THE ROUTLEDGE HANDBOOK OF MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY DOMESTICATION

Edited by Maren Hartmann

Chapter 3

CONCEPTUALIZING RE-DOMESTICATION

Theoretical reflections and empirical findings to a neglected concept

Corinna Peil and Jutta Röser

3

CONCEPTUALIZING RE-DOMESTICATION

Theoretical reflections and empirical findings to a neglected concept

Corinna Peil and Jutta Röser

Introduction

This chapter addresses processes of re-domestication, which are a common, important and intriguing part of the domestication of media and technologies, but so far underexposed in research. On the one hand, we seek to explain what re-domestication means and what role it plays in existing domestication studies. On the other hand, based on three case studies, we will show which causes and dynamics re-domestication processes can entail. In this way, this chapter aims to contribute to a better understanding of the complexity and multidimensionality of the domestication process.

One of the particular strengths of the domestication approach is its process orientation (Berker et al., 2006; Haddon, 2006; Peil & Röser, 2012; Röser & Müller, 2017). With its perspective on appropriation processes over time, it differs from a number of theoretical concepts that solely focus on individual segments of media adoption, such as the moment of deciding to acquire a particular media technology (e.g., diffusion of innovation theory), the motivation to use a certain medium (e.g., uses and gratifications approach) or the actual consequences of media use or non-use (e.g., digital divide concept). In contrast to these approaches, domestication directs its analytical attention to the entire process of media appropriation, starting with the first ideas about possible uses, through acquisition and placement of a new technology in the home as well as initial usage attempts, to daily modes of use and their change over time. Domestication is not a "one-time," but an ongoing process, as Haddon (2003: 46) noted as early as 20 years ago. It even includes moments that go beyond actual use, such as product development and marketing or conversations about a newly acquired or already long-time used technology (Hartmann, 2009: 306–307).[1] The process perspective results not least from the further features of the domestication approach, especially the importance of everyday life and the domestic sphere as a signifying context of media use as well as the continuing meaning-making practices of the users. Although this process perspective is repeatedly emphasized, it has rarely been empirically researched or theoretically differentiated. Similarly, the term "re-domestication," which is sometimes applied, refers to the processuality of domestication, but has hardly been reflected in greater detail (Röser et al., 2019: 27–30). In the following sections, we will therefore take a more in-depth look at the nature of re-domestication processes and fill this void.

For this purpose, we first theoretically address the process perspective of the domestication approach and discuss existing studies that have investigated re-domestication processes (Section "State of research: domestication as a discontinuous and non-linear process with phases of re-domestication"). We then propose our own definition of re-domestication (Section "Conceptualizing re-domestication"), which we elaborate on the basis of three case studies. The first case study illustrates how spatial arrangements with the Internet, everyday uses, and domestic communication cultures interact and – together with new technological affordances for mobile uses – have led to a re-domestication of the Internet (Section "Case study 1: Spatial arrangements and domestic communication cultures with the Internet in transition"). The second case study demonstrates the importance of stimuli emanating from life-world changes. It deals with re-domestication processes as a result of radical changes in everyday life such as moving house, parenthood or divorce (Section "Case study 2: Re-domestication processes as a result of radical changes in everyday life"). Empirically, these two cases build on the project "The Mediatized Home in Transition," which explored the domestication of the Internet in a qualitative panel study (Röser et al., 2019). Twenty-five heterosexual couples of the broad middle class, proportioned by school education and age (25–63 years old in 2008), were interviewed and surveyed several times at home between 2008 and 2016. Since the first interview also looked back at the acquisition phase of the Internet, the project was able to analyze the first 20 years of Internet domestication in Germany (Müller & Röser, 2017; Röser & Peil, 2010, Röser et al., 2019: 37–70).

Finally, the third case study is devoted to a historical example and shows how television was gradually re-inscribed in everyday domestic life as a consequence of the establishment of the dual broadcasting system in Germany (Section "Case study 3: The re-domestication of television in Germany in the aftermath of the implementation of the dual broadcasting system"). In a concluding section, we discuss the insights gained and argue for a stronger theoretical reflection of re-domestication processes within domestication research (Section "Conclusion").

