (2017). Mediating social media use: Connecting parents' mediation strategies and social media literacy. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 11(3), Article 5.
- Department of Statistics Singapore (2018). Key household income trends, 2018. Retrieved 26 Feb 2020 from <https://www.singstat.gov.sg/-/media/files/publications/households/pp-s25.pdf>
- Eastin, M. S., Greenberg, B. S., Hofschire, L. (2006). Parenting the Internet. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 486-504.
- eSafety Commissioner (2021). The digital Lives of Aussie Teens. Retrieved 1 November 2021 from <https://protect-au.mimecast.com/s/UbnkCXLKNwFXlmoOZfDyxhE?domain=esafety.gov.au>
- Family Online Safety Institute (2014). Parents, Privacy & Technology Use. Retrieved 10 June 2020 from <https://www.fosi.org/policy-research/parents-privacy-technology-use/>
- Fitzsimmons, C. (2018). How wealthy are you compared with other Australians? The Sunday Morning Herald (April 10, 2018). Retrieved 26 Feb 2020 from <https://www.smh.com.au/money/planning-and-budgeting/how-wealthy-are-you-compared-with-other-australians-20180410-p4z8s4.html>
- Fujioka, Y., & Austin, E. W. (2003). The implications of vantage point in parental mediation of television and child's attitudes toward drinking alcohol. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 47(3), 418-434.
- Gilmore, L., & Cuskelly, M. (2009). Factors structurer of the parenting sense of competence scale using a normative sample. *Child: Care, Health, and Development*, 35(1), 48-55.

- Glatz, T., Crowe, E., & Buchanan, C. (2018). Internet-specific parental self-efficacy: Developmental differences and links to internet-specific mediation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 84, 8-17.
- Haslam, D., Poniman, C., Filus, A., Sumargi, A., & Boediman, L. (2020). Parenting style, child emotion regulation and behavioral problems: The moderating role of cultural values in Australia and Indonesia. *Marriage & Family Review*, 56(4), 320-342.
- Hofstede Insight (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/>
- Huawei (2020). Global Connectivity Index. Retrieved from <https://www.huawei.com/minisite/gci/en/>
- Infocomm Media Development Authority (2019). Annual survey on infocomm usage in households and by individuals for 2018. Retrieved from https://www.imda.gov.sg/-/media/Imda/Files/Infocomm-Media-Landscape/Research-and-Statistics/Survey-Report/2019-HH-Public-Report_09032020.pdf
- Jones, T. L., & Prinz, R. K. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25, 341-363.
- Kirwil, L. (2009). Parental mediation of children's internet use in different European countries. *Journal of Children and Media*, 3(4), 394-409.
- Lee, S.-J. (2013). Parental restrictive mediation of children's internet use: Effective for what and for whom? *New Media & Society*, 15(4), 466-481.
- Leung, K., Lau, S., & Lam, W.-L. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross-cultural study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 44(2), 157-172.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Vincent, J., Mascheroni, G., & Olafsson (2014). *Net Children Go Mobile: The UK report*. London: London School of Economic and Political Science.

- Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2008). Parental mediation of children's internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 52(4), 581-599.
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., Dreier, M., Chaudron, S., & Lagae, K. (2015). *How parents of young children manage digital devices at home: The role of income, education and parental style*. London, UK: EU Kids Online.
- Livingstone, S., Olafsson, K., Helsper, E. J., Lupianez-Villanueva, F., Veltri, G. A., & Folkword, F. (2017). Maximizing opportunities and minimizing risks for children online: The role of digital skills in emerging strategies of parental mediation. *Journal of Communication*, 67, 82-105.
- Lwin, May O., Stanaland, A. J. S., & Miyazaki, A. D. (2008). Protecting children's privacy online: how parental mediation strategies affect website safeguard effectiveness. *Journal of Retailing*, 84(2), 205-217.
- Mertens, S., & d'Haenens, L. (2014). Parental mediation of internet use and cultural values esafety*Communications*, 39(4), 389-414.
- Nathanson, A. (1999). Identifying and explaining the relationship between parental mediation and children's aggression. *Communication Research*, 26(2), 124-143.
- Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2006). Parental mediation of children's videogame playing: A comparison of the reports by parents and children. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(2), 181-202.
- Office of eSafety Commissioner (2018). *Parenting in the Digital Age*. Retrieved 16 July 2021 from <https://www.esafety.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-07/eSafety%20Research%20Parenting%20Digital%20Age.pdf>
- O'Keeffe, G. S., Clarke-Pearson, K., & Council on Communications and Media (2011). *Pediatrics*, 127(4), 800-804.

