

MODERN CIVILIZATION THREATS AND THE QUALITY OF DIALOGUE IN FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Arkadiusz Wąsiński, Michał Szyszka

Higher School of Administration in Bielsko-Biała, Poland
E-mail: arkadiusz.wasinski@gmail.com, szyszkathome@gmail.com

Abstract

In this study the authors discuss the issue of changes related to the integration and disintegration of family as regards the interaction of external factors listed among modern civilization threats. The authors assume that family is a special type of community life as compared to other forms of communities on various levels of social structure. It has a function to protect its members in the relations with the outside world, and at the same time it prepares them to take active part in the world and integrates them with what is outside. Coherence and durability of the family is in this context of key importance not only for development processes, quality and functioning of family members (both children and parents), but also for getting them ready to take up actions that contribute new values to the family life.

The form and structure of the text are shaped as the theoretical analysis created on the basis of empirical research published in scientific literature. The objective of this article is not the detailed description and interpretation of the research, but rather an attempt to intellectually exceed the boundaries of the research in order to define the significance of communication processes and the authenticity of family relationships for building the atmosphere of emotional kindness and the feeling of mutual support within the space of the family community. The consequence of such processes is the positive stimulation as regards taking up developmental tasks by the family members (both children and parents), which are realised in various circles of social, cultural and educational interactions of the social environment.

The constructive image of the theoretical analysis is disclosed in the considerations focused on methodical values of the strategy of family dialogue set in the perspective of specific behavior and attitudes of the family members as confronted with stereotypical fear of weakening the position and authority of the parents.

Key words: *civilization threats, factors of family disintegration, family as a community, intergenerational dialogue, open communication model.*

Introduction

The quality of the dialogue in family relationships largely depends on the character of social and cultural changes resulting from the development of information technologies (IT), as well as from the increasing pace of life of modern people in the professional, educational, ludic sphere and, as a consequence, also in the family.

The research on the factors of risk behavior among the school-aged youth on the Internet shows that one of the key factors that increase the likelihood of netaholism (net addiction) (Şenormancı,

Konkan, Sungur, 2012) among young people is the quality of communication between parents and the children. Daily Internet activity of young people takes place at home, after school, in the afternoon and evening and sometimes even at night and in the early morning. If such activity is taken up at the expense of other forms of participating in family life and experiencing daily family events together, it increases the communication barrier, accounts for a lack of common ground and causes the family members to become locked out in their separate worlds (Wąsiński, Tomczyk, 2013). As a result, the reality of family life is becoming less and less of an interaction between the parents and the child, and more of existing side by side. It becomes the reality of mental alienation of family members, who, despite truly loving each other, cannot talk about events that are important to them, experiences, expectations and desires (Ngai, 2007).

The increasing pace of life of both parents (adults) and children also lead to the weakening of various forms of community interactions between family members. The need to retain the control over the events, to plan one's professional career, to display effectiveness and availability at work also limits the opportunity to be with the child and to focus on the child's daily joys, successes but also hardships and problems. In addition to this, there is yet another civilization need related to the systematic self-improvement in various forms of formal and informal education (Buber, 1993; Bauman, 2005). Therefore, people experience the feeling of actually wasting the time which could be spent on relaxation and rest. Then a parent experiences a typical dilemma: *with whom and how to relax?*, in order to be able to distance oneself from current events and to relax physically and mentally. Organising free time with friends only strengthens the scheme of living side by side rather than together. Spending time with children, on the other hand, limits the parents' activity within their own age group.

Civilization threats for the modern people should in this context be identified not only with a loss of internal development harmony and natural dynamics of functioning, but also with the reduction in the quality of existence in the sphere of community life. The main issue is the gradual loss of the ability to fulfil oneself in the relations with other people who are with me and for me, for reasons other than an exchange of goods and benefits of material, financial and prestigious nature (Aronson, Wilson, Akert, 1998). Such a loss is impossible to make up for, recover, accelerate or compensate in any way as the time passes.

