Young Adolescents' Digital Technology Use and Mental Health Symptoms: Little Evidence of Longitudinal or Daily Linkages

By: Michaeline Jensen, Madeline J. George, Michael R. Russell, and Candice L. Odgers

Jensen, M., George, M., Russell, M., & Odgers, C. (2019). Young Adolescents' Digital Technology Use and Mental Health Symptoms: Little Evidence of Longitudinal or Daily Linkages. *Clinical Psychological Science.* https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702619859336

Michaeline Jensen, Madeline J. George, Michael R. Russell, and Candice L. Odgers, Young Adolescents' Digital Technology Use and Mental Health Symptoms: Little Evidence of Longitudinal or Daily Linkages, *Clinical Psychological Science.* Copyright © 2019 The Authors. DOI: 10.1177/2167702619859336

*****© 2019 The Authors. Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from SAGE Publications. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. *****

Abstract:

This study examines whether 388 adolescents' digital technology use is associated with mental-health symptoms during early adolescence to midadolescence. Adolescents completed an initial Time 1 (T1) assessment in 2015, followed by a 14-day ecological momentary assessment (EMA) via mobile phone in 2016–2017 that yielded 13,017 total observations over 5,270 study days. Adolescents' T1 technology use did not predict later mental-health symptoms. Adolescents' reported mental health was also not worse on days when they reported spending more versus less time on technology. Little was found to support daily quadratic associations (whereby adolescent mental health was worse on days with little or excessive use). Adolescents at higher risk for mental-health problems also exhibited no signs of increased risk for mental-health problems on higher technology use days. Findings from this EMA study do not support the narrative that young adolescents' digital technology usage is associated with elevated mental-health symptoms.

Keywords: digital technology usage | mental health | early adolescence | ecological momentary assessment | technology | adolescence | open materials

Article:

For better or for worse, digital technologies are integrated into the daily lives of modern adolescents. Nearly all adolescents have at least one mobile device to call their own (95%); 89% own their own smartphones (Rideout & Robb, 2018). Teens spend an average of 6.67 hr/day on screen media for non-school purposes; preteens spend an average of 4.6 hr/day (Rideout, 2016). This constant connectivity has been accompanied by growing concern among parents, the public, and even industry stakeholders that technology (particularly smartphone use) is harming adolescents' mental health and, more specifically, is responsible for recent increases in depression, loneliness, and suicidal ideation (Rosenstein & Sheehan, 2018; Twenge, 2017).

Despite this widespread public attention to the negative implications of technology use, the research base around technology and mental health is far from conclusive (Orben & Przybylski, 2019); very little data suggest causal processes (Bell, Bishop, & Przybylski, 2015; Odgers, 2018).

Despite widespread fears, we also see evidence that engagement with the digital world can have real-world benefits to youths, including enhancement of important skills such as communication, social connection, and facility with technology (Ito et al., 2008). Given the ubiquity of technology adoption, alongside rising rates of mental health problems (Mojtabai, Olfson, & Han, 2016) among young people, it is imperative that conclusions and recommendations around adolescent technology use and mental health be solidly based in evidence from rigorous research (Guernsey, 2014).

Technology and Mental Health: Evidence to Date

There are two primary theories for how or why technology use and mental health might be related, representing both causal and selection effects. The displacement hypothesis asserts that time youths spend on technology occurs at the expense of time that could be spent doing other "real-life" social or cognitively enriching activities (and the mental health benefits of those activities that are displaced are lost; Kraut et al., 1998). Alternatively, the social compensation hypothesis is that youths with mental health difficulties may leverage technology as a tool to make up for real or perceived deficits in social skills and thus that associations between time spent on technology and mental health may result from selection into certain types of technology use (Campbell, Cummings, & Hughes, 2006; Shapira et al., 2003; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007).

A number of recent reviews and meta-analyses summarize the associations between technology use and adolescent well-being and mental health. Across these reviews, cross-sectional designs using retrospective reporting and small effect sizes consistently stand out (Baker & Algorta, 2016; Seabrook, Kern, & Rickard, 2016). In their systematic review of 43 studies of adolescents and young adults, Best, Manktelow, and Taylor (2014) concluded that the majority of studies in their review reported either mixed or no effects of online social technologies on adolescent mental well-being. Specific identified benefits included increases in self-esteem, perceived social support, and social capital; safe identity experimentation; and increased ability to self-disclose; specific identified harms included increased social isolation, depression, and cyber-bullying. In a recent meta-analysis of social networking site use across all ages, Huang (2017) concluded that the mean correlation across all studies (most of which were cross-sectional) between time spent on social networking sites and psychological well-being was negative and low ($r = -.07$, 95% confidence interval, or CI = [–.09, –.04]), such that more social networking site use was weakly associated with worse psychological well-being. These results are consistent with a recent secondary analysis that analyzed three large-scale data sets (totaling over 350,0000 youths) via specification curve analysis to demonstrate that digital technology use is associated with only slightly worse adolescent well-being; technology use accounted for only 0.4% of the variation in well-being across these still cross-sectional studies (Orben & Przybylski, 2019).

Recent reviews also highlight that the nature of online interactions is likely more important than the quantity or frequency of technology use (Baker & Algorta, 2016; Marino, Gini, Vieno, &

Spada, 2018). Online social networking site use tends to be related to less internalizing to the extent that it includes positive interactions, enhances social support, and facilitates social connectedness and is associated with more internalizing in instances when it is excessive, reduces time spent in in-person interactions, and interactions are negative or involve social comparisons (Clark, Algos, & Green, 2018; Seabrook et al., 2016). One fairly consistent finding is that youths who report psychological distress around their online activities—that their technology use includes distressing or problematic elements conceptualized as *problematic technology use*, signs of addiction or not being able to forego technology use, and using technology to escape and avoid otherwise coping with the real world—are also more likely to report psychological distress in their offline lives (Andreassen et al., 2016; Augner & Hacker, 2012; Marino et al., 2018; Morrison, Morrison, & Gore, 2017). Note that the dominance of cross-sectional designs makes it impossible to know if perceived problematic use of technology use leads to other forms of psychopathology or if youths with existing problems offline are more likely to bring those mental health difficulties into the online sphere.

The few experiments that have been conducted on this topic are informative, though by no means conclusive. In two experiments with college students, instant messaging was associated with reductions in distress (Dolev-Cohen & Barak, 2013) and replenishment of self-esteem and perceived relational value after social exclusion (Gross, 2009). However, in another experiment, in which Danish adults were assigned to take a break from Facebook, those assigned to take a Facebook break reported greater life satisfaction and more positive emotions compared with those in the control condition who continued their Facebook use as usual (Tromholt, 2016). Results also suggested stronger effects among those whose use was already potentially problematic (as evidenced by heavy use, passive use, and envy of others on Facebook). However, the validity of these findings has been questioned because the participants were not blind to their condition, and the generalizability of these findings to adolescents is probably limited because of the nature of the sample (unpaid adult volunteers recruited via Facebook ads, 86% women).

The existing literature highlights the importance of measuring both the quality and the quantity of the different types of activities youths engage in online rather than just relying on a gross sum of time spent on screens, which may include potentially beneficial social interactions with close friends alongside likely less beneficial passive viewing of content. The key to understanding the role of technology in mental health likely lies in understanding how it is used, and teens use technology in a myriad of ways. Indeed, teens divide their digital media use across a variety of activities, including passive consumption (watching online videos or TV, reading, or listening to music; 2.1 hr/day) and interactive consumption (playing games, browsing websites; 1.32 hr/day), communication (using social media and video-chatting; 1.4 hr/day), creation (making art or music, writing; 0.15 hr/day), and other use (0.38 hr/day; Rideout, 2016).

Daily Associations Between Technology and Mental Health

Daily assessment methods such as ecological momentary assessment (EMA; Shiffman, Stone, & Hufford, 2008) facilitate in-the-moment reporting on lived experiences, such as time spent using technology and daily mental health. EMA methods may reduce the recall bias of retrospective self-report (which emerging evidence suggests is quite poor for estimates of time spent using

technology; D. A. Ellis, Davidson, Shaw, & Geyer, 2019) and facilitate accurate assessments of intermittent time allocation and mental health symptoms over the course of the day; they also allow investigators to examine within-person linkages between these experiences over time. The present study used EMA to examine daily linkages between different types of technology use and mental health symptoms. Through multilevel modeling of EMA data, we can parse the *who* (Are people who use more technology more likely to experience mental health symptoms compared with other people?) from the *when* (Are individuals more or less likely to experience mental health symptoms on days when they use more/less technology, compared with themselves?). *Who* questions are largely seen in the literature's prevalent cross-sectional designs, but few studies have tackled the *when* study questions using EMA designs. Furthermore, this design's partitioning of within- and between-person associations allows us to test the ergodicity of technology-mental health associations (whether aggregate interindividual processes operate similarly at the intraindividual level) and avoid falling prey to the ecological fallacy and incorrectly generalizing findings from between-person studies to individual adolescent experiences (Fisher, Medaglia, & Jeronimus, 2018; Molenaar, 2004).