State of research: domestication as a discontinuous and non-linear process with phases of re-domestication

In their seminal article "Information and communication technologies and the moral economy of the household," Silverstone, Hirsch, and Morley (1992) have described in more detail the processual nature of domestication, consisting of four "non-discrete elements" (ibid.: 18) – or dimensions (Hartmann, 2013: 21) – which define the transactional relationship between the "moral economy of the household" and the world outside it: appropriation, respectively, commodification, as Silverstone (2006: 233) later specified, objectification, incorporation and conversion. These elements shape and influence each other, representing an open cycle rather than a linear sequence of phases. They concern both the dynamics within the household, such as the adaptation and customization of a new media technology, its integration into in-home settings and routines, and changes of domestic communication cultures (objectification and incorporation), and the household's connection with external spheres, which is reflected in its acquisition or in the way the technology is presented to the outside world (commodification and conversion). Yet, significant shifts such as re-domestication or de-domestication are not mentioned in this basic account of domestication theory. Haddon (2016) points out in a later publication that early domestication studies from Norway added these concepts, meaning on the one hand

"giving new roles and meanings to an existing ICT" and on the other hand "ceasing to find a place for a technology in one's life" (ibid.: 21–22). The possibility of re-domestication is also taken up in the introductory article of the anthology "Domestication of Media and Technology" (Berker et al., 2006) which states: "Re- and de-domestication processes can take place – adapting and morphing to meet the changing needs of users, the constitution of households and workplaces" (ibid.: 3). However, one rarely finds more precise explanations and theoretical concretizations of these terms.

It is striking that in the few studies in which reference is made to the concept, re-domestication is associated with the introduction of new technologies or the so-called "functional alternatives" (Haddon, 2011), even though Sørensen (1994) already noted in the 1990s that the causes of re-domestication processes can vary, for instance, because individual needs or social constellations change. Fibæk Bertel and Ling (2016), for example, show – based on a qualitative study with high school students from Denmark – that Short Message Service (SMS) has undergone a process of re-domestication: "the meanings and everyday use practices associated with the technology are changing, and the technology is finding new position in the media repertoires of youth" (ibid.: 1294). The authors understand re-domestication as a transformation in the meaning of a technology and its use resulting from changed circumstances. These circumstances they see as primarily influenced by a constantly changing media environment (ibid.: 1295). Their study confirms this view by highlighting how both the symbolic and functional dimensions of SMS have changed with the availability of newer technologies and applications for interpersonal communication, while SMS has remained meaningful as a medium for instrumental purposes and within strong ties (ibid.: 1305). In a similar sense, Mascheroni et al. (2008: 24) use the term re-domestication in their cross-media study to describe the "symbolic re-definition of the PC" from a multimedia platform to a user-centred network after Instant Messaging (IM) was introduced. Grošelj (2021) also bases her study on an understanding of re-domestication as a shift in meanings and uses of a media technology due to the adoption of a newer technology. In her qualitative interview study, one research question aimed at re-domestication processes in the use of the Internet through different access technologies. As a result, she identified three types of re-domestication processes: "Spotlighting," where one device is the dominant way to get online; "distribution," where access is across multiple devices and the choice of a particular device is contextual; and "making do," where the focus is on being able to get online at all – albeit often with limited access (ibid.: 428–432). According to Grošelj, the different practices of re-domestication can be associated with different content-related emphases in use (entertainment-oriented vs. meaning-making). Re-domestication is used here to theorize how different ways of accessing the Internet relate to each other from the user's perspective. The domestic context, social constellations or everyday requirements, however, are not taken into account. Yet, one strength of this approach is that it can be linked to questions of digital exclusion and choice (Grošelj, 2021: 435).

Haddon also sees media change in particular as a driver for re-domestication processes because the addition of new media into the media ensemble makes users re-assess the role of old media (Haddon, 2011: 319). In this sense, he draws a parallel with the approach of remediation developed by Bolter and Grusin (2000), which signifies the representation of one medium in another and refers to the changeability and interplay of media. Remediation calls for media not to be regarded singularly, but always in relation to other media, whose functions they adapt, modify and reorganize (ibid.: 15). In this context, Haddon (2011: 319) refers to the social practice of listening to the radio, which changed significantly with the introduction of television, but was never replaced.

A slightly different understanding is followed by Huang and Miao (2021), who comprehend re-domestication as a restructuring of the relationship between humans and technology after usage – at least in parts – has been temporarily interrupted: "[…] *re*-domestication is used here to highlight the continued use, disuse, and reuse of social media and distinguish it from its first use" (ibid.: 180). Based on their qualitative interview study with WeChat users in China, who had voluntarily disengaged with the social media feature Moments for a while, they "[…] argue that the re-domestication of Moments is a 'reboot' of the whole process of domestication through four key stages: re-appropriation, re-objectification, re-incorporation, and re-conversion" (ibid.: 177). In their findings, the authors elaborate that re-domestication phases are used by people to renegotiate their relationship with media, for example, by setting tighter spatial and temporal limits to their use and regain control and self-determination. Accordingly, their theoretical contribution to re-domestication is primarily to emphasize and contour human agency in the domestication process over the lifetime of a technology. From the studies discussed here, it appears that the application of the re-domestication concept is not uniform and that in some cases, different ideas circulate about how to model the processuality of domestication. In the following section, we will present our own perspective on this in more detail and explain which factors must come together in order to qualify as a process of re-domestication.