It is worth noticing that civilization threats – both those related to defective functioning of young people due to modern information technologies and those affecting adults – are focused at home. It largely depends on the parents' conscious actions, their personal priorities and readiness to become involved in the family affairs, how these threats will affect the functioning of family members, the dynamics of personality development and the quality of family relations (Hendry, Kloep, 2011; Douglass, 2007).

It is the parents who have a key choice to make, which affects the quality and character of life in the family community. It is a choice between allowing for gradual family disintegration and the willingness to create the relationships based on mutual openness and dialogue. At the same time, this is a choice between the fear of revealing oneself, which makes people intentionally neglect, overlook and therefore fail to solve conflicts in the relationship with the spouse or child and the consistent attitude of open, multilevel revealing in interpersonal and community relationships (Adler, Rosenfeld, Proctor II, 2010). The above mentioned involvement is not only supposed to reduce or solve budding conflicts, but it should by nature eliminate some situations that generate tension and conflicts. Solving such dilemma in favour of the dialogue and authentic existence in a community is therefore not an act of the good will of the parents who decide to act as appropriate, but rather their mental attitude and orientation towards open communication in marital and parental relationships (Gordon, 2000).

Psycho-social Conditioning of Family Dysfunction

Considering the causes of family dysfunction one has to recognize the significance of factors that trigger the phenomena which have a destructive influence upon the integrity of a family, care for mutual respect and understanding among its members, showing love and trust, readiness to talk to each other and treat each other subjectively as well as the quality of cooperation and support in difficult situations. One has to differentiate between two categories of factors that disintegrate family life, i.e. psychological,

communication-related factors, identified with individual motives of family members' actions towards one another - these factors directly influence the shape and nature of interaction between family members. The other category comprises social and cultural factors connected with phenomena and processes outside the family, yet significantly determining the conditions in which the family functions.

The former category is connected with such phenomena as:

- domestic violence, manifested in the form of mental, physical or sexual aggression towards family members, as well as neglecting basic activities connected with taking care and upbringing (Jarosz, 1997, pp. IV-VIII);
- feeling of being emotionally betrayed and abandoned by a parent, which often leads to deep disintegration of a family, separation and often divorce (see: Pospiszyl, 2000, pp. 185-195; see also: Nowak-Dziemianowicz, 2002, p. 86-94);
- segmentation of family life (Urban, 1997, p. 48), and thus a real division of the reality of family community into incompatible, separate and disconnected worlds of individual family members.

In such cases one usually looks for the explanations of status quo in the context of not being mature enough to exercise the roles of spouse and parent, low self-esteem, emotional infantilism of adults, feeling of incomplete self-realization, faulty role models internalized in childhood and adolescence or incorrect strategies of problem solving and coping in situations of crisis (Leśniak, Dobrzyńska-Mesterhazy, 1996, pp. 90-91).

The latter category of factors contains social and cultural conditioning, which if perceived as model-forming has detrimental influence on harmonious partner relationships that support conflict-free functioning of a family. Among such factors we have to mention first of all those that have recently become common:

- post-modern – characterized by extensive focus on oneself and fear of assuming responsibility for another person (spouse) – lifestyles that promote single living, the so called single culture;
- based on egocentric and hedonistic orientation of an individual, faulty models of participation in interactions on interpersonal and group level, which make it difficult for family members to communicate in the spirit of readiness for dialogue, mutual understanding and compromise, where each side is treated subjectively;
- destructive strategies of solving interpersonal conflicts, which stem from egoistic attitude to the environment, based on the strife for domination which is usually reached through mental and physical violence (Adler, Rosenfeld, 2010).

Psychological and communicative factors are identified with threats that arise in the dimension of subjective functioning of family members (Toffler, 1981), while social and cultural factors are identified with threats that appear in the dimension of supersubjective participation of the family in the social environment. Such differentiation is significant when taking into consideration real capability of family members of effective counteracting threats that they realize. What differs is the level of difficulty when recognizing external threats is concerned, such that arise outside the family and somehow determine the quality and nature of family functioning rather than in situations when one has to make an evaluative self-insight.