The few studies that have used EMA in this domain have yielded mixed results. In a study of college students using experience sampling, no significant associations emerged between daily social networking site use and depression (Jelenchick, Eickhoff, & Moreno, 2013). In an EMA of adults, momentary supportive online interactions were associated with momentary positive affect but were not related to momentary negative affect (Oh, Ozkaya, & Larose, 2014). In contrast, another experience sampling study (Kross et al., 2013) showed that quantity of Facebook use was associated with worse affect at the next time point (a lagged effect) but not the inverse (affect did not relate to next time point Facebook use). This study concluded that this effect was not attributable to loneliness or moderated by other risk factors. Prior research from our team also showed daily associations between several indicators of technology use and increased externalizing symptoms (though effect sizes were small) in a sample of adolescents at risk for mental health problems: Daily time spent online, time spent on social media, and time spent on a mobile phone texting were associated with more same-day attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and conduct disorder symptoms, and time spent on the Internet and texts sent were also associated with more conduct disorder symptoms (George, Russell, Piontak, & Odgers, 2018). However, time spent online, time spent texting, and amount of texts sent were associated with less same-day anxiety, and increased numbers of text messages sent were also associated with less same-day depression.

The Present Study

The present study used a baseline assessment of mental health problems and digital technology use alongside intensively gathered longitudinal EMA data collected on adolescents' mobile phones to test how (or whether) technology is related to worse mental health by answering the following primary study questions (which were specified a priori within the study team, before accessing the study data):

- *Question 1a*: Do adolescents' self-reported access to and use of technology predict later mental health symptoms?

- *Question 1b*: Do adolescents' self-reported access to and use of technology predict later mental health symptoms over and above Time 1 (T1) mental health?
- *Question 2a*: Do adolescents experience more mental health problems on days when they use more technology (daily linkages, using each person as his or her own control)?
- *Question 2b*: Do adolescents with higher average daily technology use have higher levels of mental health problems on average (cross-sectional associations at the person level)?

Emerging research suggests that associations between digital technology and mental health may be less straightforward than the linear associations addressed in Questions 1 and 2. One new area of inquiry examines the digital goldilocks hypothesis, or the idea that associations between technology use and mental well-being may be best characterized by a quadratic function such that only at extremely high or low rates of use does digital technology use demonstrate negative associations with mental health, whereas the majority of adolescents who report moderate usage of digital technology fare comparatively better on measures of well-being. Przybylski and Weinstein (2017) recently tested this hypothesis using a preregistered plan from a large representative sample of English adolescents and concluded that most children's use of technology was not related to poorer mental health, but at extremely high levels of use, these associations did emerge (e.g., more than 1 hr 40 min of weekday or 3 hr 35 min of weekend video-game play, more than 3 hr 41 min of weekday or 4 hr 50 min of weekend video watching). Note that even at these high levels, the effect sizes were small, accounting for less than 1% of the observed variability in mental well-being, and associations were based on cross-sectional reports, limiting tests of directionality. Our study tests the digital goldilocks hypothesis at the daily level using EMA data.

There is also some concern that youths with existing mental health risks may be susceptible to a technology amplification of symptoms (the "poor get poorer hypothesis"; Kraut et al., 2002; Scott, Valley, & Simecka, 2017; Selfhout, Branje, Delsing, ter Bogt, & Meeus, 2009). That is, youths who already struggle socially or emotionally may experience increased social isolation because of time spent online or exacerbated difficulty with focus, attention, and self-regulation because of the constant multitasking afforded by smartphones and other technologies. Although a recent nationally representative survey of 1,141 adolescents illustrated, contrary to these expectations, that those adolescents who reported the lowest levels of social and emotional well-being were also more likely to report that social media had a positive versus negative effect on them (Rideout & Robb, 2018). These adolescents were more likely to report that using social media made them feel less depressed, better about themselves, and less lonely compared with their peers with higher levels of reported social and emotional well-being. Our sample is diverse on a number of dimensions that might predispose adolescents to mental health problems (i.e., past mental health risk, economic disadvantage) and/or increase vulnerability to different types of technology use effects (i.e., age, gender) and thus well positioned to examine subgroup differences in daily associations.

We tested these potentially complex nonlinear and interactive relations between technology use and mental health by asking the following exploratory study questions (which were not specified a priori before accessing the study data):

- *Question 3a*: Do adolescents experience more mental-health problems on days when their technology use falls at the extremes of their own distribution of usage (e.g., much more or much less than their own average technology use; daily digital goldilocks effects)?
- *Question 3b*: Do adolescents with digital technology usage at the very low and high ends of the technology use distribution, compared with other adolescents, report experiencing more mental-health problems on average (cross-sectional, person-level digital goldilocks effects)?
- *Question 4a*: Are adolescents with preexisting mental health vulnerabilities more likely to experience a negative coupling between daily technology usage and daily mental-health symptoms compared with their peers (moderation of daily linkages)?
- *Question 4b*: Do adolescents with preexisting mental-health vulnerabilities exhibit stronger associations between digital technology usage and mental-health symptoms compared with their peers (moderation of person-level associations)?



Fig. 1. Study design.

Method

Sample and procedure

The study design is depicted in Figure 1. The sample was drawn from the population of children enrolled in Grades 3 through 6 in North Carolina Public Schools during the 2011–2012 school year according to administrative data from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Participants completed an initial T1 adolescent survey ($N = 2{,}104$) between April and August of

2015, at which time participants were enrolled in Grades 5 through 8 and ranged in age from 9 to 15 years (mean age = 12.36 years, *SD* = 1.12). The sample was representative of the state population of public school children with respect to economic disadvantage, gender, and ethnicity. Participants and their parents were contacted and consented by phone. Early adolescents and midadolescents were surveyed by phone and reported on demographics, mental health, and problem behaviors. The majority of parents provided consent to link survey data to administrative data from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (*n* = 2,048, 97.3%) and gave permission to contact their child for future studies (*n* = 1,867, 88.7%).

A subsample of 395 students in early to midadolescence were recruited to participate in a home visit and a 14-day EMA between April 2016 and February 2017. Of this subsample, 388 adolescents completed at least one EMA survey for the present study and constitute our analysis sample. The vast majority of adolescents (94%) fell between the ages of 12 and 15 years (full age range = 10–17 years) at the time of the EMA. Adolescents were selected on the basis of their: (a) proximity to two geographically distinct cations (central, urban North Carolina and western, rural North Carolina) from which staff could make in-person home visits and (b) representation to the statewide public school population in terms of economic disadvantage, gender, race, and ethnicity; however, the 395 adolescents who agreed to participate in the EMA were more likely to be White (60.6% vs. 51.3%) and less likely to be economically disadvantaged (measured as current receipt of free/reduced lunch; 40.8% vs. 55.4%) compared with the overall state public school population. All procedures, protocols, and measures were approved by the Duke University Institutional Review Board for the study (Approval D0396). A home visit was conducted by two interviewers who installed MetricWire (Version 3; MetricWire Inc., Kitchener, ON, Canada), a phone-based survey application, to deliver the EMA on the participant's own mobile phone or a study-administered phone (49.9% of adolescents elected to use their own phones). Participants received three daily surveys for the next 14 days, one each in the morning, afternoon, and evening. Survey questions assessed participants' daily experiences, technology use, behaviors, and mood. Eighty percent of survey prompts were answered, resulting in 13,017 total observations over 5,270 study days for the measures analyzed here.

Measures

Covariates. At the initial T1 adolescent survey, adolescents reported their birth date, gender (49.74% female), race, and Hispanic ethnicity. Racial/ethnic group was recoded into four categories reflecting White (non-Hispanic; 59.79% of sample), Black (non-Hispanic; 19.07% of sample), Hispanic (of any race; 12.89% of sample), and "other" (including Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, multiracial, and those who did not report a racial/ethnic group; 6.44% of sample). Age was calculated on the basis of self-reported birth date and the date of the first EMA survey (mean age at first EMA = 13.37 years, *SD* = 1.14). Family economic disadvantage was determined on the basis of eligibility for free and/or reduced lunch using school administrative records. Schools use verified household income to determine eligibility; cutoffs vary with household size and are on the order of 175% of the federal poverty level. Those families who were persistently eligible for free or reduced lunch across all years for which administrative data are available (2009–2016) are classified as persistently economically disadvantaged (31.07% of the sample).

In the EMA, students reported daily in the evening on whether they attended school that day or not (0 = attended school, 1 = no school). This daily school attendance covariate is included in multilevel models to account for potential weekend effects and third-variable confounding (i.e., adolescents may report fewer internalizing and externalizing problems and more technology use in their unstructured time on days when they do not attend school). A person-mean of school attendance was also computed across the study period and reflects the percentage of days school was not attended (higher = more days out of school) and is included as a Level 2 covariate to account for summer and school break seasonality (i.e., in summer, a student would report 100% days off school).

