

**The rights of very young children in the digital environment of the family home:
findings from a UK survey of children 0-36 months and their parents.**

Details of authors

Karen Winter, Professor of Children's Social Care (**lead author**)

School of social sciences, education and social work

Queen's University Belfast

6 College Park,

Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT7 1PS.

Email: k.winter@qub.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1229-7150>

Rosie Flewitt, Professor of Early Childhood Communication (co-author)

Education and Social Research Institute (ESRI)

Birley Fields Campus, 53 Bonsall Street

Manchester Metropolitan University

Manchester, M15 6BX.

Email r.flewitt@mmu.ac.uk

Orcid [0000-0003-1986-0644](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1986-0644)

Sandra El Gemayel, Dr and research associate (co-author)

Education and Social Research Institute

Manchester Metropolitan University

Brooks Building, Birley Fields Campus

53 Bonsall Street

Manchester, M15 6GX.

Email s.el.gemayel@mmu.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4024-0415>

Lisa Bunting, Professor of social work (co-author)

School of social sciences, education and social work

Queen's University Belfast

Room 01.017, 6, College Park,

Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT7 1PS.

Email: l.bunting@qub.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1857-0074>

Lorna Arnott, Reader in Education (co-author)

Institute of Education, University of Strathclyde,

Level 5, Lord Hope Building, 141 St James Road,

Glasgow, Scotland, G4 0LT

Email: lorna.arnott@strath.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0304-778X>

Paul Connolly, Professor, PVC and Executive Dean (co-author),

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences,

Ulster University, York Street,

Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT15 1AP

Email: p.connolly@ulster.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9176-9592>

Andrew Dalziell, Dr and research associate (co-author)
School of Psychological Sciences and Health
University of Strathclyde
50 George Street
Glasgow, Scotland, G1 1QE.
Email: andrew.dalziell@strath.ac.uk

Julia Gillen, Professor of Literacy Studies (co-author)
Department of Linguistics and English Language
Lancaster University,
Office: C010, C - Floor, County South
Lancaster,
LA1 4YL
Email: j.gillen@lancaster.ac.uk
Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2356-3423>

Janet Goodall, Professor of Education (co-author)
Office - 417
Fourth Floor
Keir Hardie Building
Singleton Campus
School of Social Sciences
Swansea University, SA2 8PP, Wales
Email: j.s.goodall@swansea.ac.uk and Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0172-2035>

Min-Chen Liu, Dr and research associate (co-author)
School of social sciences, education and social work
Queen's University Belfast
Room 01.017
6, College Park,
Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT7 1PS.
Email: mliu09@qub.ac.uk

Katrina McLaughlin, Dr (co-author)
School of Psychology
Queen's University Belfast
David Keir Building
18-30 Malone Road
Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT9 5BN.
Email: k.mclaughlin@qub.ac.uk

Sabina Savadova, Dr (co-author)
Teaching Fellow in Childhood Studies and Practice
Holyrood Road,
Moray House School of Education and Sport
1.14 St John's Land
Edinburgh
EH8 8AQ
Email: Sabina.Savadova@ed.ac.uk

Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5254-5921>

Sarah Timmins, Dr and research associate (co-author)
Department for Education and Childhood Studies,
Swansea University,
Singleton Campus,
Swansea
SA2 8PP,
Wales
Email: s.e.timmins@swansea.ac.uk
Orcid <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7178-0011>

Abstract (227 words)

As digital technologies have become increasingly embedded in daily family life, there has been a growing international concern about children's protection, provision and participation rights in a digital environment. Recognising this, the Committee on the Rights of the Child published General Comment No. 25 *Children's Rights in Relation to the Digital Environment* (CRC, 2021), giving detailed advice on implementation issues in this area and calling for up-to-date research about children's digital lives. This paper makes a significant contribution to that much-needed knowledge base by reporting the findings of an online survey conducted with parents and legal guardians (n=1,444) (hereafter parents) of children aged 0-36 months across socially and ethnically diverse families in the four UK nations. The survey represented Phase One of a larger three-phase project, 'Toddlers, Tech and Talk', funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, which aimed to build an empirically robust body of knowledge about how 0-3-year-olds' lives intersect with digital technologies at home in socially and ethnically diverse families in inner-city, urban and rural communities. The survey found that nearly all family homes have Wi-Fi connection, that many homes have a wide range of digital devices, and that very young children engage in a wide range of digital activities both with their parents and on their own. Parents' mediation practices are shaped by parental digital practices and attitudes, with concomitant implications for children's digital rights. Implications are highlighted.

