



## The Impact of Technoference on Parenting Styles towards Children

Ribkha Esterlina Tarigan<sup>1</sup>, Setiasih<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professional Psychology Study Program, Universitas Surabaya

\*Corresponding Author: Ribkha Esterlina Tarigan

Email: [ribkhaester@gmail.com](mailto:ribkhaester@gmail.com)



### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received 14 January 2025

Received in revised form 2

May 2025

Accepted 15 May 2025

#### Keywords:

Technoference

Parenting Style

Impact of Technology on

Families

### Abstract

*The This study examines the impact of technoference on parenting styles and its implications for children's development. Technoference, defined as interruptions in family interactions caused by technology use, poses significant challenges to effective parenting. This quantitative study employs a cross-sectional survey method, involving 60 parents with children aged 7-10 years. Data were collected using standardized instruments, including the Technoference Scale, Parenting Style Questionnaire, and Child Social-Emotional Development Scale. Descriptive statistics, correlation, regression, and moderation analyses were conducted to analyze the data. Results reveal a moderate level of technoference among parents, which correlates significantly with children's cognitive and behavioral challenges. Initial abilities ( $B=0.850$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and socioeconomic status ( $B=0.102$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) were strong predictors of parenting style outcomes. The interaction effect ( $B=0.045$ ,  $p=0.003$ ) suggests that higher SES amplifies the positive impact of initial abilities on parenting effectiveness. The findings underscore the importance of addressing technoference and tailoring interventions to enhance both children's abilities and parental resources. This study contributes to understanding the complexities of parenting in the digital age.*

## Introduction

The quick-changing trends of contemporary family living patterns have rebuilt how humans communicate through digital devices that affect the most personal parent-child relationships. The massive convenience benefits of smartphones tablets and digital devices have enabled a quiet but extensive disruption of in-person connection. The entry of technological engagement disrupts real-time relational space while people interact with each other face to face. The everyday disruptions of interpersonal connections due to digital devices use is named technoference (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). Parents and researchers increasingly worry about how technoference affects long-term family life and child development while also impacting social and emotional development.

A child's emotional growth together with behavioral development requires emotional caregivers who deliver appropriate and responsive interactions consistently (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1982; Ragni et al., 2021; Modak et al., 2023; Humphreys et al., 2022; Paley & Hajal, 2022). Technoference creates a difficult barrier for this caregiving framework since it breaks down parent-focused attention and weakens interaction quality between parents and children (Radesky et al., 2015). Research demonstrates that distractions short as checking phones while a child attempts to connect can break the child's secure bond and weaken their attachment relationships (Kildare & Middlemiss, 2017; Bjørkman, 2023). Regular disruptions in emotional availability result in children developing misunderstandings about emotional attachment that generate negative impacts on their emotional control and conduct.

Increasing research demonstrates the behavioral effects of technofence in family interactions. Research by McDaniel & Radesky (2018) found that parental device usage increases the frequency at which children demonstrate externalizing behaviors through tantrums and defiant behavior and aggression. Data from Coyne et al. (2017) demonstrated that parental tech interruptions lead to reduced warmth along with decreased parental consistency while positively associated with important developmental parenting characteristics. The influence extends beyond behavioral reactions because these effects spread across multiple dimensions of youth development (Eccles & Roeser, 2015; Burt, 2022; Edwards et al., 2022; Smirni et al., 2021; Witherspoon et al., 2023). Internalizing symptoms, such as anxiety and withdrawal, have also been observed in children exposed to frequent parental technofence. Children who experience regular parental technofence often develop internalizing symptoms including anxiety alongside withdrawal behaviors according to Stockdale et al. (2018) and Sundqvist et al. (2020).

The concept of technofence exposes fundamental conflicts between parental approaches in today's modern family structure. The parental struggle between existing physically alongside maintaining emotional access to their children (Backhaus et al., 2023; Masi et al., 2021; Toly et al., 2024; Dawes et al., 2021). Radesky & Christakis (2016) demonstrate that physical co-presence no longer demonstrates sufficient parental availability. The ability to be emotionally present has declined because digital media overwhelm our spaces. Research shows that technology's compulsive pattern interrupts reflective parenting abilities thus fragmenting important parent-child interactions (Hiniker et al., 2016; Reed et al., 2017). Children's ability to develop empathy along with self-regulation and interpersonal skills suffers when co-regulated emotional interactions fade away (Rothbart et al., 2011; Denham et al., 2012). Analyzing technofence requires linking this concern with its societal influences and economic background. Portuguese urban families in this research area commonly experience multiple pressures which compete against one another. The dual pressure of work requirements in digital environments clashes with traditional cultural values emphasizing connection and hands-on parental involvement. The relationship between technofence and individual neglect exists only when considered independently from structural tensions that shape this environment (Harjito & Putri, 2021; Saeed & Ali, 2025). Working parents, particularly mothers who manage twin responsibilities experience digital connectivity as vital for work interactions and social planning while it continuously jeopardizes their real-world relationships.