T1 mental health. Adolescents reported on their psychological distress, conduct, and temperament during the initial T1 adolescent survey. Psychological distress was assessed with six items from the well-validated Kessler (K6) scale for psychological distress in the Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being (Furukawa, Kessler, Slade, & Andrews, 2003; Green, Gruber, Sampson, Zaslavsky, & Kessler, 2010). Participants responded on a scale from 0 (*none of the time*) to 4 (*all of the time*); the mean score was 4.17 (SD = 0.61; α = .85). Conduct problems were assessed using the 25-item Problem Behavior Frequency Scale (Miller-Johnson, Sullivan, & Simon, 2004). For each item, responses captured the frequency of a behavior over the past 30 days, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*20 or more times*), and were averaged to create a total score (M = 0.13, SD = 0.21; α = .88). Adolescents responded to 16 questions from the Early Adolescent Temperament Questionnaire (L. K. Ellis & Rothbart, 2001), a widely used instrument to measure effortful control, deficits in which are associated with risk for ADHD (Eisenberg et al., 2009; Martel & Nigg, 2006). Response options ranged from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*) and were averaged to yield a total score (M = 3.73, SD = 0.60; α = .77). Adolescents scoring in the highest quartile for baseline psychological distress and conduct problems and the lowest quartile on T1 effortful control were classified as being at T1 risk for internalizing (worry and depression), conduct problems, and inattention/hyperactivity, respectively.

T1 technology access and use. At the T1 adolescent survey, adolescents answered questions adapted from the PEW Internet & American Life national surveys (Lenhart, Ling, Campbell, & Purcell, 2010) reporting on their mobile phone ownership (0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*), social-media access (0 = *no access*, 1 = *uses social media*), and frequency of social-media use ("How often do you use social networking sites like Facebook or Instagram?"; response options were as follows: 0, *I do not have social media*; 1, *less often than every few weeks*; 2, *every few weeks*; 3, *1 to 2 days per week*; 4, *3 to 5 days per week*; 5, *about once per day*; and 6, *several times a day*.

Daily technology use. Adolescents reported each evening on the number of text messages sent ("How many texts or online messages did you send today?"). Daily reports that exceeded 10,000 text messages (11 daily observations, or .002% of daily observations) were coded as missing. Adolescents also reported each evening on the number of hours spent online or on their phone using technology for the following purposes: school work, communication (online or on phone talking to others or sending messages), entertainment (browsing social media, watching videos, playing games), and creating content (posting on social media, creating videos, etc.). Reports on these items that exceeded 24 hr daily were coded as missing (< .018% of daily observations). These items, which tap time spent on technology for various purposes, were chosen because they

allowed for an assessment of time allocation that could be compared across participants' preferred platforms and are in line with literature suggesting that passive use of technology (e.g., entertainment) may be more detrimental to well-being than time spent in active use (i.e., communicating or creating content; Deters & Mehl, 2013; Verduyn et al., 2015). Time adolescents spent online or on their phone using technology for school work, communication, entertainment, and creating content were summed to yield a measure of total screen time that day.

Daily externalizing symptoms. Inattention and hyperactivity were assessed with four EMA-adapted questions from studies of attention-deficit hyperactivity in children (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004; Whalen, Odgers, Reed, & Henker, 2011), assessing the presence of attention difficulties (e.g., "I'm having a hard time concentrating or focusing," morning, afternoon, and evening; "I'm having a hard time finishing things"; afternoon and evening), hyperactivity ("So far today, I've felt restless or like I was always 'on the go,'" afternoon and evening), and impulsivity ("I've been doing things without thinking first"; morning, afternoon, and evening). Items were dichotomized at the daily level to reflect the presence or absence of each symptom that day, and a daily symptom count was computed. Person-means were computed by averaging the daily measures across the study period and reflect the average number of symptoms across all days. The average participant endorsed 0.82 symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity on an average day ($M = 0.82$, $SD = 0.88$; $\alpha = .83$). Across all study days for all participants, at least one symptom of inattention/hyperactivity was endorsed on 44% of days; 17% of the sample never endorsed any symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity.

Conduct problems were assessed with seven (yes/no) questions in the afternoon and evening about whether adolescents engaged in aggressive and deviant behavior (e.g., "So far today, I took or stole something that didn't belong to me"). Because of the low base rates of the fairly serious conduct problems queried, responses were dichotomized at the daily level to yield indicator of the presence (1) or absence (0) any conduct problems that day. Person-means were computed by averaging the daily measures across the study period and reflect the proportion of days on which adolescents endorsed a conduct problem ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.17$, $\alpha = .72$). Across all study days for all participants, a conduct problem was endorsed on only 8% of days; 66% of the sample never endorsed any conduct problems.

Daily internalizing symptoms. Adolescents responded to questions from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule for Children (Laurent et al., 1999) in the morning, afternoon, and evening each day. Administered items that most closely overlap with diagnostic criteria for internalizing problems were chosen for the present study. *Depressive* symptoms were measured by asking adolescents to use a slider scale to indicate whether they felt "sad," "tired," and "lonely," on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 100 (*very*); these three symptoms were averaged across the day to yield a daily depressive symptom score, and a person-mean depression score was computed by averaging daily depressive symptoms across all study days ($M = 21.34$, $SD = 12.46$; $\alpha = .69$). A key symptom of anxiety (worry) was assessed using the same slider scale to respond to a question asking adolescents to indicate whether they were "worried about something" (averaged across the day to yield a daily worry score), and a person-mean worry score was computed by averaging daily worry symptoms across all study days ($M = 18.32$, $SD = 17.13$).

Data analyses

For clarity, specific analytic procedures for each study question are presented alongside each study question's results below. All analyses were conducted in Mplus (Version 8.1; Muthén & Muthén, 2018) with full-information maximum-likelihood (FIML) estimation to handle missing data at the person level (Level 2) and robust maximum-likelihood estimation to account for nonnormality. Listwise deletion was employed at the daily level (Level 1), and thus the number of Level 1 observations varied slightly from one model to the next (because of participant nonresponse or skipping items); the *n*s for each analysis are reported in Table 2. Given the large number of comparisons necessary to test six indicators of technology use predicting four mental-health dimensions, plus exploratory quadratic effects and T1 risk interactions, the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for adjusted significance tests was used to manage the false-discovery rate (FDR; Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). The FDR method of error control is less conservative than other alternatives such as the Bonferroni method (McDonald, 2015) and was computed by ordering the p values for each study question from smallest to largest (smallest has a rank of i = 1, the second smallest has i = 2, etc.); each p value was compared with its Benjamini-Hochberg critical value using the formula $(i/m)Q$, where i = rank, m = total number of tests, and Q = the allowable false-discovery rate of .05. Traditional p values are reported in all tables; those that meet FDR-corrected significance levels are marked with an asterisk. To encourage the open sharing and reproducibility of our research, we have made all Mplus output files (including syntax and variance/covariance matrices that allow for replication) available on the Open Science Framework.

Results

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, skew, kurtosis, and percentage of the sample comprising each categorical variable) and correlations between study variables can be found in Table S1 in the Supplemental Material available online. Adolescents sent an average of 47 texts per day; 10.73% of adolescents reported never sending any texts over the study period. Adolescents reported an average of 4.18 hr of daily screen time (3.41% of the sample never reported using technology). That screen time was divided among technology for school work (M = 0.79 hr/day; 20.2% never reported using technology for school), communication (M = 1.34 hr/day; 13.7% of adolescents never reported using technology to communicate), entertainment (M = 1.83 hr/day; 5.8% of adolescents never reported using technology for entertainment), and creating content (M = 0.38 hr/day; 45.7% of adolescents never reported using technology to create content).

Age was associated with more total daily screen time, including time spent daily using technology for school work and communication but not time spent on technology for entertainment or creating content. There were no differences between males and females on any technology use measure. African American adolescents reported spending significantly more time per day on total screen time (6.16 hr) than White adolescents, who reported the least total screen time (3.51 hr); adolescents of Hispanic and another race/ethnicity reported levels of use between these two extremes. This race/ethnicity difference persisted for time spent using technology for school work, communication, entertainment, and creating content. Adolescents

from economically disadvantaged households reported more daily screen time (5.24 hr) than adolescents from nondisadvantaged households (3.68 hr); this difference was also evident in time spent on technology for school work, communication, and creating content but not for entertainment. The number of text messages sent did not differ by any demographic categorization. These demographic differences did not appear to be due to differing rates of personal phone ownership (the nature of differences persisted when non-phone owners were excluded from analyses).