Keywords: 0-3 years old children; digital technology; family home; children's rights; (*project name*).

Introduction

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (UN, 1989), an international human rights treaty, was adopted by the UK in 1991. It contains 54 articles which outline the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights to which all children regardless of their age, gender and other characteristics are entitled. It is accompanied by General Comments, published by the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which give detailed advice on implementation. To date, there are 26 General Comments. General Comment No. 25 (CRC, 2021) focuses on children's rights in the digital environment. This is a pivotal document in a fast-changing society, and the challenges posed in its implementation are significant (Green et al., 2024).

With regard to these challenges, national and international research shows that more and more children are born into homes where digital technologies feature prominently in their families' everyday lives (Marsh et al., 2020; Chaudron et al., 2018) and they engage in diverse digitally mediated activities, such as watching TV programmes online, reading digital books, playing with digital toys and games, finding information online and interacting with distant family and friends via social media platforms (Arnott et al., 2019; Griffith and Arnold 2019; Zhao and Flewitt, 2020; McAuthur et al., 2022). These everyday digital practices offer rich opportunities to promote young children's social, cultural, educational and developmental rights (children's participation rights) yet also raise concerns about the longer-term impacts of inequality of access (children's provision rights) and about the potential harms to child development and wellbeing associated with 'digital exposure' (children's protection rights). They also draw attention to the pivotal role played by parents in facilitating and balancing the interplay of their children's participation, protection and provision rights through their mediation practices which frame children's access to and engagement with the digital environment (Goodall et al., forthcoming; Livingstone and Third, 2017; Livingstone and Blum-Ross, 2020).

Informed in its inception by the work of Livingstone and colleagues (Livingstone et al., 2024) General Comment No. 25 is pivotal. Firstly, it defines the term digital technology noting that this 'covers a vast array of types and usages encompassing information and communications technologies, including digital networks, content, services and applications, connected devices and environments, virtual and augmented reality, artificial intelligence, robotics, automated systems, algorithms and data analytics, biometrics and implant technology' (CRC, 2021, para 3, p.1. Secondly, it highlights the societal implications of the expansion of digital technology noting that 'there is a growing reliance on its various forms for social, educational, cultural,

work related, political and economic reasons’, (CRC, 2021, para 2, p. 1). Thirdly, it highlights both the potential benefits and harms of digital technology, noting the challenges in balancing and responding appropriately to the interplay and interdependent relationship between children’s rights to digital provision, participation and protection. Finally, it stresses the need for detailed research to inform both our understanding of children’s rights in the digital environment and the development of implementation plans.

Within this context, this article aims to inform developments in policy and practice by presenting and discussing findings of a UK-wide survey about digital technology ownership and use in the family homes of our youngest children, aged 0-36 months. The paper opens with a brief overview of research in this field regarding children’s rights to provision, participation and protection as defined in the UNCRC.

Research regarding very young children and digital technology

Provision rights - very young children’s access to and ownership of digital technology

A fundamental focus of the UNCRC is children’s equitable access to services, goods and the benefits they afford. Indeed, General Comment No. 25 (CRC, 2021, para 4, p.1) notes that for all children ‘if digital inclusion is not achieved, existing inequalities are likely to increase, and new ones may arise’. Existing survey-based research that focuses on children aged 0-3 years and digital technology in family homes reveals that while there is widespread global access to and ownership of digital technology by young children, there are notable variations across and within countries, cultures and different demographic groups (Azevedo et al., 2022; Alroqi et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2022; Dardanou et al., 2020; Bellagamba et al., 2021). Some studies have found associations between different sociodemographic variables and children’s use of digital technology including child age, household income, maternal educational level, maternal age and maternal well-being (Przybylski and Weinstein, 2019; Shin et al., 2021; Krogh et al., 2021).