In the case of the supersubjective threats recognized by the members of a community, they have to face the choice of the correct strategy of action minimizing the negative influence of society. The extent to which they experience negative consequences in the quality of family functioning and in their own life depends on whether or not they can recognize the phenomena and processes identified with this category of threats correctly and on the adequacy of defensive strategy. The more aware they are of the necessity to focus on different negative aspects of reality, the more ready they will be to prevent successfully and consistently the transfer of these aspects to the space of family life and in specific instances, to intervene adequately to the situation.

Threats analyzed in the subjective dimension are mainly referred to the maturity of family members, to the durability of the emotional bond between them, the skill of showing affection, sharing experience, treating other family members subjectively and readiness for dialogue within the family,

facilitated by the skill of conversation (see: Mabry, Giarusso, Bengtson, 2007, pp. 94-95). The level of difficulty of self-evaluation is much higher when compared to recognizing supersubjective threats. It is much harder to identify one's own communicative mistakes and incorrect action, which often results from hidden complex, low self-esteem, emotional chill, instrumental attitude to other family members, longing for domination or lack of understanding, as well as lack of feeling of authority or helplessness as a parent.

It is worth mentioning that both categories of threats permeate each other, and remain interdependent within the space of family life. The focus is on the gradation of their significance from the point of view of destructive influence on the nature and quality of coexistence of family members. It is eventually up to them what kind of family they create. The awareness of external and internal threats can make the family members create such reality of community life that will fulfil a protective and integrative role. However, it is not enough to be aware of potential threats. For instance, the media provides the participants of social discourse with the analyses of all potential family problems as well as the advice on preventive and rough-and-ready methods of coping with them (Walotek-Ściańska, 2010, pp. 91-105; Fichnová, Spálová, 2006). However, the scale of family problems does not seem to decrease. Paradoxically, high incidence of domestic violence, divorces, neglecting children or abandoning newborn babies is accompanied by the more and more common phenomenon of young people's fear of making the decision to start a family as well as delaying this decision until later stages in their lives. This fear is manifested in the tendency to enter informal partner relationships or living a single life, which epitomizes the recently popularized single culture.

The conviction that it is not enough to be aware of real threats in order to avoid them leads to the conclusion that a real challenge for a family is working out such forms of communication and cooperation that will enable its members to become really close together (See: Kozłowska, 2000, pp. 49-56). Only then is it possible to participate fully and mutually in joyful and sad moments, supporting other family members and sharing one's own experience. Experiencing the mutual presence and closeness by family members strengthens the feeling of being understood and supported within the community, as well as trust and responsibility for others (Leśniak, Dobrzyńska-Mesterhazy, 1996, pp. 89-90).

Although such idyllic image of family seems unattainable in practice, it follows from the observation of some families that it is worth looking for community based forms of communication and cooperation in order to create conditions for the realization of such model. When claiming that such closeness of family members is in fact feasible, it is good to consider the way to come close to such "idyllic" family life.

In this context, one can witness first of all the existence of the generation barrier that makes it difficult for parents and children to find a common language and consequently a common level of mutual understanding and accompanying in everyday life both in momentous and minor events (See: Adler, Rosenfeld, Proctor II, 2010). The underlying cause of this barrier is most of all in the process of shaping of the information society that transforms social relationships according to the criterion of prefigurateness (Mabry, Giarusso, Bengtson, 2007, 98-110).

Dialogue and Cooperation in the Context of the Family Community

Starting with the concept of Margaret Mead (Mead, 2000), one must indicate that the reflection on creating favorable conditions for the dialogue between family members cannot be disconnected from social and cultural reality because it is more and more marked with prefigurateness. On one hand it is impossible to escape or ignore this reality if one is to attempt to create dialogue within a family. On the other hand, parents, who want to adapt to qualitative changes triggered by the shaping of prefigurative cultures, realize the dilemma manifested in the insecurity, how to strengthen the authority in relationship with the children, how to shape interpersonal relationships within a family or how to educate? An interesting suggestion of constructively solving the dilemma is a model of family communication identified by Kazimierz Jankowski as the art of the community (Jankowski, 1983).

