

**Should smartphones be banned for children or does cyberpsychology have a bigger problem?**

Running title: Are smartphones the real problem?

*David A. Ellis<sup>1</sup>*

*Brittany I. Davidson<sup>2</sup>*

*Linda K. Kaye<sup>3</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, UK*

*<sup>2</sup>School of Management, University of Bath, UK*

*<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychology, Edge Hill University, UK*

Keywords: smartphones, addiction, public health, science communication

David A. Ellis (corresponding author)

Lancaster University

Bailrigg

Lancaster

Lancashire

LA1 4YF

email: d.a.ellis@lancaster.ac.uk

telephone: +44 (0) 1524 593207

"Should smartphones be banned for children?" appeared in April's edition of *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, where Wiederhold suggested that "excessive smartphone use can lead to a myriad of potential problems" (Wiederhold, 2019, p2) [1]. Like Wiederhold, we agree that this issue warrants discussion, particularly in light of recent government enquiries in the UK [2]. However, we were surprised to notice that, unlike other editorials [e.g., 3], it relies on media articles at the expense of empirical research.

In less a deliberate sense, this commentary reveals some serious concerns for cyberpsychology as a whole. Specifically, the field often attempts to pathologize everyday behaviors to the point where the majority of the population can be classified as presenting 'problematic' or 'addictive' tendencies [4]. This overlooks large and statistically robust studies, which suggest that the impact of technology use on well-being has been vastly overstated [5]. Methodological shortcomings are similarly glossed over as a limitation, rather than a fundamental stumbling block. For example, the assessment of technology use via self-report does not align well with objective behaviour and technology 'addiction' scales continue to be developed without subsequent validation [6]. To exemplify this point, another recent editorial in *Neurological Sciences* claims great progress in the area of problematic smartphone use. However, after acknowledging measurement limitations, the portrayal of a successful field becomes less convincing [7]. If existing knowledge is built on very weak foundations - an outsider would quickly conclude that our current understanding is poor and start afresh.

The harsh reality is that unsubstantiated claims about the impact of technology use on people and society continue to be repeated, irrespective of new evidence suggesting the contrary. This almost appears as a form of selective exposure where people will avoid information that would create cognitive dissonance because it is incompatible with current beliefs [8]. Some prominent voices have even suggested that the public should not believe scientists who disagree with them [9]. This undermines scientific progress and betrays public trust.

Editors and editorials can shape the discourse and direction of their respective fields, which we believe does happen within the pages of *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*. However, improvements concerning transparency are urgently required and the community should give serious consideration to pre-registration, the sharing of data and engaging constructively with debate post-publication. Journals could also respond by building on facilities made popular by other publishers (e.g., *PLOS*), where readers can freely comment on published papers.

In summary, Wiederhold's recent editorial highlights a very real challenge for Cyberpsychologists and other organizations who represent psychological science. Debates concerning the impact of technology on psychology are not new and smartphones will eventually evolve or be replaced. How the field engages with some harsh truths is vital in order to remain relevant [6]. We must ensure that key societal issues - such as the effects of smartphones on children, and individuals of all ages - continue to encourage the spirited exchange of ideas and enthusiastic debate. Discussion is the way forward, not cherry-picking or stonewalling.

## **Acknowledgements**

No competing financial interests exist.

## **References**

[1] Wiederhold BK. Should Smartphone use be banned for children. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 2019; 22:1-2

[2] UK Parliament. Science and Technology Committee: Impact of social media and screen-use on young people's health inquiry <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/science-and-technology-committee/inquiries/parliament-2017/impact-of-social-media-young-people-17-19/>. (accessed April. 14, 2019).

[3] Wiederhold BK. Behavioral health apps abundant, but evidence-based research nearly nonexistent. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 2015; 18:309-310.

[4] Panova T, Carbonell X. Is smartphone addiction really an addiction? *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 2018; 7:252-259

[5] Orben A, Przybylski A. The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2019; 3:173-182

[6] Ellis DA. Are smartphones really that bad? Improving the psychological measurement of technology-related behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2019; 97:60-66

[7] Elhai JD, Levine JC, Hall BJ. Problematic smartphone use and mental health problems: current state of research and future directions. *Neurological Sciences* 2019; 32:1-3.

[8] Jeong M, Zo H, Lee CH, et al. Feeling displeasure from online social media postings: A study using cognitive dissonance theory. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2019; 97:231-240.

[9] Twenge JM. Stop Debating Whether Too Much Smartphone Time Can Hurt Teens, and Start Protecting Them. <http://time.com/5555737/smartphone-mental-health-teens/> (accessed April. 14, 2019).