Conceptualizing re-domestication

With our own conceptualization of re-domestication, we move quite close to Sørensen's (1994) original contribution and place a special emphasis on the importance of every-day (domestic) life. Despite his rather casual mention of the terms re-domestication and dis-domestication, it is clear from his remarks that these are dynamics in the domestication process that can emanate from very different factors: "The truce expressed in practical routines of use may be broken, needs may change, relevant, external symbolic codes may be transformed, or the persons involved may shift. Children grow, and sometimes households split up" (Sørensen, 1994: 7). As is already indicated here, everyday life with all its obstinateness, unpredictability and contingencies is the key. In everyday domestic life, the domestication process is constantly exposed to new impulses through people's actions, routines, and interactions, as well as through dynamically changing media ensembles or evolving life circumstances. Accordingly, the domestication of a new media technology does not proceed in a straightforward, orderly or rigid manner following specific phases, but is volatile, messy and often unpredictable.

As an open and basically endless process, the domestication of media technologies is never completed. It is a development, which is characterized by constant movement and unforeseen turns (Röser et al., 2019: 28–29). "In one sense, people often acquire ICTs, go through an initial period of experimentation and fall into a routine usage pattern. Despite this routinization, consumption patterns also change as a result of social and technological change" (Haddon, 2003: 46). This means that the domestication process may well reach "saturation phases" in which the use of a technology or even the entire media repertoire becomes quite stable. However, the process can pick up speed again at any time, "if new circumstances, in whatever sense, mean that the role of an ICT has to be re-assessed" (Haddon, 2003: 46). Such new circumstances can lead to an intensification of domestication, or equally to a shift in meaning or decline in importance of a particular technology. In this sense, we understand re-domestication as *the re-inscription of a medium into everyday domestic life, which is linked to a transformation of established domestic communication cultures*. In other words, re-domestication

is not about small-scale changes in media preferences or technologies, such as when a smartphone is replaced by a more powerful successor model. Rather, re-domestication refers to a change-intensive phase in which users renegotiate and reshape the way they integrate one or more media into their everyday lives at home. Central to this idea is the interplay between changes in media behaviour on the one hand and changes in the way everyday life is shaped on the other.

Re-domestication processes can be triggered by a wide variety of factors, such as altered range of products and services on offer, technological advances, everyday life-related and societal changes or a combination of all of these factors. In fact, several factors usually come together, intertwined and mutually reinforcing. We therefore believe that it would be inadequate to view re-domestication processes merely as the consequence of techno-logical change. In this respect, Röser et al. (2019: 27) draw a connection to the overarching metaprocess of mediatization, which is characterized by various mediatization thrusts ("Mediatisierungsschübe") – change-intensive phases in which fundamental socio-political and cultural contexts are restructured and renegotiated. Yet, with regard to re-domestication, we are not concerned with major technological transformations over long periods of time (e.g., mechanization, electrification, digitalization; see Hepp, 2020: 5). Instead, we want to use the concept to analyze the transformation of media, communication, and society in narrower periods of time and in concrete fields. Re-domestication captures the momentous intertwining of technical, cultural and communication-related factors in the concrete field of the home, where the specific potentials of media technologies have to meet the require-ments of everyday life in a meaningful way (Röser et al., 2019: 29).

Case study 1: spatial arrangements and domestic communication cultures with the Internet in transition

Our first case study is about the re-domestication of the Internet during the 2010s. Röser and Peil (2014) as well as Röser et al. (2019: 95–117) have shed light on the process in which the Internet was initially used rather detached from other activities of daily life, then gradually became more integrated into domestic routines, and finally – in the sense of a re-domestication process – flexibly filled every corner of the house. The authors focus on the spatial arrangements with the Internet in transition and at the same time show their connec-tion to domestic communication cultures.

The domestication approach specifies "objectification" as the second phase of the media domestication process where a new technology is assigned a place in the home (Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morley, 1992: 20–26). But this designated place does not have to be longlast-ing. As domestication deepens, that is, when a medium becomes more fully integrated into everyday life, spatial arrangements may be questioned. Objectification (phase 2) and integra-tion (phase 3) are thus in an ongoing reciprocal relationship. This becomes particularly clear when looking at the domestication of the Internet. For as the integration of the Internet into everyday life progressed, ways of using it changed, which, in turn, challenged and altered the original place settings. Related processes and decisions were closely linked to the commu-nication cultures in the household, to the ways in which community and retreat were being shaped and negotiated with or without the help of media. Attention must therefore be paid to how practices of Internet use, spatial arrangements, and domestic modes of communication interact. The term "spatial arrangement" includes here the placement of a (new) medium in connection with its uses and its meanings in the domestic context (Peil & Röser, 2014; Röser et al., 2019: 95).