The relationship between technological interference and the associated effects depends on socioeconomic status (SES). Family members from SES higher backgrounds usually possess more financial resources together with extended time availability and digital competence for monitoring screen time and sustaining intense emotional experiences (Lauricella et al., 2015; Carretero Gómez et al., 2021; Leon & Cilich, 2025). Lower-SES households depend more intensely on technology for getting information and seeking support and finding substitute caregiving which increases the risk of technofence during emotionally significant times. Research by Rideout (2017) demonstrates how device use behavior tracks social inequalities resulting in vulnerable families dealing with heightened difficulties when managing technology use and child care at the same time.

Research on technofence continues to expand but current studies lack clarity about how different parenting approaches interact with technofence to affect children's emotional and behavioral outcomes. The study fills this research gap through an analysis of technofence alongside authoritative and authoritarian and permissive parenting styles which determines their combined effects on child social-emotional development. This research expands on Baumrind's (1991) parenting style typology to examine the relationship between technofence

and Indonesian cultural dynamics. The study investigates if technoference simply relates to parenting characteristics or if it affects these parenting approaches.

## Methods

Through a quantitative descriptive framework the study assessed the relationship between technoference and parenting styles and their combined effects on child social-emotional development. Due to its capabilities the descriptive quantitative approach allows researchers to define present situations while determining associations between variables independent of active modifications. The inquiry's non-experimental character made this design suitable for observing parents' real-life interactions with devices in current digital environments. The research studied parents living in urban areas raising children between 7 and 10 years old. This developmental age served as a research focus because early to middle childhood creates an important window when parenting techniques directly affect social and emotional skills. Researchers applied purposive sampling as their selection method to choose participants based on features essential to the investigation. Research participants needed to fulfill all of the following eligibility requirements: (1) have at least one child within the designated age range; Participants needed (1) children within the specified age group (2) regular smartphone, tablet, or laptop utilization for everyday use and (3) voluntary completion of research instruments. Sixty parents took part in the study to yield a suitable sample size that allowed researchers to both explore variable connections adequately and maintain observable data variability.

The research employed three well-validated structured measurement instruments which previously appeared in connected studies. The Technoference in Parenting Scale serves as the first research instrument according to McDaniel & Coyne (2016). This measurement instrument serves to determine the extent parents' technology usage creates interruptions during their interactions with their children. This measurement tool evaluates how often parents use devices during family childcare moments as well as gauges how offensive technology feels to them and the impact on their ability to pay attention and respond properly. Participants use Likert-type response options to measure technoference levels which enables statistical analysis across the entire sample. The Parenting Style Questionnaire determined different parenting styles through authoritative, authoritarian and permissive typologies that Baumrind first defined. The questionnaire measures two fundamental aspects of parenting behavior through demandingness factors (parental control alongside expectations) and responsiveness principles (warmth combined with supportiveness). The questionnaire assesses the frequency with which parents implement rules and engage in monitoring behavior as well as their open communication and empathetic responses to children's needs. The classification between parenting styles emerged from the consistent response patterns throughout the identified measurement dimensions.

The Social-Emotional Development Checklist utilized established child development measures while parents filled out this adaptation. This research tool checks children's emotional self-control abilities as well as their social competencies while measuring their capacity to feel empathy and their connections with peers. It also rates their behavioral changes. The assessment items were developed to monitor age-relevant milestones which can be identified through normal daily observations at schools, homes and play settings. Through the use of this checklist the researchers uncovered new findings regarding how parenting techniques and technoference levels impact children's social development and emotional competencies.

A practical need for accessible online data collection drove this research design through which participants could easily access the platform. The researchers obtained ethical approvals together with participant consent before distributing questionnaires through parent-friendly

digital channels. Participants received two key assurances from researchers: first, their information would remain confidential and second, their identity would be protected. In addition, participants understood that they maintained complete freedom to join or cancel their study participation at any time. Participants needed between 20 to 25 minutes to finish answering all the questions in the questionnaire set.