Key categories in the model described in the previous paragraph are the notions of personal space and territory (Jankowski, 1983, pp. 72-77). The difference between the two notions is that personal space is like "an invisible 'bubble' which surrounds us, moves with us and constitutes the expansion of our physical existence, while territory does not change its location" (Adler, Rosenfeld, Proctor II,

2010). Personal space is susceptible to change and is associated with individual space that symbolises current mental states of a human being manifested in the physical distance spontaneously regulated with respect to others during interactions. Territory, on the other hand, corresponds to relatively stable divisions of “geophysical” area, a flat (house) inhabited by family members. It therefore symbolises social stratification of the community manifested in the way of dividing the space of social life understood as the family area of dialogue and cooperation.

Personal space and territory define the character and quality of interpersonal relationships between family members. It is illustrated by the correlation between distance and happiness in marriage, which shows on the basis of empirical research that statistical distance during everyday interaction declared by married couples describing their relationship as happy is 25% smaller than in the case of couples who describe their relationship as failing; The authors of *Interpersonal relationships* give the following statistics: approximately 28,9 cm – happily married couples and 37 cm – failing married couples. (See: Adler, Rosenfeld, Proctor II, 2010). The size of the distance in interpersonal relationship defines the meaning and intensity of emotional relationship between family members. The larger the distance the greater emotional chill and the smaller trust between them. Greater distance in this context expresses the reluctance to share personal and intimate issues (such that are usually hidden from others) with the other person (Hall, 1969). The division of specific rooms within the flat/house into territories belonging to particular family members reflects relatively stable stratification of the community. The distinguished position of a family member is unequivocally connected with occupying the largest space in the house or such rooms that are considered the most prestigious. What is more, an attempt to occupy the territory by other people is treated as “territorial invasion” aimed at degrading the significance of an individual in the relationship with other family members (Jankowski, 1983, p. 164).

Referring this information to the previously mentioned model one has to emphasize that each family member tries to establish the borders of one’s own territory, at the same time keeping his or her own personal space. Apart from this task, there is still the necessity to define common areas – such places in the house that do not belong to any one member of the family. Such division can therefore be in accordance with demarcation lines defined with the criteria of interest and domination.

For instance, a small workshop in the garage or in the basement can be the father’s territory, which he shares with the younger son, the kitchen might be considered the mother’s territory sometimes shared with elder sister, children’s rooms belong to the siblings, while the bathroom and hall are special places because they belong to all family members. In the category of one’s territory we can also take into consideration particular pieces of furniture, objects such as remote control, books, CDs, pictures, toys or clothes. This is why territorial divisions can also appear in the following borders: computer and home video can stand for the territory „gained” together by the sister and brother, armchair in the living room and remote control are regarded as exclusively belonging to the father, while for example another armchair and dining table belong to the mother. It is easy to notice that territories used together with other family members might become a potential source of conflict. The reason for this is the awareness of defining the conditions for using the space and objects that go with it according to the wish of the person who “rules” this territory. It usually corresponds to the possibility “(...) to decide and take responsibility for everything that takes place within the territory. Each family witnesses various ‘battles’ and has its own ‘imperialists’, ‘lieges’ and goes through rebellions, coups d’etat and uprisings” (Jankowski, 1983, p. 74).

The nature and progress of interaction within a family are influenced by the actions of the family members caused by the awareness of existing divisions. According to the classification suggested by K. Jankowski, one distinguishes the following groups of behavior (Jankowski, 1982, p. 77-79):

- autonomous - aimed at satisfying basic physiological needs connected only with the territories of particular family members; this includes all activities realized individually that satisfy the needs such as sleep, eating, taking care of health, cleanness, dressing adequately to weather conditions, etc.
- destructive - connected with behavior that is conducive to the intrusion on someone else’s territory and according to the family requires a direct ban, e.g. verbal or physical aggression towards other family members or wrong handling of the objects meant for common use, as a result of which they are destroyed;