Participation rights - use of digital technology by very young children and parents

With regards to very young children and their participation rights, the focus in the UNCRC is the promotion of children’s rights to exercise their own evolving agentic capacity and competences in using digital technology whilst also safeguarding their best interests and protection. General Comment No. 25 (CRC, 2021, para 20, p. 4) states that account must be taken of ‘the changing position of children and their agency in the modern world, children’s

competence and understanding, which develop unevenly across areas of skill and activity, and the diverse nature of the risks involved. Those considerations must be balanced with the importance of exercising their rights in supported environments and the range of individual experiences and circumstances'. Research consistently indicates that very young children own and use digital technology. For example, Azevedo et al. (2022), in a survey of 435 Brazilian mothers of infants aged 0-36 months, noted that 92% of infants were first introduced to digital media before the age of one year. Drawing on data from 630 children aged 12 months in the KUNO Kids birth cohort study, Bavaria, Durham et al. (2021) found that 45% of children had used digital media by their first birthday (TV and Smartphones being the most frequent first device exposed to). Importantly, as explored further below, very young children's participation rights cannot be considered in isolation from their protection rights. There are significant concerns regarding young children's exposure to digital technology, in particular screentime (Veldman et al., 2023) and there are guidelines that state that exposure to screentime should be avoided before the age of two years (WHO, 2019). There are also significant concerns regarding the protection of children's privacy rights and their protection from bullying, harassment, exploitation and harm (Green et al., 2024).

Protection rights – parental mediation practices and young children's engagement

How children access technology and exercise their rights are mediated primarily by the adults around them. Within the family home, the role and responsibilities of parents, their attitudes towards digital technology and their everyday digital practices, are central considerations. The UNCRC (UN, 1989) both acknowledges the responsibilities and duties of parents to protect their children from harm and the obligation of governments to make available appropriate parental services and supports. In the digital environment, General Comment No. 25 (CRC, 2021, para 21, p. 4) outlines States' obligations 'to support parents and caregivers in acquiring digital literacy and awareness of the risks to children in order to help them to assist children'. Research studies confirm that parental attitudes towards, anxieties about and confidence with digital technology play an important role in children's use of digital technology (Dong et al., 2022; Shin et al., 2021; Wan et al., 2021). Dong et al. (2022), for example, found that parents who believe digital literacy is essential for their children's development tend to be comfortable with their children actively engaging with digital technologies at home. Conversely, O'Connor and Fotakopoulou (2016) found in their survey that 61.5% parents reported multiple concerns about under-3s using touch technologies, including addiction/dependency, loss of innocence, negative physical effects, cognitive, social, language and physical delay and accessing

inappropriate content. This survey also found that lack of informed guidance, particularly around ‘safe’ lengths of time for 0–3s to use touch screens, was a concern for many parents, who lacked trust in official guidance and research-based evidence.

As illustrated in the review of key research studies above, surveys carried out internationally and nationally regarding young children and digital technology have generated a wealth of knowledge (Marsh et al., 2020) regarding child access to and activities with digital technology. However, gaps remain in our knowledge about how and in what ways, very young children engage with digital media and how parents in diverse socio-economic circumstances and ethnic communities support their very young children’s learning with technology at home (Flewitt and Clark 2020; Gillen et al., 2018). Furthermore, there are gaps in understanding how issues such as digital inclusion, security and privacy, are balanced in family homes. It is against this backdrop that this article reports the findings of an online survey conducted with parents and legal guardians (n=1,444) of children aged 0-36 months across socially and ethnically diverse families in inner-city, urban, and rural communities in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

The overall ‘Toddlers, Tech and Talk’ project aims, objectives and design

The overall aim of the research project was to address key questions about how the home lives of children aged 0-36 months intersect with digital technologies in diverse families across the four UK nations; Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales and England (Flewitt et al., 2024). A three-phase mixed method approach was used, comprising a Phase 1 survey involving a minimum of n=270 responses per nation, followed by Phase 2 interviews with 10 parents per nation (n=40) and 5 practitioners per nation (n=20), and Phase 3 case studies in the family homes of children aged 0-36 months (10 per nation, n=40). This paper reports findings from the Phase 1 survey and considers these in relation to children’s rights in the digital environment. Below, we briefly outline the survey design, development and implementation.