- Russell, A., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., & Olsen, S. F. (2003). Children's sociable and aggressive behavior with peers: A comparison of the US and Australia, and contributions of temperament and parenting styles. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(1), 74-86.
- Sahithya, B. R., Manohari, S. M., & Vijaya, R. (2019). Parenting styles and its impact on children – A cross cultural review with focus on India. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 22(4), 357-383.
- Sasson, H., & Mesch, G. (2014). Parental mediation, peer norms and risky online behavior among adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 33, 32-38.
- Scott, K., Ummer, O., & LeFevre, A. E. (2021). The devil is the detail: Reflections on the value and application of cognitive interviewing to strengthen quantitative surveys in global health. *Health Policy and Planning*, 36(6), 982-995.
- Shin, W. (2017). Active mediation of television, internet, and mobile advertising. *Young Consumers*, 18(4), 378-392.
- Shin, W. (2018). Empowered parents: the role of self-efficacy in parental mediation of children's smartphone use in the United States. *Journal of Children and Media*, 12(4), 465-477.
- Shin, W., & Li, B. (2017). Parental mediation of children's digital technology use in Singapore. *Journal of Children and Media*, 11(1), 1-19.
- Sonck, N., Livingstone, N., Kuiper, E., and de Haan, J. (2011). Digital literacy and safety skills. EU Kids Online. Retrieved 28 February 2020 from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/33733/1/Digital%20literacy%20and%20safety%20skills%20%28lse%20ro%29.pdf>.
- Sonck, N., Nikken, P., & de Haan, J. (2013). Determinants of internet mediation. *Journal of Children and Media*, 71(1). 96-113.

- Stright, A. D., & Yeo, K. L. (2014). Maternal parenting styles, school involvement, and children's school achievement and conduct in Singapore. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(1), 301-314.
- Uncapher, M. R., Lin, L., Rosen, L. D., Kirkorian, H. L., Baron, N. S., Cantor, J., Strayer, D. L., Parsons, T.D., & Wagner, A. D. (2017). Media multitasking and cognitive, psychological, neural, and learning differences. *Pediatrics, 140* (Supplement 2), S62-S66.
- Valkenburg, P. M., Krcmar, M., Peeters, A. L., & Marseille, N. M. (1999). Developing a scale to assess three styles of television mediation: "Instructive mediation, "restrictive mediation," and "social coviewing." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 43*(1), 52–66.
- Warren, R., Gerke, P., & Kelly, M. A. (2002). Is there enough time on the clock? Parental involvement and mediation of children's television viewing. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 46*(1), 87-111.
- We Are Social (2021a). Digital 2021 Singapore. Retrieved 16 July 2021 from <https://wearesocial.com/sg/digital-2021-singapore>
- We Are Social (2021b). Digital 2021 Australia. Retrieved 16 July 2021 from <https://wearesocial.com/au/digital-2021-australia>
- The World Bank (2018). Educational attainment, at least Bachelor's or equivalent, population 25+, total (%) (cumulative). Retrieved 26 February 2020 from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.TER.CUAT.BA>

Table 1. Demographic Profiles of Participants

	Singapore (N = 316)	Australia (N = 315)
Child's age (Mean)	12.61	12.45
Child's gender (Male, %)	56.3%	57.0%
Parent's gender (Male, %)	42.1%	43.5%
Parent's ethnicity (Mode)	Chinese (83.2%)	Australian (79.4%)
Parent's education: Bachelor and above	62.3%	54.3%
Annual household income (Median)	S\$100,000-149,000 (25.3%)	A\$100,000-149,000 (31.4%)

* 1 Singaporean dollar (S\$) is close to 1 Australia dollar (A\$)

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Measurements

Variables	Range	Singapore		Australia	
		Mean (SD)	Cronbach's α	Mean (SD)	Cronbach's α
Active mediation	1-5	3.58 (0.76)	0.89	3.80 (0.86)	0.91
Restrictive mediation	1-5	3.24 (1.02)	0.91	3.49 (0.82)	0.92
Monitoring	1-5	2.95 (0.90)	0.80	3.17 (0.99)	0.85
Concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use	1-5	3.67 (0.89)	0.94	3.21 (1.07)	0.96
Digital literacy	0-18	15.23 (3.16)	-	14.50 (4.00)	-
Parental self-efficacy	1-5	3.55 (0.61)	0.77	3.71 (0.66)	0.81

Table 3. Hierarchical Regressions to Examine the Impact of Country on Parental Mediation Practices

	Active mediation	Restrictive mediation	Monitoring
Block 1: Control variables			
Child's age	-.09*	-.37***	-.30***
Child's gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	.05	.01	-.03
Parent's gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	.14***	.11**	.10**
Parent's education	.07	.10**	.15***
Household income	.03	.03	.08*
Ethnicity (1 = Australian/Chinese, 0 = other)	-.05	-.07*	-.05
Concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use	.23***	.21***	.24***
Digital literacy	.19***	.03	.08*
Parental self-efficacy	.23***	.26***	.23***
R ² Δ	[.20***]	[.32***]	[.31***]
Block 2: Country (1 = Singapore, 0 = Australia)	-.19***	-.14***	-.15***
R ² Δ	[.03***]	[.02***]	[.02***]
Total R ²	[.23***]	[.34***]	[.33***]

* < .05, ** $p < .01$, *** < .001. *, ** for R^2 indicates significance of R^2 increments.