- negotiative - also connected with behavior that intrudes on other people's territories, but does not require an explicit ban, but is treated as conditionally accepted; this includes the instances of temporary intrusion on someone else's territory with the consent of other family members, e.g. an adolescent child holding a party for peers at home without the presence of parents, or a parent using for professional purpose a room normally occupied by other family members;
- potentially destructive - it is the behavior that requires a ban from the family, it does not intrude on other family members' territories; this includes the lack of consent for such behavior that is considered threatening for the health or life of other family members or threatening the integrity of the family, e.g.: drug taking, a child drinking alcohol, a parent abusing alcohol, premature sexual initiation of children, sexual promiscuity of the parents or addiction to computer or Internet;
- learnt - such behavior that is connected with socially accepted intrusion on someone else's territory and is a result of education, upbringing or socialization in the community, aimed at socially important goals connected with the desired way of fulfilling roles specific for a given age (senior, parent, child), position in the family (husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter), gender (boy, girl, man, woman), social relationships with the environment (neighbor, friend, colleague).

Perceiving a family from the point of view of actions aimed at defining one's own territory as well as respecting the territories of others facilitates the ordering of issues and problems that arise every day in the space of family life. Thinking in the category of territories of family members allows us to refer accurately to the process of particular interactions, which in turn forms the basis for a differentiated and adequate interpreting and solving conflicts. One can therefore distinguish basic levels of interaction within a family, which correspond to separate, as far as territory is concerned, groups of problems (Jankowski, 1983 pp. 79-82):

- intrapersonal, identified only with the family members' individual territories,
- interpersonal, connected with territories shared by two people (parent and a child, child and another child, or between spouses),
- group, extending onto the whole community, i.e. taking place in the territory common for the whole family.

Correct interpretation and solving conflict situations depends on the „territorial” sensitivity of family members, which is translated onto the relationships between them. It is, however, worth mentioning that „territorial” sensitivity can be shaped in the family members only through internalizing values that empower them and introduce harmony into the space of community life (Chalas, 2003, pp. 56-57). Among these values we have to list reciprocity, partnership and openness (Chalas, 2003, pp. 83).

Reciprocity defined on one hand the accepted division of duties within the family, which if clear and „fair” – which means it is connected with proportional share of duties and tasks among family members – then from pedagogical point of view constitutes an important factor in shaping correct models of family functioning (Ryś, 1999, pp. 28-32). On the other hand, reciprocity is identified as flexible family relationships, characterized by the rotation of roles and tasks that is adequate to circumstances. That is to say that despite fixed competence division, which becomes the source of habit formation in everyday life, family members are at the same time ready for unconventional action that correct any difficulties in satisfying conscious needs. Flexibility in the field of temporary role switching caused by unplanned events, such as Bad state of health of one family member, sickness, work trip, New tasks resulting from increasing the family or change in professional roles, organizing an important family event etc strengthens the feeling of support and stability among family members (Mastalski, 2007, p. 494). Interchangeability of roles and tasks in this context leads to creating mechanisms that introduce harmony into family relationships by maintaining balance in the share of duties of particular family members according to their age, health and capability. Reciprocity is thus based on the dialogue within the family since the interchangeability of roles and tasks is only possible in the situation of mutual understanding and expressed will to this form of coexistence. At the same time this kind of dialogue is strengthened because each experience of this sort brings the family members closer together and induces other people, who temporarily take on their duties, to understand them even better.

The partnership involves the recognition of the rights and privileges of particular family members as well as their duties and responsibilities within the community. It is therefore connected with subjective and equal treatment of each family member. Each person, since childhood, is made aware of the rights bestowed by the community and the duties one has to perform for other family members (Kozłowska, 2000, pp. 57-60). Partnership refers symbolically to the personal space of each family member. It strengthens both the awareness of borders set by the subject in relationship with others, and the expectation of self-limiting expansive behavior, i.e. understanding and respecting the borders set by a subject. Partner relationships in a family are thus based on the community dialogue that makes family members sensitive to the care for mutual limitation of the tendency to shrink personal space referring to each family member regardless of their age at the same time inducing everybody to establish the privileges and responsibilities continually and together. It is worth emphasizing that in such common defining all members of the family have to participate, at the same time learning to discuss important events and issues in the atmosphere of willingness to understand and respect others, which in turn leads to agreement. The partnership is therefore identified as the space of mutual dialogue where both children and parents acquire and master the competences of mature participation in family life (Ryś, 1999, pp. 24-27).