Design and development of the survey

The survey was designed to ask parents of children aged 0-36 months about: their household internet connectivity; types of digital devices owned in the household and more specifically owned by 0-36-month-olds; children’s and adults’ digital media use at home; adults’ attitudes, confidence, and concerns about their very young children’s use of technology; and demographic information. A draft survey, designed and developed in July and August 2022,

was piloted with 10 respondents (each of the four participating nation teams recruited minimum two respondents) and feedback received via Qualtrics in November 2022. While most respondents found the survey easy/very easy to complete, some changes were made to the layout, length of the survey and the accompanying instructions on the basis of comments received.

The final survey comprised 34 questions. Three compulsory ‘qualifying’ questions were asked at the beginning of the survey to ensure that respondents were: 1) the legal guardian of a child aged 0-36 months; 2) UK residents; and 3) aged 18 years or over (this adult age requirement was stipulated by the institutional research ethics approval process). For the remainder of the survey, parents were not obliged to answer questions on personal demographic data. The survey was also designed in such a way that on completion, participants were asked if they would like to receive a copy of the summary findings and/or consider taking part in study Phase 2. If participants were interested, they were asked to click on a link at the end of the survey which redirected them to a separate page, where they could leave contact details for the research team to connect with them at a later date by. All personal details were kept separately from the survey data and were destroyed once the summary report was finalised and sent to those respondents who requested a copy.

Ethical approvals

Initial ethical approval for the survey, participant information sheets (PIS) and consent forms, was secured by the lead university, (Manchester Metropolitan University), on 20.09.22, followed by ethical approval from the collaborating universities (Lancaster University, Queen’s University Belfast, Stirling University and Swansea University). An amendment for approval to retain summary IP information for the sole purpose of tracking response rates per nation was lodged by the lead university (Manchester Metropolitan University) on 22.12.22 and approved 03.01.23 and was subsequently approved by collaborating universities’ ethics committees. PIS and consent forms were updated accordingly. This amendment was requested after it was discovered that survey participants were not routinely including their postcodes, which meant that it was not possible to track response rates by nation. A further amendment to the ethical approval for the survey was lodged by the lead university on 24.03.23 to engage with a UK-based online survey panel provider, namely Panelbase (which is now known as Norstat UK). Approval for this was granted on 01.04.23. Approval was also secured from all collaborating universities, and PIS and consent forms were updated.

Procedures

Participant recruitment

The target sample was parents of children aged 0-36 months in diverse socioeconomic and ethnic groups, living in diverse rural, urban, and inner-city locations across the four UK nations. An open call online recruitment strategy was adopted through parenting and early childhood professional social media platforms, including Twitter feeds and blogs for parenting websites used by majority and minority ethnic communities (such as Best Beginnings, Mumsnet, Netmums and Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) networks). Additionally, the questionnaire was promoted via the project Advisory Board members' and project team's networks in each UK nation (including, for example, National Children's Bureau, National Literacy Trust, Scottish Book Trust, Early Years Scotland, Education Scotland, Starcatchers, N8 Child of the North, Home-Start, Sure Start, The Froebel Trust, Refugee Council, Early Years Alliance, Nursery World as well as Prolific and TikTok platforms). Participants were adult (aged 18 years+) mothers, fathers, and legal guardians of young children aged from birth to thirty-six months. Those excluded were parents aged under 18 years and those who were not responsible for the home-based care and education of 0-36-month-old children.

Open call survey

Following a further period of refinement and pilot testing, the survey was launched online 07.12.22, using the Qualtrics platform, deploying the open call participant recruitment strategy outlined above. To maximise accessibility to a wide population, the survey was available in print, or as an oral interview (e.g. for visually impaired respondents). The survey and supporting promotional materials were translated into significant languages of UK minority populations, namely those most frequently cited by minority populations in the 2011 Census data as "can't speak English well" or "not at all" (at the time of completing the survey design and launch, 'languages spoken at home' data were not available from the more recent UK Census (2021). At the time, these languages were Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, Gujarati, Panjabi, Polish, Romanian, and Urdu. The survey was also available in Welsh, and to enable the inclusion of recent asylum-seeking populations, in Farsi and Ukrainian. In the event, all surveys were completed online, and no alternative formats were requested.