Note: Beta weights (β) are from final regression equations with all blocks of variables in the model.

Table 4. Comparisons between Singapore and Australia on Parental Mediation Strategies

Measurement items	Singapore	Australia	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> (2-tailed)
<u>Active mediation</u>				
I explain why certain contents are appropriate/ inappropriate for my child.	3.58 (1.01)	3.83 (1.06)	-3.07	< 0.01
I try to help my child understand what s/he sees on digital media.	3.47 (0.99)	3.68 (1.02)	-2.65	< 0.01
I explain how to protect his/her personal information.	3.48 (1.01)	3.82 (1.05)	-4.01	< 0.01
I encourage my child to talk to me if s/he has come across someone or something that makes him/her feel uncomfortable.	3.85 (0.98)	4.07 (1.02)	-2.78	< 0.01
I explain the dangers of digital media to my child.	3.63 (0.97)	3.88 (0.96)	-3.22	< 0.01
I suggest ways to behave towards other people online.	3.41 (0.98)	3.65 (1.08)	-2.88	< 0.01
I have a conversation about the amount of time s/he spends on digital media.	3.62 (0.89)	3.68 (1.03)	-0.85	0.39
<u>Restrictive mediation</u>				
I restrict the types of websites my child can visit or mobile apps he/she can use.	3.13 (1.33)	3.35 (1.40)	-2.02	< 0.05
I restrict the types of content my child can view.	3.22 (1.26)	3.37 (1.34)	-1.39	0.17
I set rules regarding the types of people my child can talk.	3.15 (1.25)	3.68 (1.28)	-5.30	< 0.01
I restrict the types of personal information my child can share.	3.41 (1.18)	3.73 (1.25)	-3.39	< 0.01
I limit the amount of time my child can spend on digital media.	3.46 (1.11)	3.47 (1.20)	-0.12	0.91
I restrict the types of activities my child can do using digital media.	3.10 (1.23)	3.36 (1.28)	-2.58	< 0.05
<u>Monitoring</u>				
I keep an eye on my child while s/he is using digital media.	3.25 (1.02)	3.44 (1.18)	-2.14	< 0.05
I ask about what my child is doing while using digital media.	3.51 (0.91)	3.74 (0.97)	-3.00	< 0.01
I check the messages in my child's email, instant messaging, or social media profile with his/her consensus.	2.64 (1.32)	2.97 (1.32)	-3.06	< 0.01
I check the messages in my child's email, instant messaging, or social media profile without his/her consensus.	2.40 (1.25)	2.71 (1.44)	-2.91	< 0.01

Note: All measures are based on a 5-point scale. Cells under Singapore and Australia represent the mean value and standard deviation.

Table 5. Hierarchical Regressions to Predict Parental Mediation: Country Comparison

	Active mediation		Restrictive mediation		Monitoring	
	Singapore	Australia	Singapore	Australia	Singapore	Australia
Block 1: Control variables						
Child's age	-.07	-.10	-.34***	-.41***	-.31***	-.31***
Child's gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	.07	.02	-.01	.03	-.09	.01
Parent's gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	.14**	.16**	.13**	.09	.19***	.03
Parent's education	.05	.07	.12*	.09	.16**	.13*
Household income	.07	-.01	.08	-.04	.10	.05
Ethnicity (1 = Australian/Chinese, 0 = other)	-.11*	.03	-.13**	.01	-.10*	.00
R ² Δ	[.12***]	[.05*]	[.29***]	[.18***]	[.29***]	[.15***]
Block 2: Factors Motivating Parental Mediation Practices						
Concerns about risks associated with children's digital media use	.15**	.30***	.16**	.26***	.14**	.30***
Digital literacy	.25***	.14**	.09	-.01	.10*	.06
Parental self-efficacy	.22***	.23***	.26***	.26***	.25***	.22***
R ² Δ	[.14***]	[.17***]	[.10***]	[.13***]	[.09***]	[.14***]
Total R ²	[.25***]	[.21***]	[.39***]	[.31***]	[.39***]	[.29***]

* < .05, ** p < .01, *** < .001. *, ** for R^2 indicates significance of R^2 increments.

Note: Beta weights (β) are from final regression equations with all blocks of variables in the model.