In the project, three spatial arrangements with the Internet were elaborated over the entire study period with survey waves in 2008, 2011, 2013, and 2016 (Röser et al., 2019: 95–117; also see Röser & Peil, 2014):

The first arrangement was the separation of the Internet in an extra room, where the Internet functioned as a kind of "appendage" of everyday domestic life: the technology was spatially detached from other domestic activities and specifically from common rooms such as the living room or kitchen. Often, the Internet, accessible from a stationary computer, had a fixed place in a study – especially when the computer had already been used as a work device in a separate room before the Internet was acquired. However, basements and guest rooms, closets and hallway niches were also used as Internet locations. In the first interviews in 2008, this room arrangement was chosen by most of the couples interviewed. Yet, from a strictly technical point of view, more flexible and mobile modes of use would have been possible even back then, as WIFI had been available since 2002. In fact, some households already had laptops, but these were mostly used as stationary devices and were hardly ever moved at home. The reason why many couples separated the Internet in the home was, first, its symbolic meaning: computer and Internet were coded as work and non-leisure and were therefore meant to be moved outside the leisure areas. Second, the physical separation indicated a limited integration of the Internet into everyday life and its little use in terms of time. It was suitable for couples who made occasional use of the Internet, but embedded it only moderately in everyday routines and tasks. As long as both partners were online only a few times a week for a short period of time, this arrangement worked well. Conflicts arose when one partner (usually the man) began to use the Internet far more extensively than the other (usually the woman). Then, there were disputes over the lack of time together, for example, during joint television viewing. But couples where both partners were interested in the Internet also had problems. As they used the Internet more frequently in the course of its domestication process, the separate extra room led to tendencies towards fragmentation. Couples who took turns using an Internet-enabled computer, for example, or who sat in separate rooms at their own computers, complained about the resulting reduction in time together. This was the beginning of a second phase characterized by search movements, in which the couples tried out new spatial arrangements.

The second room arrangement involved integrating the Internet into living spaces such as the sitting room or kitchen. In some households, the computer with Internet connection was given a permanent place in the living room alongside the TV. One couple set up a shared work and dining room with computers standing next to each other. Some couples complemented the office location of the Internet with mobile uses of a laptop. The motivation to try out new spatial arrangements was rooted in the desire to establish situations of community and communication – not only with television, but also with the Internet. Respondents felt that it was fragmenting and a loss of couple time if everyone used media for themselves in another part of the home. As uses of the Internet became more deeply integrated into everyday life, the need for alternative spatial arrangements came up, ultimately leading to a re-domestication of the Internet. It was mainly those couples who were open to new, inclusive spatial arrangements where both partners used the Internet regularly and with pleasure. In the first series of interviews in 2008, there were a few couples who more or less pursued integrating arrangements of online use. Three years later, they already made up a slight majority. There was no best practice for implementing inclusive settings with the Internet, but rather a variety of spatial arrangements. In some cases, different options were tried and tested within a household. Here, we can already see that these arrangements had the character of a *search movement* and pointed to a *transitional phase*. For ultimately, a third spatial arrangement prevailed over all.

The third spatial arrangement involved the *mobilization of the Internet within the home*, which resulted in more intensive uses of the Internet and its *omnipresence in the domestic context*. By "domestic mobilization" (Peil & Röser, 2014: 244–245), we refer to the process in which online services at home were increasingly accessed via small, portable devices which can potentially be used in any place of the home. In the longitudinal study, this flexible arrangement was only emerging in a number of the households during the 2011 interviews, it had then become widespread among the majority in 2013, and by 2016, it had become the couples' go-to option (Röser et al. 2019, 95–117). The couples engaged in mobile online uses to a greater or lesser extent: some as their primary mode of use, others only as an occasional supplementary mode. Through mobile Internet use within the home, users created "provisional Internet spaces" (Peil & Röser, 2014: 244). As a result, the Internet became omnipresent in the domestic sphere, leading to a deeper mediatization of the home that is still characteristic today.

These changing spatial arrangements with the Internet can be understood as a re-domestication process. After all, the modes of use have once again changed profoundly with the domestic mobilization of the Internet, and new patterns of use have emerged. Not only did bedrooms, bathrooms or balconies become online places, but second screening was established as a popular practice to combine the use of stationary television and mobile Internet (Peil & Röser, 2014: 244–245; Röser et al., 2019, 116–117, 142–146). By mobilizing the Internet in the home, couples were able to resolve the opposition between isolating and integrating spatial arrangements in favour of temporary Internet spaces that allowed for the realization of couple-related as well as individual interests and preferences.

The driving force behind the processes described was the ever more intensive everyday integration of the Internet. This initially led to communication problems and tendencies towards fragmentation in the way couples lived together. The following search movements and trials with regard to spatial-communicative settings can be construed as an adaptation to changed patterns of everyday use. The domestication of smartphones and tablets was a facilitating factor for these processes and provided the necessary technological potential. However, the deeper cause of the re-domestication of the Internet did not come from the technology – mobile devices such as laptops existed years before – but from the users and their changed communicative needs and practices.