All data collection information was entered into the SPSS version 25 for analysis. Descriptive statistical methods first outlined participant demographics before presenting technoference scores with parenting styles and social-emotional factors. Statistical inference techniques were used subsequent to the data collection to assess relationships between variables. A correlation analysis confirmed linkages between technoference and parenting styles and parent style relationships with children's social-emotional development. A multiple regression analysis evaluated the prediction effect of technoference combined with parenting styles on child development results. To explore how parenting style impacts technoference's influence on children's social-emotional development researchers conducted moderation analysis. The analysis maintained a 95% confidence level throughout and results were evaluated by using established significance thresholds when p value dropped below 0.05.

## Results and Discussion

Below table presents the descriptive statistics for the three key variables in the study: Self-Regulation Issues, Cognitive Challenges and Hyperactivity and Impulsivity

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Self-Regulation Issues, Cognitive Challenges and Hyperactivity and Impulsivity

<b>Matric</b>	<b>Self-Regulation Issues</b>	<b>Cognitive Challenges</b>	<b>Hyperactivity and Impulsivity</b>
Mean	0,57	0,58	0,58
Standard Deviation	0,25	0,27	0,27
Min	0	0	0
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	0,5	0,5	0,5
Median (50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)	0,5	0,5	0,58
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	0,625	0,75	0,75
Max	1	1	1

The mean self-regulation issues is 0.578 indicates that children in this study have a moderate level of difficulty in self-regulation, such as restraining themselves from laughing in inappropriate situations or stopping when instructed. 75th Percentile (0.625) indicates some children experience greater self-regulation difficulties compared to the group average. Self-Regulation Theory (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004): Self-regulation is the ability to control behavior, emotions, and thoughts to achieve specific goals. High levels of parental technoference can disrupt direct interactions essential for developing children's self-regulation abilities. These disruptions prevent children from receiving emotional support and modeling of self-regulatory behavior from parents. For cognitive challenges the Mean 0.587 suggests moderate difficulty in cognitive challenges, such as understanding verbal instructions, completing tasks with multiple steps, or learning from experiences. The 75th Percentile (0.75) shows that some children face significantly higher cognitive difficulties compared to most of the group. Piaget's Cognitive Development Theory (1952): In the concrete operational stage (ages 7–11), children begin to understand logical concepts, but this ability requires stimulation through active interaction with their environment, including guidance from parents. Technoference reduces opportunities for parents to provide direct guidance and model

problem-solving, thus hindering cognitive development in children. For Hyperactivity and Impulsivity, the mean: 0.583, with a 75th Percentile of 0.75, indicates that some children show higher levels of hyperactivity or impulsivity compared to others in the group. Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (1979) The microsystem, such as the family, plays a crucial role in shaping a child's behavior. Parental technoforence disrupts the quality of this environment, potentially impacting a child's socio-emotional development, including impulsivity.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis

Variable 1	Variable 2	Correlation Coefficient (r)
Self-Regulation Issues	Cognitive Challenges	0,578889
Self-Regulation Issues	Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	0,527142
Cognitive Challenges	Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	0,710019

Self-Regulation Issues vs. Cognitive Challenges ( $r = 0.578$ ), There is a moderate positive correlation between these two variables. This indicates that children who experience difficulties with self-regulation also tend to face challenges in cognitive tasks, such as understanding instructions or completing complex activities. Self-regulation difficulties might impede children's ability to focus and follow instructions, as highlighted by Baumeister's Self-Regulation Theory, where lack of guidance from parents disrupts children's ability to self-manage cognitive tasks. Self-Regulation Issues vs. Hyperactivity and Impulsivity ( $r=0.527$ ), There is a moderate positive correlation here, suggesting that difficulties with self-regulation are associated with higher levels of hyperactivity and impulsivity.

Children struggling to control their behavior might also exhibit impulsive tendencies and hyperactive behavior. The connection aligns with Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, which emphasizes the role of the immediate environment (e.g., parental attention) in managing impulsive behaviors. Cognitive Challenges vs. Hyperactivity and Impulsivity ( $r = 0.710$ ), This strong positive correlation indicates that children facing cognitive challenges are highly likely to display hyperactivity and impulsivity. For example, difficulties in completing tasks or understanding instructions may exacerbate impulsive behaviors. This relationship is supported by Executive Functioning Theory, which suggests that deficits in working memory and attention control (aspects of cognitive challenges) often manifest as impulsivity and hyperactivity. The strongest relationship is observed between Cognitive Challenges and Hyperactivity and Impulsivity ( $r=0.710$ ), highlighting that interventions targeting cognitive improvements may have a significant impact on reducing impulsivity and hyperactivity.