Table 1. Longitudinal Associations Between Adolescents' T1 Technology Use and Later Mental Health (Question 1)

	Unadjusted for T1 risk			**Adjusted for T1 risk**		
Statistic	**Phone ownership**	**SM access**	**SM use frequency**	**Phone ownership**	**SM access**	**SM use frequency**
Conduct						
b	–0.01	**0.04**	**0.01**	–0.01	0.03	< 0.01
SE	.02	**.02**	**.00**	.02	.02	< .01
95% CI for *b*	[–.01, .03]	**[.01, .07]**	**[.00, .01]**	[–.03, 0.3]	[–.01, .06]	[> –.01, .01]
β	–0.01	**0.11**	**0.10**	–0.02	0.07	0.06
p	.81	**.03**	**.04**	.72	.16	.26
Inattention/hyperactivity						
b	–0.03	–0.01	> –0.01	–0.03	–0.03	–0.01
SE	.10	.10	.02	.10	.10	.02
95% CI for *b*	[–.22, .17]	[–.21, .20]	[–.04, .04]	[–.22, .16]	[–.23, .17]	[–.05, .03]
β	–0.02	> –0.01	–0.00	–0.02	–0.02	–0.03
p	.79	.95	.93	.73	.76	.65
Depression						
b	0.67	1.07	0.35	0.67	0.87	0.33
SE	1.37	1.40	.28	1.35	1.40	.28
95% CI for *b*	[–2.00, 3.35]	[–1.67, 3.80]	[–.20, .91]	[–1.98, 3.32]	[–1.88, 3.61]	[–.23, .88]
β	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.06
p	.62	.45	.22	.62	.54	.25
Worry						
b	1.44	–0.24	0.16	1.43	–0.51	0.13
SE	1.89	.80	.39	1.88	1.95	.39
95% CI for *b*	[–2.27, 5.15]	[–4.06, 3.59]	[–.61, .92]	[–2.27, 5.12]	[–4.33, 3.32]	[–.64, .89]
β	0.04	–0.01	0.02	0.04	–0.01	0.02
p	.45	.07	.68	.45	.79	.75

Note: $n = 388$. T1 = Time 1; SM = social media. Associations between each type of technology use and each type of mental health symptom are tested in single-level regressions alongside covariates of age, gender, economic disadvantage, and dummy-coded racial/ ethnic groups. Models adjusted for T1 risk each include an additional covariate tapping T1 mental health risk (psychological distress for worry and depression, Time 1 (T1) conduct problems for conduct problems, and T1 effortful control for inattention/hyperactivity). Raw regression coefficients (*b*), standard errors (*SE*), 95% confidence intervals (CI), and standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported. No coefficients met false-discovery-rate-corrected significance levels. Boldface type indicates significant relationships ($p < .05$).

Primary study questions

Question 1

Analyses. We sought to replicate prior findings demonstrating cross-sectional relations between technology use and worse mental health in a longitudinal sample. Time 2 (T2) mental-health

outcomes were measured using the person-level averages of daily conduct problems, inattention/hyperactivity, depression, and worry across the entire 2-week EMA period. We tested Question 1a (Do adolescents' self-reported access to and use of technology relate to later mental-health symptoms?) by regressing T2 mental-health outcomes on T1 mobile phone ownership, social-media access, social-media use frequency, and demographic covariates. To answer Question 1b (Do adolescents' self-reported access to and use of technology predict later mental-health symptoms over and above T1 mental health?), we included T1 levels of mental-health symptoms (psychological distress for worry and depression, T1 conduct problems for conduct problems, and T1 effortful control for inattention/hyperactivity) as additional covariates.

Results. Results for Question 1a are shown on the left side of Table 1; adolescents' phone ownership, social-media access, and frequency of social-media use were unrelated to later depression, worry, and inattention/hyperactivity symptoms. Adolescents' social-media access and use frequency were both related to higher levels of later conduct problems, although these associations did not meet FDR-corrected significance levels accounting for multiple comparisons. Adolescents' phone ownership was unrelated to later conduct problems. Results for Question 1b are shown on the right side of Table 1; adolescents' phone ownership, social-media access, and frequency of social-media use were unrelated to all domains of later mental-health symptoms. The associations between social-media access and use frequency that emerged with conduct problems in Question 1a were reduced to statistical nonsignificance once T1 conduct problems were controlled for.

Question 2

Analyses. EMA is unique in that the daily associations allow for the adolescent to serve as his or her own control across time, testing whether changes in adolescents' technology use are associated with within-individual risk for same-day mental-health symptoms, holding all stable characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, or socioeconomic status) constant over time. The nature of the EMA assessment (days nested within people) allows for the parsing of within-person associations at the daily level (Question 2a: Do adolescents experience more mental-health problems on days when they use more technology relative to their own usage?) and between-person associations (Question 2b: Do adolescents who use more technology have higher levels of mental-health problems on average compared with other adolescents?). We examined Question 2 in a two-level model:

Level 1: $$\text{Mental Health}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1(\text{dTU}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{dSchoolDay}_{ij}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

Level 2: $$\beta_{00} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{mTU}_j) + \gamma_{02}(\text{mSchoolDay}_j) + \gamma_{03}(\text{Age}_j) + \gamma_{04}(\text{ender}_j) + \gamma_{05}(\text{Disadvantage}_j) + \gamma_{06}(\text{Black}_j) + \gamma_{01}(\text{Hispanic}_j) + \gamma_{08}(\text{Other}_j) + \upsilon_{0j}$$

Level 1 modeled daily mental-health symptoms for day *i* and person *j* as a function of a person-specific intercept term (β_{0j}), daily technology use ($\beta_{2;}$ dTU_{ij}), whether the adolescent went to school that day (β_2; 0 = attended school, 1 = no school), and a residual term (ε_{ij}). Level 2 modeled the person-specific intercept as a function of person-average technology use ($\gamma_{01;}$ mTU_j), average non-school days (γ_{02}; the percentage of study days not in school, to account for summer and school break seasonality), person-level covariates (γ_{03}–γ_{08}), and a random

person-specific error term (υ_{0j}). The binary nature of daily conduct problem symptoms was modeled using multilevel logistic regression, and the count nature of daily inattention/hyperactivity symptoms was modeled using a Poisson distribution; neither of these models included a Level 1 residual term.

We parsed daily and person-level variation in technology use by leaving the daily technology use variables in raw (uncentered) form while accounting for the difference in average technology use (across days). This approach (in contrast to a person-mean centering approach) allows for the interpretation of daily technology use variables (Level 1 predictors) in their natural metrics (number of texts and hours) such that the zero point represents a day with no technology use while still accounting for the fact that some adolescents use more or less technology than other adolescents overall. Thus, the models yield pure Level 1 estimates of daily linkages between adolescents' technology use and mental health (over and above person-level relations) and pure Level 2 estimates of person-level relations between adolescents' technology use and mental health (over and above daily linkages and covariates), allowing Level 1 and Level 2 relations to differ in magnitude and direction (contextual effects; Hoffman & Stawski, 2009).

Results. Results for Question 2a are shown in Table 2: No daily linkages (β_1) between digital technology usage and mental-health symptoms emerged. Days when adolescents reported relatively higher levels of texts sent, technology for school work, technology for communication, technology for entertainment, technology for creating content, and total screen time were not more likely to be days when the adolescents reported conduct problems, more symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity, or higher levels of worry or depression.

The person-level relations (γ_{01}) addressed in Question 2b were slightly more robust than daily linkages (Table 2), although only two relations persisted when corrected for false-discovery rates. Adolescents who spent more time using technology for school work reported more inattention/hyperactivity symptoms on average; a 1-hr increase in average daily technology use for school work was associated with a 20% increase in the average counts of inattention/hyperactivity symptoms (incident risk ratio = 1.20). Adolescents who reported sending more text messages on average reported fewer depressive symptoms (each additional 10 texts sent was associated with a .066-point decrease in average depressive symptoms; $\beta = -0.089$).

We conducted a sensitivity analysis to determine whether our decision to use listwise deletion to handle missing data at the daily level influenced study results. Question 2 models were estimated using FIML for daily observations with partial missingness. Inattention/hyperactivity models were not identified, and thus results are not available. For the remaining three outcomes, results were consistent with those using listwise deletion for 15 of 18 of the coefficients of interest, with three new associations meeting FDR-corrected significance cutoffs: Average daily technology for school work was associated with higher average levels of conduct problems ($b = 0.28$, $SE = 0.09$, odds ratio, or $OR = 1.32$, $p \leq .01$) and depression ($b = 1.66$, $SE = 0.51$, $\beta = 0.16$, $p \leq .01$), and daily time spent on technology for entertainment was associated with lower levels of same-day worry ($b = -0.43$, $SE = 0.14$, $\beta = -0.07$, $p \leq .01$).