Case study 2: re-domestication processes as a result of radical changes in everyday life

Our second case study is about the re-domestication of media triggered by upheavals in everyday life. The findings are part of the already described long-term study with heterosexual couples on the mediatized home in transition (Röser et al., 2019: 151–175). A central finding of the study was that it was above all drastic life changes among the couples that dynamically drove the change in domestic media practices. Everyday life upheavals, such as parenthood or separation of the couple, led to profound changes in media activities within the home. In contrast, technological factors, such as the domestication of new technological devices, initiated only gradual and slow transformations.

Evidence of a connection between upheavals in everyday life and a change in everyday media behaviour can also be found in earlier studies (Gauntlett & Hill, 1999: 79–109; for an overview: Haddon, 2004). However, in the project by Röser et al. (2019), this connection was systematically analyzed for the first time and further systematized and theorized by Stephan Niemand (2020, 2021) in a more in-depth study. Changes in the lives of the couples

that proved relevant in the study were, in particular, parenthood, moving house, children moving out, death of a partner, separation of the couple and a new partnership.[2]

The example of "parenthood" illustrates which factors lead to which new ways of using the Internet and for what reasons. Regarding *content*, new thematic interests emerged from the pre-birth period onwards, which were served in online forums and via informative websites. In terms of *space*, having a baby results in new forms of immobility that have been compensated for by increased use of online services and online shopping. Particularly, many effects were evident in relation to *time*,[3] as time shortages arise due to new caregiving tasks. As a result, a variety of new forms of online use can become meaningful: through second screen uses, non-linear television, or combining caregiving practices with convenient smartphone use, couples tried to condense time and make everyday life more flexible. At the same time, the time resources spent on entertainment genres, especially via inflexible linear television, decreased.

Overall, birth can lead to a re-domestication of the Internet in the domestic sphere, in that it is inscribed in everyday life in a more intensive way in order to meet the new needs arising from parenthood. In most cases, re-domestication processes through parenthood have affected mothers more than fathers. After all, a traditional gender-related division of labour prevailed among the couples studied, which interacted with a correspondingly specific use of the Internet. This clearly shows how societal structures can also have an influence on re-domestication processes.

The effects of a gender-related division of labour with the Internet were also evident after a separation or after the death of the male partner. Some women in the sample had mostly delegated activities with the Internet to their partners and had themselves remained distanced from the medium. This was also because the male partners had partially claimed dominance over the Internet. After the end of their relationship, these women acquired online skills themselves and gradually integrated the medium in new ways into their everyday lives. In this case, the discontinuation of the gender-related division of labour due to separation or the death of their partner provided the impetus for a re-domestication of the Internet among women (Niemand, 2020: 151–184, 200–207; Röser et al., 2019: 161–166, 172).

The findings presented on the connection between upheavals in everyday life and changes in Internet use illustrate that complementary to technological or societal impulses re-domestication processes can be triggered by life-world changes. For established media practices have to prove themselves in a new life situation and in some cases become obsolete.[4]

In the course of a radical change in everyday life, the couples in the panel study adapted their Internet use to their altered life situation which was usually accompanied by a more intensive mediatization and even a re-domestication of the Internet. This is because breaking out of established everyday structures and thus changing the everyday context can open up new opportunities for development, but also new constraints. As a result, needs and demands change and are met by new online practices (Niemand, 2020: 238–241).

Case study 3: the re-domestication of television in Germany in the aftermath of the implementation of the dual broadcasting system

Our third example of media re-domestication processes focuses on television in the 1980s and 1990s in Germany. John Ellis (2002: 40) divides the history of television into three eras: the era of scarcity, "characterized by a few channels broadcasting for part of the day only," the "era of availability," in which various stations competed with each other for viewers'

attention, and the present "era of plenty," marked by a constant availability of audiovisual content via multiple technologies.

In the era of availability, following the licensing of commercial television stations under the introduction of the dual broadcasting system in 1984, a re-domestication process of television took place in Germany, as we demonstrate in our last case study. This did not happen as a direct result of the changed communication system, but in the course of the increasing integration of television into everyday life about ten years later. Only the new offerings and services that have emerged in this context have fully developed the potential of television as an everyday medium and thus ushered in this re-domestication process (Peil & Röser, 2007).

In the scarcity era, particularly in the 1950s and 1960s, television was domesticated. It moved into the home and was assigned a fixed place, quickly changing from an initially strange and unfamiliar consumer object to an integral part of the domestic sphere. During this period, the early fascination with live technology gave way to an interest in television as a medium for entertainment, regeneration and leisure (Hickethier, 1998; Peil & Röser, 2007). Programme makers recognized early on the close relationship of television with the daily lives of its viewers and scheduled shows around the anticipated rhythms of the household members (Ellis, 2002: 43–46; Modleski, 1983; O'Sullivan, 1991).[5] These programme structures, tailored to domestic routines as well as cultural specifics and national interests, promoted the domestication of television. Yet, at this time, the further integration of television into everyday life was still subject to considerable restrictions in terms of time, content, and programming policy. Unlike in the U.S., where daytime TV had already been available since 1948, or in the U.K., where the public broadcaster BBC faced competition from a commercial station as early as the mid-1950s (Ellis, 2002), television in Germany had tight media policy limits until the early 1980s. Viewers could only watch television in the late afternoon and the evening, and it was not until 1963 that there was a small choice between at least two public service broadcasters.