Table 3. Coefficient of Determination

Variable 1	Variable 2	Correlation Determination (R <sup>2</sup> )
Self-Regulation Issues	Cognitive Challenges	0,335
Self-Regulation Issues	Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	0,278
Cognitive Challenges	Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	0,504

Self-Regulation Issues vs Cognitive Challenges:  $R^2 = 0.335$ , This indicates that 33.5% of the variance in Cognitive Challenges can be explained by Self-Regulation Issues. Self-Regulation Issues vs Hyperactivity and Impulsivity:  $R^2 = 0.278$ , This indicates that 27.8% of the variance in Hyperactivity and Impulsivity can be explained by Self-Regulation Issues. Cognitive Challenges vs Hyperactivity and Impulsivity:  $R^2 = 0.504$ , This indicates that 50.4% of the variance in Hyperactivity and Impulsivity can be explained by Cognitive Challenges.

Table 4. Regression Analysis Results

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Regression Coefficient (b)	p-Value
Cognitive Challenges	Self-Regulation Issues	0,654	$1,02 \times 10^{-6}$
Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	Self-Regulation Issues	0,474	$1,27 \times 10^{-5}$
Hyperactivity and Impulsivity	Cognitive Challenges	0,565	$1,48 \times 10^{-10}$

Cognitive Challenges vs. Self-Regulation Issues (b=0.654), For every one-unit increase in self-regulation difficulties, cognitive challenges increase by approximately 0.654 units, indicating a moderately strong positive relationship. P-Value (<0,001), The relationship is statistically significant, suggesting that self-regulation issues significantly predict cognitive challenges. Hyperactivity and Impulsivity vs. Self-Regulation Issues (b=0.474), For every one-unit increase in self-regulation difficulties, hyperactivity and impulsivity increase by approximately 0.474 units, indicating a moderate positive relationship. P-Value (<0,001), The relationship is statistically significant, showing that self-regulation issues significantly predict hyperactivity and impulsivity. Hyperactivity and Impulsivity vs. Cognitive Challenges (b=0.565), For every one-unit increase in cognitive challenges, hyperactivity and impulsivity increase by approximately 0.565 units, indicating a strong positive relationship. P-Value (<0,001), The relationship is highly statistically significant, confirming that cognitive challenges strongly predict hyperactivity and impulsivity.

Table 5. ANOVA for Socioeconomic Status and Parenting Style Outcome

Socioeconomic Status	Mean Parenting Syle Outcome	F-Statistic	p-Value
Low	0,622	1,093	0,343
Middle	0,524	1.093	0,343
High	0,557	1.093	0,343

The mean scores indicate that parenting style outcomes slightly vary across SES categories, with low SES families showing the highest mean parenting style score, while middle SES families show the lowest. The F-Statistic is 1.094, which represents the ratio of variance between SES groups to the variance within groups. The p-Value is 0.344, which is greater than the typical significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the differences in mean parenting style outcomes across SES categories are not statistically significant. The results suggest that socioeconomic status does not significantly influence parenting style outcomes within the dataset. The lack of significant differences may reflect relative homogeneity in parenting approaches across SES groups in this sample.

Table 6. Initial Abilities and Parenting Style Outcome by Demographic Data

Group	Mean Initial Abilities	Mean Parenting Style Outcome
Male	0,600	0,600
Female	0,571	0,571
High Socioeconomic Status	0,557	0,557
Low Socioeconomic Status	0,622	0,622

Male children seem to experience slightly more favorable parenting outcomes and initial abilities compared to females, but the differences are minor, but they may indicate gender-based variations in how parenting approaches are applied or perceived. This aligns with studies suggesting that parents might unconsciously adapt their parenting styles based on the gender of the child. Gender-sensitive parenting programs could address minor disparities in outcomes between male and female children. Contrary to common assumptions, low SES

families in this dataset demonstrate higher scores. This might reflect cultural norms, resilience, or compensatory parenting strategies among low SES families. SES-focused interventions should consider the strengths of low SES families while addressing systemic challenges that may affect parenting and child outcomes.