Table 2. Multilevel Models Testing Daily Associations Between Adolescents' Technology Use and Mental Health Symptoms (Question 2)

	Conduct					Inattention/hyperactivity					Depression					Worry				
	b	***SE***	**95% CI for *b***	***OR***	***p***	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI for *b***	**IRR**	***p***	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI for *b***	**β**	***p***	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI for *b***	**β**	***p***
Texts send (in 10s)																				
3,572 days, n = 370																				
Daily β_1	< 0.01	< 0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	1.00	.94	> -0.01	< 0.01	[>-0.01, <0.01]	1.00	.17	0.02	0.02	[-0.01, 0.05]	0.04	.26	< 0.01	0.02	[-0.03, 0.03]	> -0.01	.98
Person-m slope γ_{01}	0.00	0.36	[-0.02, 0.02]	1.00	.67	-0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.01]	1.00	.71	**-0.07[a]**	**0.02**	**[-0.10, -0.04]**	**-0.09**	**< .01**	-0.02	0.04	[-0.09, 0.05]	-0.02	.56
Tech school work																				
3,537 days, n = 370																				
Daily β_1	0.07	0.05	[-0.02, 0.14]	1.07	.15	0.02	0.01	[-0.00, 0.03]	1.02	.06	0.10	0.15	[-0.20, 0.35]	0.02	.51	0.37	0.26	[-0.14, 0.88]	0.04	.15
Person-m slope γ_{01}	**0.21**	**0.12**	**[< 0.01, 0.48]**	**1.27**	**.05**	**0.19[a]**	**0.05**	**[0.09, 0.28]**	**1.20**	**< .01**	**1.62**	**0.64**	**[0.37, 2.88]**	**0.16**	**.01**	**1.66**	**0.83**	**[0.04, 3.28]**	**0.12**	**.05**
Tech communication																				
3,530 days, n = 366																				
Daily β_1	0.05	0.04	[-0.03, 0.13]	1.05	.24	> -0.01	0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	1.00	.79	-0.23	0.16	[-0.54, 0.08]	-0.05	.15	-0.12	0.15	[-0.42, 0.17]	-0.02	.42
Person-m slope γ_{01}	0.18	0.12	[-0.04, 0.41]	1.20	.11	0.08	0.05	[-0.03, 0.18]	1.08	.15	0.46	0.53	[-0.57, 1.49]	0.06	.38	0.29	0.63	[-0.94, 1.52]	0.03	.64
Tech entertainment																				
3,541 days, n = 367																				
Daily β_1	0.01	0.03	[-0.05, 0.07]	1.01	.70	-0.01	0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	.99	.16	-0.08	0.10	[-0.26, 0.11]	-0.02	.43	-0.11	0.13	[-0.37, 0.15]	-0.02	.40
Person-m slope γ_{01}	0.14	0.09	[-0.04, 0.32]	1.15	.12	0.09	0.05	[-0.01, 0.19]	1.10	.07	0.21	0.36	[-0.50, 0.92]	0.03	.56	0.47	0.54	[-0.58, 1.53]	0.05	.38
Tech creating content																				
3,548 days, n = 368																				
Daily β_1	0.09	0.07	[-0.04, 0.22]	1.09	.17	0.01	0.02	[-0.03, 0.04]	1.01	.63	-0.28	0.34	[-0.95, 0.38]	-0.03	.41	0.06	0.31	[-0.56, 0.67]	< 0.01	.86
Person-m slope γ_{01}	**0.60**	**0.24**	**[0.14, 1.08]**	**1.83**	**.01**	**0.30**	**0.13**	**[0.05, 0.55]**	**1.35**	**.02**	1.43	1.28	[-1.10, 3.90]	0.08	.27	1.24	1.18	[-1.06, 3.55]	0.05	.29
Total screen time																				
3,611 days, n = 370																				
Daily β_1	0.03	0.02	[> -0.01, 0.06]	1.03	.08	> -0.01	< 0.01	[-0.01, 0.01]	1.00	.56	-0.08	0.07	[-0.21, 0.06]	-0.04	.26	-0.02	0.08	[-0.17, 0.18]	-0.01	.76
Person-m slope γ_{01}	**0.09[a]**	**0.04[a]**	**[0.01, 0.17][a]**	**1.09**	**.03**	**0.06**	**0.02**	**[0.02, 0.10]**	**1.06**	**.01**	0.30	0.22	[-0.14, 0.73]	0.13	.18	0.32	0.27	[-0.21, 0.86]	0.07	.23

Note: Associations between each type of technology use (Tech) and each mental health domain are tested in separate multilevel models alongside covariates of daily school attendance and person-level mean school attendance, age, gender, economic disadvantage, and dummy-coded racial/ethnic group. Conduct is a binary variable at the daily level and modeled using logistic regression. Inattention/ hyperactivity is a count at the daily level and modeled using a Poisson distribution. Raw regression coefficients (*b*), standard errors (*SE*), and the 95% confidence intervals (CI) are reported. Effect-size estimates are reported as odds ratios (OR; binary conduct problems), incident risk ratios (IRR; count inattention/hyperactivity symptoms), and standardized regression coefficients (β; continuous depression and worry symptoms). Boldface type indicates significant relationships ($p < .05$).

[a] Coefficients that met false-discovery-rate-corrected significance level.

Exploratory study questions

Question 3

Analyses. We tested the digital goldilocks hypothesis (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2017), which posits that relations between technology use and mental health are quadratic, with increased risk at both very high and very low levels of technology use. We examined within-person associations (Question 3a: Do adolescents experience more mental-health problems on days when their technology use falls at the extremes of their own distribution of usage, that is, much more or much less than their own average technology use?) and between-person associations (Question 3b: Do adolescents with digital technology usage at the very low and high ends of the technology use distribution report experiencing more mental-health problems, on average, than their peers in the middle of the distribution?). We tested Question 3 by adding two terms to the equation above in Question 2: daily technology use squared (β_3; dTU2ijdTUij2) and person-average technology use squared (γ_{09}; mTU2jmTUj2). Person-average technology use was grand mean centered to facilitate interpretation of lower order terms. Exploring potential nonlinear associations involved testing 48 potential quadratic effects, all of which are reported in the interest of full disclosure and to avoid selective reporting.

Level 1: $$\text{Mental Health}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1(\text{dTU}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{dSchoolDay}_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\beta}_3(\mathbf{dTU}_{ij}^2) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

Level 2: $$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{mTU}_j) + \gamma_{02}(\text{mSchoolDay}_j) + \gamma_{03}(\text{Age}_j) + \gamma_{04}(\text{ender}_j) + \gamma_{05}(\text{Disadvantage}_j) + \gamma_{06}(\text{Black}_j) + \gamma_{01}(\text{Hispanic}_j) + \gamma_{08}(\text{Other}_j) + \gamma_{09}(\mathbf{mTU}_j^2) + \upsilon_{0j}$$

Results. Of the 24 possible daily quadratic effects tested in Question 3a, which examined associations between six daily indicators of technology use and four daily mental-health dimensions, only 5 were significant at $p < .05$, and 3 of these met the FDR-corrected significance level (for full results, see Table S1 in the Supplemental Material). Adolescents' daily technology use for creating content had a significant quadratic relation with daily depression (quadratic b = 0.08, SE = 0.02, $p < .01$). Figure 2a depicts this quadratic relation graphically by plotting the expected level of adolescents' daily depressive symptoms (y-axis) across the entire range of all 3,548 daily observations of daily technology use for creating content (x-axis) and reveals a shallow "u" shape. For the vast majority of observations—99% of daily observations fall within the gray shaded region—the association between technology use for creating content and daily depressive symptoms was weakly negative (days with relatively more technology use for creating content tended to be days with relatively fewer depressive symptoms). For instance, at 2 hr of technology use for creating content per day, an additional hour of use is associated with about a 1-point decrease in depressive symptoms ($b = -0.957$, SE = 0.338, p = .003). Only in the very far reaches of the distribution of daily technology use for creating content—less than the highest 1% of observations shown in the white region of the graph—did the association between daily technology use for creating content and depressive symptoms become positive, such that days with relatively more technology use tended to be days with relatively more depressive symptoms.



Fig. 2. Quadratic associations-time spent on technology creating content and daily depressive symptoms. (a) Within-person daily quadratic association of daily technology use creating content (*x*-axis) and expected depressive symptoms (*y*-axis). (b) Between-person average quadratic associations between technology use creating content (*x*-axis) and expected depressive symptoms (*y*-axis). Dashed lines represent the 95% confidence interval. The full ranges of reported hours of technology use creating content are depicted; gray shading reflects the 95th and 99th percentiles for technology use creating content.

Adolescents' daily technology use for creating content also had a significant quadratic relation with daily conduct problem symptoms (quadratic $b = -0.11$, $SE = 0.03$, $p < .01$), which took the form of a downward curving line (see the left panel of Fig. S1 in the Supplemental Material). For nearly all daily observations, there was no association between daily hours on technology creating content (shown by the nearly flat line in the shaded gray regions depicting 99% of observations), and only in the very farthest reaches of the distribution was technology use for creating content associated with lower expected odds of daily conduct problem symptoms. Adolescents' daily technology use for school work had a small but significant quadratic relation with daily symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity (quadratic $b = -0.01$, $SE < 0.01$, $p < .01$), which took the form of an inverted "U" (see Fig. S3 in the Supplemental Material). For most daily observations, more time spent on technology for school work was associated with more reported same-day symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity, but in the very farthest reaches of the daily distribution (> 1% of the daily observations), more time spent on technology for school work was associated with fewer symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity. Note that these three observed quadratic relations should be interpreted with extreme caution and may not be trustworthy given that these curvilinear associations are driven by observations in the tail of the distributions and are based on a tiny minority of daily observations.