The legal framework for the establishment and reception of commercial broadcasters in the early 1980s set an important course for a deeper integration of television into everyday life. However, this did not occur immediately after implementation, nor inevitably. The process of re-domestication did not begin until the turn to television went beyond a mere curiosity about the innovative and unconventional content and formats of the new providers and became firmly established in a taken-for-granted way of dealing with the medium and its changed structures, conditions and offerings (Peil & Röser, 2007: 99). New ways of viewing television – facilitated on the one hand by new programme structures, and on the other hand by technical innovations – contributed significantly to this self-evident use of television, which became entrenched over the years. In this context, three factors in particular should be mentioned: (1) broadcasting times were massively extended, especially into the early morning and late evening hours, making it possible to watch television around the clock. (2) With regard to content, a larger selection of programmes was provided, especially in the entertainment sector. In addition, standardized programme schedules enabled a continuous viewing experience, famously described as "flow" by Raymond Williams (1974). (3) In terms of technical innovations, the remote control and the video recorder played an important role for the re-domestication of television, as they both gave viewers the opportunity to adapt it more to their own rhythms, routines and reception preferences in everyday life (Peil & Röser, 2007: 99).

This new framework of television allowed people to integrate the medium into their daily lives in new and more profound ways. As its constant presence became a matter of course,

"[d]eeply and almost 'invisibly' etched and stitched into the textures and routines of familiar, everyday domestic life and the home" (O'Sullivan, 2007: 161), television suddenly occupied niches that had previously been filled by non-media activities or by other media such as the radio. With the differentiation of media preferences and media-related interests, television also served new functions and purposes (e.g., providing an acoustic background for domestic tasks and routines or simulating co-presence). Accordingly, it was not "availability" alone that triggered the re-domestication process – even though this was an important prerequisite – but it was the increased needs and opportunities people perceived to embed television more deeply in their personal lives and to assign various, everyday-related meanings to it. It would be wrong to assume that in the current era of plenty, which Ellis (2002: 162–178) imagined in a visionary manner as being characterized by a coexistence of on-demand offerings, strong brands, and everyday-oriented series formats, a further re-domestication process automatically set in. After all, not every technical advancement or reinvention of television is necessarily accompanied by a change-intensive phase of use that is constitutive of media re-domestication. Nevertheless, many transformations of television – which has always been a volatile and heterogeneous object with many histories (Richter, 2020: 34) – have expanded the range of options for using television in a more flexible, self-determined way, adapted to individual interests, habits and daily rhythms. It is therefore not unlikely that Netflix, YouTube and other streaming services with a television-like quality (ibid.: 37–40) as well as their reception on a variety of devices provide the grounds for completely new forms and intensities of television viewing in everyday life.

Conclusion

Based on three case studies, our chapter has sought to provide deeper insights into the nature and characteristics of media re-domestication processes. In this respect, the qualitative long-term study on the mediatization of the home (2008–2016), from which the first two case studies were taken, proved to be extremely valuable for gaining knowledge in this matter, as domestication could be analyzed over a longer period of time (Röser et al., 2019). This also revealed the particular strength of the domestication approach, which is capable of precisely describing and contextualizing processes of change. While domestication in itself is inherently processual, re-domestication processes refer to change-intensive phases of transition in which a media technology is inscribed in everyday domestic life in a new way. Crucial in this context are the associated, media-related changes in domestic communication cultures, which are closely interwoven with everyday routines, actions and structures. What is important – and the three case studies have clearly shown this – is that technological innovations or further developments are not the cause of re-domestication processes, but rather a necessary but not sufficient condition for them. Re-domestication processes can be triggered by various factors, which we will summarize systematically below.

In the first case study on changing spatial arrangements with the Internet, altered communicative needs combined with more intensive uses of the Internet proved to be the impetus for re-domestication. The new mobile smartphones and tablets provided the technological potential to realize new demands for flexible Internet spaces, but they were not the cause of this process. Needs for new spatial-communicative arrangements arose primarily in the context of domestic togetherness, for example, to prevent fragmentation.

In the second case study, profound upheavals in everyday life became apparent as an impetus for re-domestication. As everyday life at home is deeply mediatized and shaped with media, a change in lifestyle always has a direct impact on media use practices.