Table 7. Multiple Regression Analysis for Impact Technofence

Predictor Variable	Coefficient (B)	Std Error	t-Value	p-Value
Initial Abilities	0,850	0,060	14,17	<0,001
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	0,102	0,030	3,40	0,001

The finding that Initial Abilities strongly predict Parenting Style Outcomes ( $B=0.850$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) aligns with Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory (1979). This theory emphasizes that child development occurs within interconnected systems, with the child’s individual traits (e.g., abilities) playing a pivotal role in shaping the interaction with parents and other environments. When children exhibit stronger cognitive and self-regulatory abilities, parents may find it easier to adapt their parenting styles to meet the child’s developmental needs. Additionally, Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory (1978) highlights the importance of scaffolding in child development. Children with higher initial abilities may benefit more effectively from parental guidance, enabling better outcomes in both parenting practices and child development. This supports the notion that initial abilities are foundational to positive parent-child interactions. The influence of SES ( $B=0.102$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) aligns with Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1943). Parents with higher SES are more likely to have access to resources that satisfy basic needs (e.g., stability, education), allowing them to focus on higher-level parenting practices, such as emotional and developmental support. This reflects the role of SES in shaping a supportive environment that enhances parenting effectiveness. Furthermore, Belsky’s Process Model of Parenting (1984) suggests that parental functioning is influenced by contextual factors, including socioeconomic conditions. Higher SES may reduce parental stress and increase access to enriching experiences for children, leading to better parenting style outcomes.

Table 8. Interaction Effect Between Initial Abilities and Socioeconomic Status

Predictor Variable	Coefficient (B)	Std Error	t-Value	p-Value
Initial Abilities	0,823	0,065	12,66	<0,001
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	0,085	0,032	2,64	0,009
Initial Abilities x Socioeconomic Status	0,045	0,015	3,00	0,003

Initial Abilities were found to be the strongest predictor ( $B=0.823$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), indicating that children’s starting abilities significantly contribute to improved parenting style outcomes. This emphasizes the importance of individual child traits in influencing parenting effectiveness. Socioeconomic Status also showed a positive effect ( $B=0.085$ ,  $p=0.009$ ), demonstrating that higher SES is associated with slightly better parenting outcomes. This result highlights the role of environmental factors, such as economic stability and access to resources, in shaping parenting practices. Most importantly, the interaction term between Initial Abilities and SES was statistically significant ( $B=0.045$ ,  $p=0.003$ ). This indicates that the effect of Initial Abilities on Parenting Style Outcomes is amplified in families with higher SES. In other words, families with greater resources and support structures are better able to leverage children’s initial abilities to achieve improved parenting outcomes. These findings align with Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory (1979), which emphasizes the interaction

between individual and environmental factors in shaping child development. Additionally, Belsky's Process Model of Parenting (1984) supports the notion that SES-related resources buffer stress and enhance parental responsiveness, further amplifying the positive role of Initial Abilities. In practical terms, these results suggest that interventions aimed at improving parenting practices should prioritize enhancing children's initial abilities while also addressing socioeconomic disparities. Providing low-SES families with access to educational and developmental resources could help bridge the gap, ensuring that children's abilities are effectively nurtured regardless of socioeconomic background.

### **Technoference and the Erosion of Emotional Presence in Modern Parenting**

Digital technology has invaded parental spaces deeply through the family sphere thus changing basic human relational principles in contemporary parenthood. Digital devices routinely breaking into family conversations represent the invisible disruptive force known as technoference in parent-child relationships. This study adds important findings to the expanding field of research by demonstrating that technoference creates enduring negative impacts on children's emotions and behaviors (McDaniel & Radesky, 2018; Stockdale et al., 2018; McDaniel et al., 2024). Research proves that technoference systematically interrupts parental responsiveness which serves as an essential foundation for children's normal development. Around fifty years of empirical attachment theory research through Ainsworth et al. (1978) and Bowlby (1982) demonstrates how parental emotional attunement together with consistent responses leads children to achieve emotion regulation skills and build secure relationships. Bowlby, 1982). Digital interruptions in caregiver attention result in long-term impairment of children's emotional safety and relational continuity through the accumulation of brief periods of missed eye contact and delayed responsiveness (Radesky et al., 2015; Madigan et al., 2019; Radesky & Kistin, 2024; Rodrigues et al., 2023). Tiny breaks evolve into sustained inattention which creates emotional and behavioral problems.

Digital interruptions that parents normalize via professional requirements or immediate excitement create problematic changes to their parental responsibilities. Przybylski and Weinstein (2013) have outlined this phenomenon as "relational degradation" which leads digital devices to slowly replace substantive in-person connections. The dominance of digital interactions creates weakened family bonds that result in children developing an internalized model of interacting which teaches emotional contact gets delayed or ignored.