Of the 24 possible person-level quadratic effects tested in Question 3b, only 4 were significant at $p < .05$ (for full results, see Table S1 in the Supplemental Material), and 3 reached the FDR-corrected significance cutoff. Specifically, average technology for creating content had similar quadratic associations with average depressive symptoms (quadratic $b = -2.00$, $SE = 0.47$, $p < .01$), average symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity (quadratic $b = -0.80$, $SE = 0.17$, $p < .01$), and average conduct problems (quadratic $b = -0.39$, $SE = 0.13$, $p < .01$). For instance, as seen

in Figure 2b, the association between average daily hours of technology use creating content and average daily depressive symptoms takes an inverted "u" shape. For the majority of the sample, as technology use for creating content increased, so too did depressive symptoms (individuals who reported more technology use on average also reported higher average depressive symptoms). For those individuals at the top end of the technology use spectrum, however (~5% of the sample in the light gray and white regions of the graph, falling above about 1.6 average hr/day), the association became negative (individuals who used more technology for creating content reported lower depressive symptoms).

The quadratic associations between average daily hours spent creating content and average daily conduct problems and average daily symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity took the same form (see Figs. S1 and S2 in the Supplemental Material); the majority of adolescents saw positive associations (those adolescents who spent more time on technology creating content tended to report more symptoms of conduct problems and inattention/hyperactivity), though for a subset of adolescents at the upper end of the technology use range, more time spent on technology creating content over the study period, was associated with fewer average externalizing problems. Again, we urge caution in interpreting these quadratic relations because they are based on a small subset of individuals in the sample. Note that there was little consistency between the daily and person-level quadratic associations observed. For instance, the daily and person-level associations between depicted in Figure 2 (between the time adolescents spend on technology creating content and depressive symptoms) differ in sign, whereas those in Figure S1 (between the time adolescents spend on technology creating content and conduct problems) share the same sign but very different magnitudes. This lack of consistency between the daily and person levels highlights the importance of testing the ecological fallacy and not overgeneralizing person-level associations to the within-person processes.

Question 4

Analyses. Lastly, we explored whether adolescents with existing mental-health vulnerabilities exhibit stronger associations between their technology usage and mental-health symptoms at the daily (Question 4a: Are adolescents with preexisting mental-health vulnerabilities more likely to experience a negative coupling between daily technology usage and daily mental-health symptoms compared with their peers?) and between-person level (Question 4b: Do adolescents with preexisting mental-health vulnerabilities exhibit stronger associations between digital technology usage and mental-health symptoms compared with their peers?). Interaction terms were computed between all six indicators of technology use (texts sent, technology for school work, technology for communication, technology for entertainment, technology for creating content, and total screen time) and select indicators of mental-health risk: age (younger adolescents may be more susceptible to technology effects), economic disadvantage, gender (females at risk for internalizing and males at risk for externalizing), and T1 levels of mental-health symptoms (psychological distress for worry and depression, T1 conduct problems for conduct problems, and T1 effortful control for inattention/hyperactivity). This method allowed for separate tests of whether adolescents traditionally deemed to be at higher risk for negative effects of digital technology (e.g., females, those from low-socioeconomic-status households) exhibit stronger daily linkages (a cross-level interaction tested within-person, β_3) and whether

adolescents at high risk experience stronger relations between average technology use and mental-health symptoms (a between-person interaction, γ_{10}).

Level 1: $\text{Mental Health}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1(\text{dTU}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{dSchoolDay}_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\beta}_3(\mathbf{dTU}_{\boldsymbol{ij}} \times \mathbf{Risk}_{\boldsymbol{j}}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$

Level 2: $$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{mTU}_j) + \gamma_{02}(\text{mSchoolDay}_j) + \gamma_{03}(\text{Age}_j) + \gamma_{04}(\text{ender}_j) + \gamma_{05}(\text{Disadvantage}_j) + \gamma_{06}(\text{Black}_j) + \gamma_{01}(\text{Hispanic}_j) + \gamma_{08}(\text{Other}_j) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{09}(\mathbf{Risk}_{\boldsymbol{j}}) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{10}(\mathbf{dTU}_{\boldsymbol{ij}} \times \mathbf{Risk}_{\boldsymbol{j}}) + \upsilon_{0j}$$

We report all 192 potential daily and person-level interactions tested in the interest of full disclosure and to avoid selective reporting.

Results. Of the 96 potential daily linear interactions tested in Question 4a (high risk moderation of Question 2a), examining effects of six daily technology use variables on four outcomes as moderated by four indicators of risk (age, economic disadvantage, gender, and T1 risk), only 10 met a significance cutoff of $p \leq .05$, and all were reduced to nonsignificance when FDR-corrected to account for multiple comparisons (for full results, see Tables S3−S6 in the Supplemental Material).

Of the 96 potential person-level linear interactions tested in Question 4b (high risk moderation of Question 2b; Tables S3−S6 in the Supplemental Material), 13 met a significance cutoff of $p \leq .05$. Of those, only 2 met the FDR-corrected cutoff for significance accounting for multiple comparisons. Age moderated the person-level association between technology use for entertainment and conduct problems: At younger ages, more technology use for entertainment was associated with a higher average likelihood of endorsing a conduct problem (e.g., age 12 $b = 0.35$, $SE = 0.09$, $OR = 1.42$, $p < .01$), whereas at older ages, technology use for entertainment was associated with less likelihood of conduct problem endorsement (e.g., age 15 $b = -0.31$, $SE = 0.16$, $OR = 0.73$, $p = .05$). The person-level association between technology use for entertainment and conduct problems was also moderated by T1 mental-health risk (those in the upper quartile for T1 conduct problems were classified as being at highest risk). Although those adolescents in the T1 risk group were more likely to endorse conduct problems on average, they did not see a significant association between their average time spent on technology for entertainment and their average conduct problems ($b = -0.08$, $SE = 0.19$, $OR = .92$, $p = .68$). In contrast, among those adolescents not classified as being at T1 risk, more technology use for entertainment was associated with a higher average likelihood of endorsing a conduct problem ($b = 0.21$, $SE = .10$, OR = 1.23, $p = .04$).

Discussion

Scientist, parents, and the public are clamoring to know if adolescents' mental-health is somehow harmed by their frequent technology use. Much of the literature on this question to date has been cross-sectional in nature (prohibiting causal inference), and the few existing experimental, longitudinal, and preregistered studies have largely yielded mixed results with small effect sizes. The present study used in-the-moment EMA surveys on adolescents' phones to measure the daily co-occurrence of technology use and mental-health symptoms. Across four specific study questions, the resounding conclusion was that there is little evidence of

longitudinal or daily associations between technology and mental-health symptoms; technology use did not predict later mental-health symptoms, and only 3 of the 144 potential daily associations tested were significant.

Adolescents' baseline technology use did not predict later mental-health symptoms over and above baseline mental-health risk. This finding is consistent with a number of other longitudinal studies that have failed to replicate cross-sectional associations between digital technology use and mental health (Nesi, Miller, & Prinstein, 2017; Nesi & Prinstein, 2015; Ohannessian, 2009; Selfhout et al., 2009). It may be that today, when frequent technology use is the norm among most adolescents, these previously reported cross-sectional associations have dissipated over time.

Adolescents exhibited no significant daily linkages between any of the six indicators of technology use and the four domains of mental-health symptoms. Even in sensitivity analyses with increased power at the daily level, only one significant daily effect emerged, and it was contrary to the hypothesized direction: Adolescents' daily time spent on technology for entertainment was associated with less same-day worry. This lack of same-day co-occurrence of mental-health symptoms with any type of technology use is in line with other EMA studies that failed to find associations between online interactions and social networking site use with negative affect and depression (Jelenchick et al., 2013; Oh et al., 2014) but in contrast to one study that showed associations between quantity of Facebook use and worsened affect among adults (Kross et al., 2013) and some of our own team's work among high-risk adolescents (with existing behavioral and attentional problems) that evidenced small same-day associations between technology use and symptoms of externalizing problems (ADHD and conduct disorder; George et al., 2018).

Only two significant associations emerged at the person-level using the EMA data, and neither was prototypical of hypothesized technology-poorer mental-health associations. First, adolescents who reported sending more text messages on average reported lower average depression symptoms. Second, adolescents who spent more time on technology for school work on average reported more frequent symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity. We observed similar associations between technology use for school and higher average conduct problems and depression (which met traditional cutoffs of $p < .05$ for statistical significance but not FDR-corrected cutoffs accounting for multiple comparisons but did meet FDR-corrected significance levels in sensitivity analyses with more statistical power). We would hope that time spent on technology for school work would impart the most benefits for adolescents though should not be surprised that those adolescents with the most difficulty sustaining attention and exerting self-control (and perhaps those who struggle with depression or conduct problems) would spend more time toiling on computerized homework assignments. Likewise, the finding that frequent texters are the least depressed is consistent with the extant literatures on social connections both online and face to face (Seabrook et al., 2016; Seeman, 1996) as well as our past finding that daily text messaging was associated with less daily depression symptoms given adolescents reported lower levels of depression on days when they were most connected to others online via text messaging (George et al., 2018).