In the third case study, transformations in the media system were the starting point. These led to structural, content-related and temporal changes in the medium of television. As a result, new modes of use and a deeper everyday integration of television in the sense of a re-domestication process developed. In this case, it is important to understand that the structural, content-related and temporal changes in the television programme met already existing needs among users, which they were previously unable to satisfy due to a lack of offerings: namely, the desire for greater temporal flexibility and availability of programmes as well as a greater selection of entertainment genres. When these wishes could be realized in the dual broadcasting system, the already existing technological potentials of remote control and video recorder were also exploited in a new way.

The deeper causes of re-domestication processes thus always lie in communicative needs and practices in everyday life. Technological, supply related or legal innovations can only provide potential. However, re-domestication ultimately starts with the people who use media at home and integrate them meaningfully into their communication cultures and interactions.

Notes

1 Only recently, Neville (2020) has shown how the reception of so-called unboxing videos on YouTube and the related discourse in the comments can be understood as part of the domestication process of new media technologies (see also Neville & Borkowski in this book).
2 Further drivers for changes in media use became apparent in the sample, at least as a tendency: retirement, career changes, health impairments (Niemand, 2020: 200–215; Röser et al., 2019: 157–158).
3 In addition to the content, spatial and temporal dimensions, Niemand (2020) systematized other dimensions that can give rise to impulses for re-domestication processes: social, material, sense-related, emotional, as well as body-related dimensions (ibid.: 217–224).
4 It has also happened that in phases of upheaval, established patterns of media use, for example, with television, provided stability and were retained (Röser et al., 2019: 173). With regard to the Internet, however, the main observation was that people were integrating it more intensely into everyday life. A kind of de-domestication was evident in one individual case: after retirement, a woman radically reduced her Internet use, which she had previously practiced reluctantly due to professional constraints (Niemand, 2020: 209).
5 While orientation to the everyday life of an average household was characteristic of TV programme structures around the world, scheduling strategies varied widely among nations. Until 1957, the BBC in England did not broadcast any programming between 6 and 7 p.m., the so-called toddler's truce, to make it easier for parents to put their children to bed (O'Sullivan, 1991). Iceland, however, did not broadcast any television program at all on Thursdays until the 1980s because this day was to be reserved for social activities (Ellis, 2002: 45).

References

Berker, T., Hartmann, M., Punie, Y. and Ward K. J. (2006) 'Introduction,' in T. Berker, M. Hartmann, Y. Punie, and K.J. Ward (eds.) *Domestication of Media and Technology*, Maidenhead: Open University Press, 1–17.

Bolter, J. D. and Grusin, R. (2000) *Remediation. Understanding New Media*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ellis, J. (2002) *Seeing Things. Television in the Age of Uncertainty,* London: I.B. Tauris.

Fibæk Bertel, T. and Ling, R. (2016) ''It's Just Not That Exciting Anymore': The Changing Centrality of SMS in the Everyday Lives of Young Danes,' *New Media and Society,* 18 (7): 1293–1309. doi: 10.1177/1461444814555267.

Gauntlett, D. and Hill, A. (1999) *TV Living. Television, Culture and Everyday Life,* London: Routledge.

Grošelj, D. (2021) 'Re-Domestication of Internet Technologies: Digital Exclusion or Digital Choice?' *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 26 (6): 422–440. doi: 10.1093/jcmc/zmab017.

Haddon, L. (2003) 'Domestication and Mobile Telephony,' in J. E. Katz (ed.) *Machines That Become Us. The Social Context of Personal Communication Technology,* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 43–56.

Haddon, L. (2004) *Information and Communication Technologies in Everyday Life. A Concise Introduction and Research Guide,* Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Haddon, L. (2006) 'The Contribution of Domestication Research to In-Home Computing and Media Consumption,' *The Information Society,* 22 (4): 195–203. doi: 10.1080/01972240600791325.

Haddon, L. (2011) 'Domestication Analysis, Objects of Study, and the Centrality of Technologies in Everyday Life,' *Canadian Journal of Communication,* 36 (2): 311–323. doi: 10.22230/cjc.2011v36n2a2322.

Haddon, L. (2016) 'The Domestication of Complex Media Repertoires,' in K. Sandvik, A.M. Thorhauge and B. Valtysson (eds.)*, The Media and the Mundane. Communication Across Media in Everyday Life,* Göteborg: Nordicom, 17–30.

Hartmann, M. (2009) 'Roger Silverstone: Medienobjekte und Domestizierung,' in A. Hepp, F. Krotz and T. Thomas (eds.) *Schlüsselwerke der Cultural Studies,* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 304–315.

Hartmann, M. (2013) *Domestizierung,* Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Hepp, A. (2020) *Deep Mediatization,* London & New York: Routledge.

Hickethier, K. (1998) *Geschichte des deutschen Fernsehens,* Stuttgart & Weimar: J.B. Metzler.