Openness depends on the quality of reciprocity and partnership in a family. It is connected with the process of democratic participation of all family members in establishing, defining and redefining the rules and norms on which the community is based. In openness one pays particular attention to two aspects of organizing a community in the axionormative dimension. What matters is both the content that forms the basis for community functioning and who defines this content and how. If the community accepts openness in its relationships, the space of family dialogue is then used for recognizing particular norms together, and for deciding what is good and what is bad for the family, what is worthy and what is unworthy of a family member, what is beautiful and what is foul and punishable. Only after recognizing the meaning of these can one reasonably follow them in everyday life and redefine them accordingly or complete with new standards. Openness of family life prepares its members for mature participation in the community. It is not only a challenge for the children, who are yet to acquire the image of axionormative framework of social existence, but also for the parents, who learn how to treat their children subjectively. This is when they experience the significance of reciprocity and partnership, on the basis of equal participation of all community members in the process.

Family Community as a Space for Partnership in Dialogue

The model of family communication defines the levels of community dialogue, for which the basis is common ground, the ability to talk, readiness to reach solutions together, participation in events important for family members, spending free time together and performing tasks for the community (see: Jarrott, 2007). Realizing such model involves “being together”, in the wide context, and gives all family members the sense of important contribution they make (Newman & Larkin, 2006).

Referring to the analyses of intergenerational barriers to communication and social existence (Ito, 2008) one has to notice that the model breaks depending divisions in the consciousness of parents and children (Carr, 2010). What in prefigurative cultures was perceived as a challenge exceeding their educational capability and manifested as helplessness in relationship with a child, is now different in the reality of a community functioning on the basis of reciprocity, partnership and openness. Parents who adopt these values do not treat New challenges in the context of losing control over children and gradual increase of distance, but they see them as a chance to create a new level of relationship with a child. Paradoxically, the process of strengthening the authority of the younger generation in prefigurative cultures corresponds to the Basic assumptions of the model of family communication. Young people want to participate actively and equally in public space and contribute to it. They do it consistently and without any complexity. The real stronghold of the young generation are now network media, which open up the possibility of participation in social debate and through which young people can effectively modify the content and process of this debate (Lovink, 2011, p. 29).

What can be the answer of the adults (parents) in this situation? Definitely any attempts to reduce the role of the younger generation in the public space ruled by the media will be less and less effective. Transforming this experience on to the level of education and upbringing within a family, one has to

conclude that the strategy of exclusion is pedagogically incorrect because it triggers the tendency for antagonism on both sides and it does not favor the development of new forms of dialogue and cooperation. On the other hand, adopting the strategy open for dialogue creates the possibility for the child to be able to participate together with them in the public space ruled by the media (Szyszka, 2013). Parents who open up for the child's suggestions on different forms of social existence in the network not only learn about the child's world from another perspective, but stand a chance to direct his/her way of thinking and acting.

Adopting the open strategy is not connected with the risk of rejecting the authority of parents. Only through dialogue and cooperation can parents create a convenient opportunity to eliminate the fears connected with upbringing. The parent has the opportunity to learn what the child is thinking, how he/she interprets situations, what he/she longs for and expects in connection with his/her activity also in the space of network media. The child, on the other hand, can show the parents his/her competence and knowledge on information technology, which is the domain where the parents will probably always be less proficient than children. What is more, this strategy is connected with projecting a New area of issues, which are now seen as opportunities for common ground that directs both parents and children towards constructive updating of one's potential within cooperation that is characterized by partnership and openness. This is when the parents feel that the need for control is decreased, as far as orders and bans are concerned, because the parents simply know more about the child's actions and plans and what follows, they are aware of greater influence they can have on the direction and nature of the child's activity also in the net. The child, for his part, is aware of greater freedom of action and trust of the parents, and because of this he/she can independently decide whether he/she wants to follow what has been decided together with the parents or to reject this option. One has to think that a child free from coercion and treated as a partner – as has already been stipulated – will try to become a responsible person who sticks to what they have defined together with the parents. A child treated seriously and with respect will feel induced to make a deep insight into the meaning of moral obligation to respect all decisions made beforehand. Remaining in agreement with his/her own reflections and free will, and not constrained by the fear of punishment, the child wants to stand by the decisions.