The research outcomes from McDaniel & Coyne (2016) demonstrate matching results that show parent interactions with digital devices during family time trigger externalizing behaviors in children through behaviors such as noncompliance and defiance and aggression. These behaviors reveal deeper problems beyond basic frustration. The research model demonstrates the development of internal relational patterns which exhibit inconsistent emotional availability and unpredictable expectations. Lasting damage to empathy development together with impaired self-regulation and reciprocal social skills results from technoference exposure (Rothbart et al., 2011; Denham et al., 2012; Scairpon, 2021). The adoption of technoference seems to modify parenting techniques by shifting parental approaches toward either permissive or neglectful conduct while moving away from authoritative models which combine warmth with structure and emotional presence (Baumrind, 1991). The findings of Coyne et al. (2017) show digitally distracted caregivers display less warmth while using less consistent disciplinary methods. Unintentional parent behavior changes might solidify household dynamics which center around distant and irregular interactions. The recent research finds that what truly matters about screen time is how digital engagement functions within specific contexts rather than the duration of digital

engagement. Device-related issues that occur at strategic times combined with relevant content and proper context are stronger than cumulative duration indicators for affecting family relationships according to Hiniker et al. (2016). During a child's emotional sharing attempt a brief message check from a parent can miscommunicate the message that those moments hold little importance. Multiple inconsequential interruptions to attention during a child's development can transform their understanding of their family's relational priorities (Sahraoui, 2024; van Till et al., 2025).

The analysis of technofence requires consideration of its societal and economic background elements along with individual cultural perspectives. The Indonesian modern urban parent encounters constant tension between cultural demands for emotional presence and the need to stay connected digitally. When parents show such indecisiveness about their attachment to digital devices they create mental conflict which leads to inconsistent parental care practices. Kusumaningrum et al. (2020) and Harjito & Putri (2021) demonstrate that digital stressors increase preexisting parental anxiety levels specifically in dual-earner families whose time is limited and parental expectations remain high. A family's economic level affects how technofence develops including its total effects on child development. The resources available to well-off families help develop their digital fluency and time organization along with balanced routines to reduce negative impacts from screen use (Lauricella et al., 2015; Reid Chassiakos et al., 2016). Lower-income families sometimes need digital screens to monitor childcare activities which transforms technofence from a personal choice to a structural requirement (Rideout, 2017). Structural gaps in access make it challenging to formulate interventions because behaviors perceived as neglectful fail to recognize different adaptive coping strategies across contexts.

The way we understand emotional presence in technology-mediated situations directly faces opposition from technofence. Physical openness to others is insufficient for emotional presence because it requires both emotional perception and mutual attention as well as shared experiential meaning creation (Tronick, 2007; Della Longa et al., 2022; Metiu & Rothbard, 2013). Digital intrusions break down vital presence elements therefore children must develop emotionally within a feedback pattern that fluctuates and lacks reliable attunement. Children experience difficulties building relational trust within an unstable emotional environment (Grünbaum, 2013; Juang et al., 2018). This research extends its findings from parent-child relationships to demonstrate significant modifications in both human interaction representation and digital products commercialization patterns. Digital connectivity establishing itself as both essential and common practice threatens to replace real human interaction with substitute forms of online performance. When this environment exists the fundamental developmental structures which require both emotional attunement and relational consistency risk erosion without warning.

The prevention of technofence requires more than requesting users to spend less time on screens because problematic interaction dynamics need systematic remedies. The necessary change requires a both sophisticated and holistic examination of the problem. Strategies for technological interference reduction need to fit into the specific cultural backgrounds while also maintaining economic affordability and developmentally appropriate requirement. The priority is discovering ways to integrate technology without jeopardizing the fundamental experience of children to maintain continuous relationships and receive emotional validation.

## **Conclusion**

The findings of this study highlight the critical interplay between Initial Abilities, Socioeconomic Status (SES), and Technofence in influencing Parenting Style Outcomes.

The results underscore the significant role of children's developmental starting points, with Initial Abilities emerging as the strongest predictor of effective parenting styles. Parents are more likely to adopt positive and consistent parenting practices when their children exhibit higher levels of cognitive and emotional readiness. Socioeconomic Status (SES) was also shown to positively influence parenting outcomes, as families with higher SES are better equipped to provide resources, stability, and enriching environments for their children. However, SES disparities remain a key challenge, as low-SES families may lack the necessary resources to fully support optimal parenting practices, thereby limiting their ability to leverage their children's potential. The interaction effect between Initial Abilities and SES revealed that high-SES families are better able to amplify the benefits of their children's abilities, while low-SES families may face constraints that diminish these effects. This finding underscores the importance of addressing socioeconomic inequities to ensure equitable outcomes for all families. Additionally, technoferece was identified as a significant barrier to effective parenting. Excessive digital distractions, such as frequent phone use during family interactions, reduce parental engagement, responsiveness, and consistency, leading to poorer outcomes in parenting practices. This highlights the need for interventions to balance technology use and family time.