Huang, Y. and Miao, W. (2021) 'Re-Domesticating Social Media When It Becomes Disruptive: Evidence from China's 'Super App' WeChat,' *Mobile Media & Communication,* 9 (2): 177–194. doi: 10.1177/2050157920940765.

Mascheroni, G., Pasquali, F., Scifo, B., Sfardini, A., Stefanelli, M. and Vittadini, N. (2008) 'Young Italians' Cross-Media Cultures,' *Observatorio (OBS*) Journal,* 2 (1): 13–32.

Modleski, T. (1983) 'The Rhythms of Reception. Daytime Television and Women's Work,' in E. A. Kaplan (ed.) *Regarding Television. Critical Approaches - An Anthology,* Frederick: University Publications of America, 67–75.

Müller, K. F. and Röser, J. (2017) 'Convergence in Domestic Media Use? The Interplay of Old and New Media at Home,' in S. Sparviero, C. Peil and G. Balbi (eds.) *Media Convergence and Deconvergence. Global Transformations in Media and Communication Research,* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 55–74. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319–51289-1_3.

Neville, S. J. (2020) 'The Domestication of Privacy-Invasive Technology on YouTube: Unboxing the Amazon Echo with the Online Warm Expert,' *Convergence*, 27 (5): 1288–1307. doi: 10.1177/1354856520970729.

Niemand, S. (2020) *Alltagsumbrüche und Medienhandeln. Eine qualitative Panelstudie zum Wandel der Mediennutzung in Übergangsphasen,* Wiesbaden: Springer VS. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658–30738-7.

Niemand, S. (2021) 'Mediatisierte Lebensführung und ihr Wandel durch Alltagsumbrüche. Zur Relevanz von Übergangsphasen in der Rezeptionsforschung,' *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft,* 69 (4): 505–527. doi: 10.5771/1615-634X-2021-4-505.

O'Sullivan, T. (1991) 'Television Memories and Cultures of Viewing, 1950–65,' in J. Corner (ed.) *Popular Television in Britain. Studies in Cultural History,* London: BFI Publishing, 159–181.

O'Sullivan, T. (2007) 'Researching the Viewing Culture. Television and the Home, 1946–1960,' in H. Wheatley (ed.) *Re-Viewing Television History: Critical Issues in Television Historiography,* London: I.B.Tauris, 159–169.

Peil, C. and Röser, J. (2007) 'Vollendete Veralltäglichung. Die Re-Domestizierung des Fernsehens im dualen Rundfunksystem Deutschlands,' in J. Röser (ed.) *MedienAlltag. Domestizierungsprozesse alter und neuer Medien,* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 89–101.

Peil, C. and Röser, J. (2012) 'Using the Domestication Approach for the Analysis of Diffusion and Participation Processes of New Media,' in H. Bilandzic, G. Patriarche and P. Traudt (eds.) *The Social Use of Media. Cultural and Social Scientific Perspectives on Audience Research,* Bristol & Wilmington: Intellect, 221–240.

Peil, C. and Röser, J. (2014) 'The Meaning of Home in the Context of Digitization, Mobilization and Mediatization,' in A. Hepp and F. Krotz (eds.) *Mediatized Worlds. Culture and Society in a Media Age,* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 233–249.

Richter, C. (2020) *Fernsehen - Netflix - YouTube. Zur Fernsehhaftigkeit von On-Demand-Angeboten,* Bielefeld & Stuttgart: Transcript Verlag.

Röser, J. and Müller, K. F. (2017) 'Der Domestizierungsansatz,' in M. Lothar and C. Wegener (eds.) *Qualitative Medienforschung. Ein Handbuch,* Konstanz & München: UVK, 156–163.

Röser, J., Müller, K. F., Niemand, S. and Roth, U. (2019) *Das mediatisierte Zuhause im Wandel,* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Röser, J. and Peil, C. (2010) 'Diffusion und Teilhabe durch Domestizierung. Zugänge zum Internet im Wandel 1997-2007,' *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 58 (4): 481–502. doi: 10.5771/1615-634x-2010-4-481

Röser, J. and Peil, C. (2014) *Internetnutzung im häuslichen Alltag,* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Silverstone, R. (2006) 'Domesticating Domestication: Reflections on the Life of a Concept,' in T. Berker, M. Hartmann, Y. Punie and K. J. Ward (eds.) *Domestication of Media and Technology,* Maidenhead: Open University Press, 229–248.

Silverstone, R., Hirsch, E. and Morley, D. (1992) 'Information and Communication Technologies and the Moral Economy of the Household,' in R. Silverstone and E. Hirsch (eds.) *Consuming Technologies. Media and Information in Domestic Spaces,* London: Routledge, 13–28.

Sørensen, K. H. (1994) 'Technology in Use: Two Essays on the Domestication of Artifacts,' *STS Working Paper,* 2/94, Trondheim: Centre for Technology and Society. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.27048.26881.

Williams, R. (1974) *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*, London: Fontana.