Conclusions

The value of the model of open communication within the family is developing the rules and principles of the dialogue together, by all family members. Equal participation in establishing the basis for community communication makes it more likely for the family members to identify with such rules and to start social control mechanisms spontaneously in order to respect these predefined rules and principles. This model stipulates a systematic creation of the family's own lexicon and communication rules, which reflect the specific relationships and arrangements in a particular family (Bell, Healey, 1992; Baxter, 1992). It favours authentic openness of family members to one another (Vito, 1999), provided they dare to formulate their findings, expectations and feelings openly, without the fear that overtness and openness in their communication will change into a dysfunctional conflict (Canarry, Messman, 2000). It creates a space where negotiating current arrangements concerning minor and major issues is each variant of interpersonal relationship and within the community becomes an integral part of daily interactions. Therefore, it leads to breaking the previous communication barriers perceived both in the intergenerational dimension (parent-child) and within the same generation (sibling-sibling).

Open family communication understood in this way integrates family members making the family a community of people who are truly together, consciously and willingly. A community of people for whom the experience of closeness and authentic presence is – regardless of the age and position – the source of power to undertake developmental tasks. Members of such family support and protect each other, both in the individual and community aspect, against external threats generated by social phenomena and processes which change the reality modern people live in.

Acknowledgement

The article has been written as part of the VEGA Project: 1/0195/11 Stereotyped genderization of media space.