Panel provider

By March 2023, over 550 respondents had completed the open call survey, but the response rate had slowed significantly. To augment responses, a UK-based online survey panel provider

was commissioned to secure a nationally representative sample of 1,000 respondents (250 from each of the four regions of the United Kingdom). Following ethical approvals, a soft launch aiming to achieve a minimum of 100 responses per nation was completed. A further 150 responses per nation were sought and the survey was closed at the end of June 2023. The combined approaches generated 1603 valid responses which were encrypted and stored on Qualtrics servers protected by firewall systems.

Analysis

Of the 1603 survey responses, 45 did not provide a response to the precise child age question and a further 114 either did not provide a valid response or indicated that their child was outside the age of the study. All subsequent analyses were based on cases where the age range of the child was 0-36 months (n=1,444) and were conducted in SPSS V29 and Jamovi V2.4.11. Frequency tables were produced for all key variables to provide a descriptive overview of the data. Multiple linear and logistic regression analyses were then conducted in SPSS to test associations between a range of outcomes and various parent, child and household demographics. With regards to parental attitudes and confidence four scales measuring different aspects of parental attitudes towards toddlers and technology were developed. Each scale consisted of 5 items measuring attitudes towards digital devices and child wellbeing, attitudes towards digital devices and child learning, parent confidence in supporting and safeguarding their child in using digital devices and parent anxiety towards their child's use of digital devices. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis identified a three-factor structure as the best fit for the data. This comprised a 7-item 'parental attitudes towards digital devices, child health and wellbeing' scale, a 4-item 'parental attitudes towards digital devices and child learning' scale and a 4-item 'parental confidence in supporting their child's use of digital devices' scale. The survey findings presented below highlight the complexities involved in understanding and legislating for children's rights in the digital environment of the family home, and the nuanced and complex interplay of child and parental characteristics, parental attitudes and confidence and wider social structural issues.

The survey findings

The children

The sample of children aged 0-36 month surveyed was balanced in relation to age in months and gender. The children's age was relatively evenly distributed in months as follows: 0-6

months (n=149); 7-12 months (n=118); 13-18 months (n=165); 19-24 months (n=273); 25-30 months (n=360); and 31-36 months (n= 379), resulting in a total of 1444 (Figure 1). 48% of children (n=687) were reported as female and 52% (n=749) as male. 4% (n=63) of respondents indicated that their child had a disability. This is lower than expected given that, difficulties in defining and ascertaining the true extent of disability aside, UK-wide prevalence rates for children with a disability are somewhat higher at approximately 10% (Wade et al., 2024). With regards to children's disability type, the main reported disability was social/behavioural challenges (reported by 28 respondents), followed by a learning disability (20 respondents), and smaller numbers of respondents who identified their child as having either visual, hearing and/or mobility disability or issues with dexterity. 11 respondents did not complete the question asking for detail of the disability.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents

The survey respondents were mostly mothers 80.6% (n=1161), mainly in the 31-40-year-old age group (59%; n=849 participants), mainly married (61%, n=861), and employed (85% or n=1226). Most reported they had a degree or higher 60% (n=850). Household income was fairly evenly split across the income brackets from £15,600/annum to £51,999 per annum (67% respondents, n=908). Furthermore, most respondents identified their ethnicity as English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British (73.1%, n=1043). 79% (n=1430) respondents said they exclusively spoke English at home. While this highlights sample bias, there is also interesting and substantive diversity within the sample of respondents as indicated below.

It is notable that despite the broad, commonly shared characteristics of the sample outlined above, there is noteworthy diversity based on the extensive efforts made to design the survey in such a way as to engage with a wide range of respondents. This included making the survey available in different formats and languages, advertising it in different ways and different places, revising the survey at the pilot stage to ensure it was accessible, and targeting respondent groups. As a result, our survey respondents included 17.8% (n=257) who were fathers, 0.8% (n=11) who were legal guardians and 0.8% (n=12) who described themselves as 'other'. Among respondents who selected 'other' (n=12), their connections with children included roles such as grandparents (n=5), foster carer (n=1), aunt (n=1), child minder (n=1) (all acting as legal guardians), and not stated (n=4).