Recent research has suggested that the lack of clarity in the literature may be due at least in part to the presence of nonlinear associations between technology and mental health, such that ill effects are not seen for most use but that extreme users may see small decrements in mental health (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2017). There was very little support for this goldilocks hypothesis in the present study. We explored 24 possible daily and 24 possible person-level quadratic effects, with 3 daily associations and 3 person-level associations evidencing nonlinear associations. The most consistent finding was that the average time spent by adolescents using technology for creating content was curvilinearly associated with average depressive symptoms, conduct problems, and symptoms of inattention/hyperactivity such that for the majority of the sample, more time spent on technology creating content was associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms and externalizing symptoms, but for the heaviest users of technology for creating content, more time spent on technology for this purpose was associated with fewer depressive and externalizing symptoms. It is noteworthy that this pattern is in the direction opposite that usually put forth about the goldilocks hypothesis (that the highest users will be at the greatest risk).

Here, instead, we see that those adolescents who spend the most time on technology creating their own content may instead be enjoying better mental health. We did not see consistent evidence of a goldilocks effect for daily technology use: The three quadratic associations that emerged were of varying signs and magnitudes and seemed to be driven by daily observations in the very farthest reaches (< 1%) of the distribution. Nonetheless, these results, in which associations between and within adolescents differ not only in their magnitude but also in their signs, serve as a reminder of an old and cardinal rule of interpreting aggregate (between-person) associations and attempting to generalize them to the individual—the ecological fallacy (Molenaar, 2004). Indeed, the lack of group-to-individual generalizability of psychological sciences in general and in the effects of technology and mental health in particular means that we should not expect the associations generated from large-scale cross-sectional surveys of adolescents' digital technology use and mental health to generalize to associations within an adolescent over time (Fisher et al., 2018; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009).

Finally, we found little evidence that adolescents' technology-mental health associations were moderated by preexisting vulnerability for technology-related problems or psychopathology as measured by age, gender, economic disadvantage, and T1 mental-health risks. This is somewhat surprising given expectations that offline risk may exacerbate or increase online problems but may also reflect the fact that the measures used in this study captured different types of screen time rather than more nuanced measures of content and type of digital technology usage.

Conclusions

In our longitudinal study of adolescents followed intensively over time on their mobile devices, we found little evidence to support a linkage, correlational or causal, between adolescents' digital technology usage and mental-health symptoms. These findings stand in stark contrast with the popular narrative that smartphones are destroying young peoples' lives and leading to increased mental-health problems. Our study's conclusions are strengthened by recent data collection, use of in-the-moment EMA assessment of multiple domains of technology use and mental health, our sample (diverse on multiple indicators of risk) drawn from a population

representative sampling frame of those enrolled in public schools, the inclusion of daily and person-level control variables to account for potential confounding, and our transparency around the presentation of null findings, which revealed few significant associations across hundreds of planned and exploratory models.

Despite these strengths, the study has a number of limitations that should be noted. First, although the assessment of daily linkages provides a higher resolution than what is typically captured in this field and allows for an estimation of the co-occurrence of technology use and mental-health symptoms, the daily reporting does not provide a means of identifying which of the two comes first within a day. Given the lack of same-day associations in general, the inability of establishing ordering of effects was less relevant. Second, we sampled mostly young adolescents to midadolescents (full age range = 10–17 years; 94% of the T2 EMA sample fell between the ages of 12 and 15), which may mask unique processes in early adolescence, for example, and does not allow us to speak to associations among older adolescents. This focus on early adolescence to midadolescence is important given that much of parent concern and policy-relevant focus on smartphone use focuses on early adolescence (e.g., the Wait Until 8th initiative; Thayer, 2017). Although there was little evidence of moderation by age in this sample, future research is required to test for associations across the entire adolescent range (now defined as between the ages of 10 and 24 years; see Sawyer, Azzopardi, Wickremarathne, & Patton, 2018). Third, although we did use internal procedures for prespecifying our primary study questions and hypotheses, we did not formally preregister the present study. We recognize that there are many design decisions that can shape final study results (Orben & Przybylski, 2019) and that preregistration serves to protect against potential bias and selective reporting. To mitigate this limitation, we have transparently presented all the results of the dozens of models estimated and have made available study materials to facilitate replication.

Finally, although technology usage and mental-health symptoms were captured daily and through a method that is known to reduce bias in reporting, both measures came from a single informant via self-report on relatively few items (which was necessary to reduce participant burden in completing multiple surveys each day). Our sample of young adolescents reported spending relatively less time on technology (4.18 hr of average daily total screen time) than other recent estimates, including Rideout (2016), who reported that teens (ages 13–18 years) retrospectively reported spending 6.67 hr and tweens (ages 8–12 years) reported spending 4.6 hr/day on screen media for non-school purposes. It is difficult to know if this difference is attributable to a difference in data collection method (daily reporting or a single survey), the younger age of our sample, or real differences in levels of technology usage between our North Carolina population representative sample and the nationally representative adolescents surveyed in this study. Although our measures of daily technology use facilitate understanding the purpose of time spent on technology (and are thus not influenced by shifting fads in platforms), this method of measurement disallows an analysis of associations with specific types of technology use (i.e., gaming or social-media use); future research is required to assess associations with more fine-grained assessments of social-media use specifically and should incorporate more objective measures of digital technology usage (i.e., device logs or sensor-based measures) and mental health (i.e., informant rated or analyses of online digital archives such as Twitter and text-messaging content).

Considerable time and energy have been dedicated recently to understanding the role that digital technologies may play in adolescents' mental health. These results, and those of many other studies cited here, suggest that we need to move beyond a focus on adolescents' quantity or frequency of technology use and toward a more comprehensive approach to establishing best practices for educating, parenting, and supporting young people growing up in the digital age. Young people are unlikely to stop using digital technologies, and in many ways, these results suggest that, with respect to mental-health outcomes, perhaps they do not need to. Limited research monies and resources could instead be directed toward better understanding how modern technologies may affect other dimensions of well-being (i.e., sleep) or how they can be leveraged to better assess young peoples' experiences (i.e., EMA, objective assessment of social interactions) or support adolescents' health and behavior (i.e., e-health or gamified interventions).

Action Editor
Kelly L. Klump served as action editor for this article.

Author Contributions
M. Jensen developed the study concept, performed the data analysis, interpreted the results, and drafted the manuscript. C. Odgers designed and was responsible for the overarching study and data collection. M. J. George, M. R. Russell, and C. L. Odgers provided critical revisions. M. R. Russell provided consultation on data analysis. All of the authors contributed to the study design and approved the final manuscript for submission.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests
The author(s) declared that there were no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or the publication of this article.

Funding
The study was supported by *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Grant T32-HD07376 (to M. Jensen), National Institute on Drug Abuse Grant P30-DA023026 (to the Center for the Study of Adolescent Risk and Resilience), the Jacobs Foundation, and the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

Supplemental Material
Additional supporting information can be found at http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/suppl/10.1177/2167702619859336

References

Andreassen, C. S., Billieux, J., Griffiths, M. D., Kuss, D. J., Demetrovics, Z., Mazzoni, E., Pallesen, S. (2016). The relationship between addictive use of social media and video games and symptoms of psychiatric disorders: A large-scale cross-sectional study. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 30, 252–262. doi:10.1037/adb0000160

Augner, C., Hacker, G. W. (2012). Associations between problematic mobile phone use and psychological parameters in young adults. International Journal of Public Health, 57, 437–441. doi:10.1007/s00038-011-0234-z

Baker, D. A., Algorta, G. P. (2016). The relationship between online social networking and depression: A systematic review of quantitative studies. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 19, 638–648. doi:10.1089/cyber.2016.0206

Bell, V., Bishop, D. V, Przybylski, A. K. (2015). The debate over digital technology and young people. The BMJ, 351, h3064–h3064.

Benjamini, Y., Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Methodological, 57, 289–300. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346101

Best, P., Manktelow, R., Taylor, B. (2014). Online communication, social media and adolescent wellbeing: A systematic narrative review. Children and Youth Services Review, 41, 27–36. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.001

Campbell, A. J., Cumming, S. R., Hughes, I. (2006). Internet use by the socially fearful: Addiction or therapy? CyberPsychology & Behavior, 9, 69–81.

Clark, J. L., Algoe, S. B., Green, M. C. (2018). Social network sites and well-being: The role of social connection. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27, 32–37.

Deters, F. G., Mehl, M. R. (2013). Does posting Facebook status updates increase or decrease loneliness? An online social networking experiment. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4, 579–586.