References

- Adler, R. B. Rosenfeld, L. B. Proctor II, R. F. (2010). *Interplay: The process of interpersonal communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., Akert, R. M. (1998). *Social Psychology. The Heart and the Mind*. Publisher: Longman Pub Group.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). Raport o kondycji moranej świata. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 20.
- Baxter, L. A. (1992). Forms and functions of intimate play in personal relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 18.
- Bell, R. A., Healey, J. G. (1992). Idiomatic communication and interpersonal solidarity in friends' relational cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 18.
- Bono de, E. (2000). *New thinking for the new millennium*. London: Penquin.
- Buber, M. (1993). *Problem człowieka*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Canary, D. J., Messman, S. J. (2000). *Relationship conflict*. In: C. Hendrick, S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A Sourcebook*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The Shallows. What the Internet is Doing to Our Brains*, New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Chąlas, K. (2003). *Wychowanie ku wartościom. Elementy teorii i praktyki – godność, wolność, odpowiedzialność, tolerancja*. Vol. I. Lublin-Kielce: „Jedność”.
- Douglass, C. B. (2007). From duty to desire: emerging adulthood in Europe and its consequences. *Child Development Perspectives*, 1 (2).
- Fichnová, K., Spálová, L. (2006). The Psychological Aspects of Advertisement Influence on Child Recipients. In: Žilková, M. (Ed.). *Globalisation Trends in the Media*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Goban-Klas, T. (2005). *Cywilizacja medialna. Geneza, ewolucja, eksplozja*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Gordon, T. (2000). *Parent Effectiveness Training. The Tested New Way to Raise Responsible Children*. Publisher: New American Library, Inc.
- Hall, E. T. (1969). *The hidden dimension: man's use of space in public and private*. London: Bodley Head.
- Hendry, L. B., Kloep, M. (2011). What is it about 20-somethings? *The New York Times Magazine*, 22 (August).
- Ito, M., et al. (2008). *Living and Learning with New Media*. Summary of Findings from the Digital Youth Project. Retrieved 11.12.2014, from <http://digitalyouth.ischool.berkeley.edu/files/report/digitalyouth-WhitePaper.pdf>.
- Jankowski, K. (1983). *Nie tylko dla rodziców*, Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Jarosz, E. (1997). Rozpoznawanie przemocy wobec dzieci w rodzinie. *Auxilium Sociale*, 1.
- Jarrott, S. (2007). *Programs that affect Intergenerational Solidarity*. Interagency Expert Group Meeting. New York.
- Kozłowska, A. (2000). *Znaczenie relacji rodzinnych dla pozytywnego rozwoju dziecka. Diagnostyka i terapia*. Warszawa: Centrum Metodyczne Pomocy Psychologiczno-Pedagogicznej.
- Leśniak, E., Dobrzyńska-Mesterhazy, A. (1996). *Rodziny w kryzysie: diagnostyka i interwencja kryzysowa*. In: Badura-Madej, W. (Ed) *Wybrane zagadnienia interwencji kryzysowej. Poradnik dla pracowników socjalnych*. Series: „Biblioteka Pracownika Socjalnego”. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Interart.
- Lovink, G. (2011). *Networks without a Cause. A Critique of Social Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Mabry, J. B., Giarusso, R., Bengtson, V. L. (2007). Generations, the Life Course, and Family Change. In: Scott, J., Treas, J., Richards, M. (Eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mastalski, J. (2007). *Samotność globalnego nastolatka*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Papieskiej Akademii Teologicznej.
- Mead, M. (2000). *Culture and Commitment: the New Relationships between the Generations in the 1970s*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Newman, S., & Larkin, E. (2006). The importance of evaluation intergenerational together. *The Generations United Magazine*, 11 (2).
- Ngai, S. S. Y. (2007). Exploring the validity of the Internet Addiction Test for grades 5-9 students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 13 (3).
- Nowak-Dziemianowicz, M. (2002). *Doświadczenia rodzinne w narracjach, Interpretacje sensów i znaczeń*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Pospiszyl, I. (2000). Przemoc w rodzinie. In: Milewska, E., Szymanowska, A. (Eds.) *Rodzice i dzieci. Psychologiczny obraz sytuacji problemowych*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Warszawskiej.
- Rajkiewicz, A. (2004). Polskie małżeństwa i rodziny oraz gospodarstwa domowe w świetle statystyki. *Małżeństwo i Rodzina*, 2.
- Ryś, M. (1999). *Psychologia małżeństwa w zarysie*. Warszawa: Centrum Metodyczne Pomocy Psychologiczno-Pedagogicznej MEN.
- Şenormancı, Ö., Konkan, R., Sungur, M. Z. (2012). Internet Addiction and Its Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. In: De Oliveira, I.R. (Ed.). *Standard and Innovative Strategies in Cognitive Behavior Therapy*. Publisher InTech.
- Szyska, M. (2013). *Kształtowanie wizerunku instytucji pomocy społecznej w mediach*. Warszawa: CRZL.
- Tyszka, Z. (1991). *Z metodologii badań socjologicznych nad rodziną*. Poznań: Zakłady Graficzne.
- Urban, B. (1997). *Zachowania dewiacyjne młodzieży*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Vito, D. (1999). Affective self-disclosure, conflict resolution and marital quality. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60.
- Walotek-Ściańska, K. (2010). *W świecie reklamy i reklamożerców*. Bielsko-Biała: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Administracji.
- Wąsiński, A., Tomczyk, Ł. (2013). Psychosocial functioning of children and young people at cybernetwork in family context. In: E. Pribišová, P. Beňo, L. Andrejiová (Eds.), *Impacts of economic crisis on quality of life, health and social area. Ethics, Nursing, Health, Education, Varia. Part 2*. Bratislava: Ústav sociálnych vied a zdravotníctva bl. P.P. Gojdiča.

Advised by Irena Gailienė,
SMC "Scientia Educologica", Lithuania

Received: November 30, 2013

Accepted: December 16, 2013

Arkadiusz Wąsiński

PhD., Lecturer, Higher School of Administration in Bielsko-Biała, 12 A. Frycza Modrzewskiego Street, 43-300 Bielsko-Biała, Poland.
E-mail: arkadiusz.wasinski@gmail.com

Michał Szyska

PhD., Lecturer, Higher School of Administration in Bielsko-Biała, 12 A. Frycza Modrzewskiego Street, 43-300 Bielsko-Biała, Poland.
E-mail: szyszkathome@gmail.com