In relation to the ethnic and cultural contexts of the very young children's lives at home, again further diversity is noted in that 8.3% (n=118) of the respondents identified as Irish, 5% as

White Other/Gypsy/Traveller, 3.9% (n=56) as any other mixed/multiple ethnic background, 3.9% (n=56) as Asian/British Asian background, 5.2% (n=74) as Black/Black British/African/Caribbean, and 0.6% (n=9) as 'Other' (including Arab). Interestingly, 19% (n=269) of the total sample reported speaking English and another language at home and 2% (n=36) reported speaking other language(s) at home and not using English. In terms of languages spoken at home, the most popular were English, Welsh, Irish (Gaelic), Spanish, Polish, French, Arabic, Urdu, Bengali, Panjabi, British Sign Language, and Chinese, in that order. Some respondents selected free-text box 'Other' languages spoken at home, and of these, 51 languages other than English were noted, with German, Scots and Yoruba as the most popular 'Other' languages. With regards to family location, 79% (n=1137) respondents said they lived in either a city, a town, or a suburb. 21% (n=295) said they lived in a semi-rural or village rural area.

General Comment No.25 (CRC, 2021) makes clear that the role of the parent is crucial in negotiating, facilitating and supporting the balance between very young children's provision, protection and participation rights in the digital environment of the family home. How and in what ways parents mediate their very young children's access to, ownership and use of digital technology cannot be considered in isolation from other parental characteristics including their socio-economic, education, cultural and linguistic background. As noted earlier, these provide the complex and nuanced context in which very young children's access to, and ownership of digital technology takes place. The following sections illustrate these complexities by organising findings in relation to the broad provision, participation and protection rights as defined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989) and General Comment No. 25 (CRC, 2021).

Very young children's access to and ownership of digital devices (provision rights)

In relation to provision rights (do very young children have access to digital technology?), our survey indicated that nearly all respondents had Wi-Fi connection (with only n=4 indicating they did not, plus n=2 respondents who did not answer this question). In addition, most respondents indicated that they had several different types of device in their homes, with the average number of devices within their homes being 12.55 (SD=5.74, Range=39.00, Min=1, Max=40) and the average number of different device types in the home being 7.43 (SD=0.97, Range =13, Min=1, Max = 14). Most respondents indicated that they had a broad range of device types within their homes; the most popular being Smartphones (98%, n=1419 indicated

they had a Smartphone with internet access, Apps, access to emails), followed by TVs/Smart TVs (92%, n=1331), then Laptops (82%, n=1189), Tablets (81%, n=1164), Smart home devices (such as Amazon Echo or Google Home) (65%, n=939), Gaming Consoles (63%, n=909) and Smart Watch/ Fitness Trackers (61%, n=879). 18% (n=263) reported owning internet-connected toys, and 12% (n=177) said that they had a VR headset. Respondents could enter free text in the category 'Other' devices. Responding to this option, the most popular device reported by parents used by their child was Yoto Player (n=9), Toniebox (n=8), and Amazon Fire Kids Tablet (n=2) (Figure 2).

These findings illustrate the multiplicity of devices, their type and their functions, in the home environments of 0-36-month-old children, thereby drawing attention to the extent to which digital technology is very much embedded in many aspects of very young children's daily lives. The findings also reveal that it is not simply that young children live in family environments where digital technology belonging to other family members is all around them, but that many also own their own digital device(s) and engage in digital activities both with family members and/or by themselves. Hence, for example, while 42.3% respondents said their 0-36-month-old child owned no devices, 39.7% reported that their child owned one device, 13.5% respondents reported that their child owned 2-3 devices and a further 4.5% that their child owned 4 or more devices. Respondents indicated that the average number of different devices owned by their child was 0.97 (SD=1.44, Range =14.00, Min =0, Max=14). 41% (n=587) respondents indicated that their child owned a Tablet, 12% (n=169) owned a Smartphone, 9% (n=125) owned a TV or Smart TV, 8% (n=118) have web-connected toys and 5% (n=70) owned a gaming console (Figure 3). These data must be understood with the proviso that we cannot be sure how survey respondents interpreted the word 'own'. For example, Phases 2 and 3 findings suggest that 'owning' a device may mean 'bought for a child' or that a device had been handed down to a child rather than purchased for the child's sole use.