Dolev-Cohen, M., Barak, A. (2013). Adolescents' use of Instant Messaging as a means of emotional relief. Computers in Human Behavior, 29, 58–63. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.016

Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., Spinrad, T. L., Liew, J., Zhou, Q., Losoya, S. H., . . . Cumberland, A. (2009). Longitudinal relations of children's effortful control, impulsivity, and negative emotionality to their externalizing, internalizing, and co-occurring behavior problems. Developmental Psychology, 45, 988–1008. doi:10.1037/a0016213

Ellis, D. A., Davidson, B. I., Shaw, H., Geyer, K. (2019). Do smartphone usage scales predict behavior? International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 130, 86–92.

Ellis, L. K., Rothbart, M. K. (2001, April). Revision of the early adolescent temperament questionnaire. Poster presented at the 2001 Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, MN.

Fisher, A. J., Medaglia, J. D., Jeronimus, B. F. (2018). Lack of group-to-individual generalizability is a threat to human subjects research. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 115, E6106–E6115. doi:10.1073/pnas.1711978115

Furukawa, T. A., Kessler, R. C., Slade, T., Andrews, G. (2003). The performance of the K6 and K10 screening scales for psychological distress in the Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being. Psychological Medicine, 33, 357–362. doi: 10.1017/S003329170200670

George, M. J., Russell, M. A., Piontak, J. R., Odgers, C. L. (2018). Concurrent and subsequent associations between daily digital technology use and high-risk adolescents' mental health symptoms. Child Development, 89, 78–88. doi:10.1111/cdev.12819

Green, J. G., Gruber, M. J., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A. M., Kessler, R. C. (2010). Improving the K6 short scale to predict serious emotional disturbance in adolescents in the USA. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 19(S1), 23–35. doi:10.1002/mpr.314

Gross, E. F. (2009). Logging on, bouncing back: An experimental investigation of online communication following social exclusion. Developmental Psychology, 45, 1787–1793.

Guernsey, L. (2014). Garbled in translation: Getting media research to the press and public. Journal of Children and Media, 8, 87–94. doi:10.1080/17482798.2014.863486

Hoffman, L., Stawski, R. S. (2009). Persons as contexts: Evaluating between-person and within-person effects in longitudinal analysis. Research in Human Development, 6, 97–120.

Huang, C. (2017). Time spent on social network sites and psychological well-being: A meta-analysis. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 20, 346–354. doi:10.1089/cyber.2016.0758

Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P., . . . Robinson, L. (2008). Living and learning with new media: Summary of findings from the digital youth project. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Jelenchick, L. A., Eickhoff, J. C., Moreno, M. A. (2013). Facebook depression? Social networking site use and depression in older adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Health, 52, 128–130. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.05.008

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. Journal of Social Issues, 58, 49–74.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? American Psychologist, 53, 1017–1031. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017

Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D. S., Lin, N., . . . Ybarro, O. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. PLOS ONE, 8(8), Article e69841. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0069841

Laurent, J., Catanzaro, S. J., Joiner, T. E., Rudolph, K. D., Potter, K. I., Lambert, S., . . . Gathright, T. (1999). A measure of positive and negative affect for children: Scale development and preliminary validation. Psychological Assessment, 11, 326–338. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.11.3.326

Lenhart, A., Ling, R., Campbell, S., Purcell, K. (2010). Teens and mobile phones. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from https://www.pewinternet.org/2010/04/20/teens-and-mobile-phones/

Marino, C., Gini, G., Vieno, A., Spada, M. M. (2018). The associations between problematic Facebook use, psychological distress and well-being among adolescents and young adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Affective Disorders, 226, 274–281. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.10.007

Martel, M. M., Nigg, J. T. (2006). Child ADHD and personality/temperament traits of reactive and effortful control, resiliency, and emotionality. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47, 1175–1183.

McDonald, J. H. (2015). Handbook of biological statistics (3rd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Sparky House Publishing.

Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 26(1S), 48–61. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2003.09.015

Mojtabai, R., Olfson, M., Han, B. (2016). National trends in the prevalence and treatment of depression in adolescents and young adults. Pediatrics, 138(6), Article e20161878. doi:10.1542/peds.2016-1878

Molenaar, P. C. M. (2004). A manifesto on psychology as idiographic science: Bringing the person back into scientific psychology, this time forever. Measurement, 2, 201–218.

Molenaar, P. C. M., Campbell, C. G. (2009). The new person-specific paradigm in psychology. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18, 112–117.

Morrison, C., Morrison, C. M., Gore, H. (2017). The relationship between excessive Internet use and depression: A questionnaire-based study of 1,319 young people and adults. Psychopathology, 43, 121–126. doi:10.1159/000277001

Muthén, L. K., Muthén, B. O. (2018). Mplus user's guide (8th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Author.

Nesi, J., Miller, A. B., Prinstein, M. J. (2017). Adolescents' depressive symptoms and subsequent technology-based interpersonal behaviors: A multi-wave study. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 51, 12–19. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2017.02.002

Nesi, J., Prinstein, M. J. (2015). Using social media for social comparison and feedback-seeking: Gender and popularity moderate associations with depressive symptoms. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 43, 1427–1438. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-0020-0

Odgers, C. L. (2018). Smartphones are bad for some teens, not all. Nature, 554, 432–434.

Oh, H. J., Ozkaya, E., Larose, R. (2014). How does online social networking enhance life satisfaction? The relationships among online supportive interaction, affect, perceived social support, sense of community, and life satisfaction. Computers in Human Behavior, 30, 69–78. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.053

Ohannessian, C. M. (2009). Media use and adolescent psychological adjustment: An examination of gender differences. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 18, 582–593. doi:10.1007/s10826-009-9261-2

Orben, A., Przybylski, A. K. (2019). The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. Nature Human Behaviour, 3, 173–182. doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0506-1

Przybylski, A. K., Weinstein, N. (2017). A large-scale test of the Goldilocks Hypothesis: Quantifying the relations between digital-screen use and the mental well-being of adolescents. Psychological Science, 28, 204–215.

Rideout, V. (2016). Measuring time spent with media: The Common Sense census of media use by US 8- to 18-year-olds. Journal of Children and Media, 10, 138–144. doi:10.1080/17482798.2016.1129808

Rideout, V., Robb, M. B. (2018). Social media, social life: Teens reveal their experiences. San Francisco, CA: Common Sense Media.

Rosenstein, B., Sheehan, A. (2018). Open letter from JANA Partners and CALSTRS to Apple Inc. Retrieved from https://cshmsfaculty.wordpress.com/2018/01/15/open-letter-from-jana-partners-and-calstrs-to-apple-inc/

Sawyer, S. M., Azzopardi, P. S., Wickremarathne, D., Patton, G. C. (2018). The age of adolescence. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 2, 223–228.

Scott, D. A., Valley, B., Simecka, B. A. (2017). Mental health concerns in the digital age. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 15, 604–613. doi:10.1007/s11469-016-9684-0

Seabrook, E. M., Kern, M. L., Rickard, N. S. (2016). Social networking sites, depression, and anxiety: A systematic review. JMIR Mental Health, 3(4), Article e50. doi:10.2196/mental.5842

Seeman, T. E. (1996). Social ties and health: The benefits of social integration. Annals of Epidemiology, 6, 442–451.

Selfhout, M. H. W., Branje, S. J. T., Delsing, M., ter Bogt, T. F. M., Meeus, W. H. J. (2009). Different types of Internet use, depression, and social anxiety: The role of perceived friendship quality. Journal of Adolescence, 32, 819–833. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.10.011

Shapira, N. A., Lessig, M. C., Goldsmith, T. D., Szabo, S. T., Lazoritz, M., Gold, M. S., Stein, D. J. (2003). Problematic internet use: Proposed classification and diagnostic criteria. Depression and Anxiety, 17, 207–216. doi:10.1002/da.10094

Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 4, 1–32. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091415

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. Journal of Personality, 72, 271–324. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

Thayer, K. (2017, August 24). What age is too young for a smartphone? “Wait Until 8th” pledge asks parents to delay tech for kids. Chicago Tribune. Retrieved from www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-cellphones-wait-until-8th-grade-smartphones-met-20170823-story.html

Tromholt, M. (2016). The Facebook experiment: Quitting facebook leads to higher levels of well-being. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 19, 661–666. doi:10.1089/cyber.2016.0259

Twenge, J. M. (2017, September). Have smartphones destroyed a generation? The Atlantic. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/09/has-the-smartphone-destroyed-a-generation/534198

Valkenburg, P. M., Peter, J. (2007). Internet communication and its relation to well-being: Identifying some underlying mechanisms. Media Psychology, 9, 43–58.

Verduyn, P., Lee, D. S., Park, J., Shablack, H., Orvell, A., Bayer, J., . . . Kross, E. (2015). Passive Facebook usage undermines affective well-being: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144, 480–488.

Whalen, C. K., Odgers, C. L., Reed, P. L., Henker, B. (2011). Dissecting daily distress in mothers of children with ADHD: An electronic diary study. Journal of Family Psychology, 25, 402–411. doi:10.1037/a0023473