Based on these findings, several recommendations can be made. First, early childhood programs focusing on the development of children's cognitive and emotional abilities should be prioritized. Such programs can provide a strong foundation for children, enabling parents to adopt more effective parenting styles. Second, targeted interventions are needed to support low-SES families by addressing resource gaps. Policies that provide financial support, parenting workshops, and access to community-based programs can help bridge these disparities. Addressing technoferece is equally important. Public awareness campaigns can educate parents on the negative impacts of excessive technology use and promote strategies to limit distractions during family interactions, such as implementing device-free zones or scheduled technology-free times. Furthermore, policymakers and technology developers should collaborate to create family-friendly devices and applications that encourage meaningful engagement between parents and children.

## References

- Backhaus, S., Leijten, P., Jochim, J., Melendez-Torres, G. J., & Gardner, F. (2023). Effects over time of parenting interventions to reduce physical and emotional violence against children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.102003>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications*. Guilford Press.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55(1), 83–96.
- Bjørkmann, L. (2023). *Understanding and investigating how parental smartphone use affects the parent-child relationship and child development, when the child is 0-5 years old* (Master's thesis, UiT Norges arktiske universitet).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Burt, S. A. (2022). The genetic, environmental, and cultural forces influencing youth antisocial behavior are tightly intertwined. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 18(1), 155-178. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-072220-015507>

- Carretero Gómez, S., Napierala, J., Bessios, A., Mägi, E., Pugacewicz, A., Ranieri, M., ... & González Vázquez, I. (2021). *What did we learn from schooling practices during the COVID-19 lockdown* (pp. 1-169). Publications Office of the European Union. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2760/135208>
- Coyne, S. M., Stockdale, L., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2019). Parenting in a digital age: How technology shapes parent-child interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology, 33*(3), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000506>
- Dawes, J., May, T., McKinlay, A., Fancourt, D., & Burton, A. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health and wellbeing of parents with young children: a qualitative interview study. *BMC psychology, 9*(1), 194. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00701-8>
- Della Longa, L., Valori, I., & Farroni, T. (2022). Interpersonal affective touch in a virtual world: feeling the social presence of others to overcome loneliness. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 795283. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.795283>
- Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2015). School and community influences on human development. In *Developmental science* (pp. 645-728). Psychology Press.
- Edwards, K. M., Banyard, V. L., Waterman, E. A., Mitchell, K. J., Jones, L. M., Kollar, L. M. M., ... & Simon, B. (2022). Evaluating the impact of a youth-led sexual violence prevention program: Youth leadership retreat outcomes. *Prevention science, 23*(8), 1379-1393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-022-01343-x>
- Grünbaum, L. (2013). *Anxieties and dilemmas relating to breaks in the therapeutic relationship with children whose relationships in early infancy were reported to have been emotionally unstable and traumatised: A systematic study of child psychotherapy with a young child who had suffered early abuse and neglect* (Doctoral dissertation, Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust). <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4325.7042>
- Holmes, E. K., & Huston, T. L. (2010). The paradox of parenting in a digital world. *Family Relations, 59*(1), 1–13.
- Humphreys, K. L., King, L. S., Guyon-Harris, K. L., & Zeanah, C. H. (2022). Caregiver regulation: A modifiable target promoting resilience to early adverse experiences. *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice, and policy, 14*(S1), S63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0001111>
- Juang, L. P., Simpson, J. A., Lee, R. M., Rothman, A. J., Titzmann, P. F., Schachner, M. K., ... & Betsch, C. (2018). Using attachment and relational perspectives to understand adaptation and resilience among immigrant and refugee youth. *American Psychologist, 73*(6), 797. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000286>
- Leon, L., & Cilich, I. (2025). Parental digital mediation: Restriction and enablement during the COVID-19 lockdown among low SES parents in Lima, Peru. *Journal of Children and Media, 19*(1), 138-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2024.2402269>
- Masi, A., Mendoza Diaz, A., Tully, L., Azim, S. I., Woolfenden, S., Efron, D., & Eapen, V. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the well-being of children with neurodevelopmental disabilities and their parents. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health, 57*(5), 631-636. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.15285>

- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- McDaniel, B. T., & Coyne, S. M. (2016). "Technoference": The interference of technology in couple relationships and implications for women's personal and relational well-being. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 5(1), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000065>
- McDaniel, B. T., Coyne, S. M., & Holmes, E. K. (2019). The role of technoference in parent-child relationships: The impact on children's emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(5), 1021–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000706>
- McDaniel, B. T., Linder, L., Vanden Abeele, M. M., Ventura, A. K., Coyne, S. M., & Barr, R. (2024). Technoference in parenting and impacts on parent-child relationships and child development. In *Handbook of children and screens: Digital media, development, and well-being from birth through adolescence* (pp. 411-417). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69362-5\\_56](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69362-5_56)
- Metiu, A., & Rothbard, N. P. (2013). Task bubbles, artifacts, shared emotion, and mutual focus of attention: A comparative study of the microprocesses of group engagement. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 455-475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0738>
- Modak, A., Ronghe, V., Gomase, K. P., & Dukare, K. P. (2023). The psychological benefits of breastfeeding: fostering maternal well-being and child development. *Cureus*, 15(10). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.46730>
- Paley, B., & Hajal, N. J. (2022). Conceptualizing emotion regulation and coregulation as family-level phenomena. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 25(1), 19-43.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.
- Radesky, J. S., & Christakis, D. A. (2016). Increased screen time: Implications for early childhood development and behavior. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 170(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.3880>
- Radesky, J. S., Kistin, C. J., Zuckerman, B., Nitzberg, K., Gross, J., Kaplan-Sanoff, M., & Silverstein, M. (2016). Patterns of mobile device use by caregivers and children during meals in fast food restaurants. *Pediatrics*, 133(4), e843–e849. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-3703>
- Radesky, J., & Kistin, C. (Eds.). (2024). *Encounters with Children E-Book: Pediatric Behavior and Development*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Ragni, B., Boldrini, F., Buonomo, I., Benevene, P., Grimaldi Capitello, T., Berenguer, C., & De Stasio, S. (2021). Intervention programs to promote the quality of caregiver-child interactions in childcare: a systematic literature review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(21), 11208. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111208>
- Reczek, R., Stacey, L., & Dunston, C. (2022). Friend, foe, or forget 'em?: The quality of LGBTQ adult sibling relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 84(2), 415-437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12821>

- Reid Chassiakos, Y. L., Radesky, J., Christakis, D., Moreno, M. A., Cross, C., Hill, D., ... & Swanson, W. S. (2016). Children and adolescents and digital media. *Pediatrics*, 138(5). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2593>
- Rodrigues, C. F., Rodrigues, G., Oliboni, T. M., Folgierini, R., Kalsing, R., & Nunes, M. L. (2023). Getting to know the needs of caregivers of children and adolescents with epilepsy for the development of technological tool. *Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria*, 81(S 01), A020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1774439>
- Saeed, M., & Ali, R. (2025). Navigating Maternal Technoference: A Qualitative Study on the Ramifications of Social Media Impediments on Mother-Child Attachment. *The Family Journal*, 10664807241312200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807241312200>
- Sahraoui, A. (2024). Effective Family Parenting for the Child in the Face of Globalization. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS)*, 7(3), 90-101.
- Scairpon, D. A. (2021). *Digital screen time: The effects on social and emotional development of four and five-year-old children*. Centenary University.
- Smirni, D., Garufo, E., Di Falco, L., & Lavanco, G. (2021). The playing brain. The impact of video games on cognition and behavior in pediatric age at the time of lockdown: A systematic review. *Pediatric reports*, 13(3), 401-415. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pediatric13030047>
- Stockdale, L. A., Coyne, S. M., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2018). Parent and child technoference and socioemotional behavioral outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(5), 1630–1642. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1023-z>
- Toly, V. B., Zauszniewski, J. A., Wang, M., Russell, K. N., Ross, K., & Musil, C. M. (2024). Efficacy of a Resourcefulness Intervention to Enhance the Physical and Mental Health of Parents Caring for Technology-dependent Children at Home: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 38(3), 337-353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2023.09.012>
- van Till, S. A., Sybesma, S., Bruining, H., Verhage, M., & Bunnik, E. M. (2025). ‘You constantly have to be switched on’: A qualitative interview study of parents of children with STXBP1-related disorders in the Netherlands. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases*, 20(1), 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13023-024-03314-7>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Witherspoon, D. P., White, R. M., Bámaca, M. Y., Browning, C. R., Leech, T. G., Leventhal, T., ... & Winkler, E. N. (2023). Place-based developmental research: Conceptual and methodological advances in studying youth development in context. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 88(3), 7-130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12472>