At first sight then, the descriptive characteristics of the survey confirm that many very young children have access to and/or own their own digital technology which they enjoy with parents and/or by themselves for social, entertainment and educational reasons. However, a more detailed analysis, in simple linear regression, found that parent age, marital status, employment status, income, highest educational qualification, ethnicity, language spoken within the household and child age were all associated with the range of devices within the household (Table 1). Notably, as both parent age and income increased, the range of devices increased.

Socio-economic factors were also associated with range of device types in that compared with those in employment, those who were unemployed reported a significantly lower range of device types. Furthermore, compared with those with no qualifications/GCSEs only, respondents with A-levels, certificates or diplomas and those with a degree or higher had a wider range of devices within their household. Lastly, an association with ethnicity was noted namely compared with those with a 'Black, Asian and Minority' ethnicity, those with a 'White' ethnicity had a wider range of devices within their household.

While the survey showed that income and educational status were the strongest predictors of range of devices and device types, the strength of the relationship between predictors and the number of different household device types was generally weak e.g. an age increase of 20 years only increased the number of devices by 0.5, while parents with an A-level, certificate or diploma had on average only one more device type than those with no qualifications/GCSEs only. The model was statistically significant and explained 7% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.994. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.451.

We explored this further by considering the range of child-owned devices (this refers to the number of different types of digital devices in the household reported as being owned by the child, based on a count of yes values in response to questions asking about 15 device types). The range of different device types in the household and those owned by the child, while clearly related, varies depending on parent attitudes toward device usage for young children, as well as the different types of devices other adults and older children in the house might have access to and therefore do not match each other. The correlation between the two was checked. It is relatively weak ($r=0.373^{**}$). In multiple linear regression, parent age, gender, marital status, income, ethnicity, nation of residence and child disability status were significant predictors of the range of devices owned by children (Table 2). As income increased, the range of devices that children owned also increased, but as parent age increased, the range of devices that children owned decreased.

Mothers reported that their child owned a significantly smaller range of devices than reported by fathers. Compared with married parents, single parents reported their child had a significantly wider range of device types, while parents cohabiting reported their child had a significantly smaller range of device types. Compared with those who lived in England, the

children of parents who lived in Northern Ireland owned a smaller range of device types. Children with a disability owned a significantly wider range of devices compared with those without a disability.

Parent gender and income were the strongest predictors of child device ownership, although, as with other models, the strength of the relationship was generally weak e.g. mothers reported their child owned, on average, 0.4 less device types than fathers. The model was statistically significant and explained 15% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.758. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.451. Together, these findings support existing research indicating that parental characteristics (in particular education, socio-economic background and income) are associated with the number and range of devices in the family home. Novel in our findings is the suggestion that the UK's very youngest children are exposed to digital inequalities at a very young age. This has clear implications for their provision rights.

Very young children's use of digital technology (participation rights)

With regard to children's participation rights in the digital environment of the family home, our survey findings revealed that most very young children are enabled, facilitated and permitted to use digital devices in a range of locations including (in order of popularity) in the home, car, restaurants, when visiting friends/family, when at nursery, on public transport, in pushchairs, when out shopping, and walking. The most frequent activities that very young children do on their own with digital devices included watching children's TV shows and videos, playing games, taking and looking at photographs, and accessing YouTube clips across Smartphones, Tablets and Laptops (Figure 4). Conversely, the most frequent activities that parents do with their 0–36-month-old child on digital devices included taking photographs, looking at family photographs and videos, speaking with family and friends, watching children's TV shows and children's films, playing music, and watching YouTube clips (Figure 5).

As previously discussed, the picture is more complicated than descriptive analysis suggests. In multiple linear regression, parent age, marital status, employment status, income, language used within the home and child age were significant predictors of the range of locations where children used devices (Table 1). As parent age increased, the range of locations where their children used devices decreased. Compared with married parents, single parents reported their child used devices in a wider range of locations. Compared with those in employment, the

children of parents who were unemployed used devices in a significantly narrower range of locations. As income decreased, the range of locations children used devices also decreased. Compared with those who spoke English only, children of parents who spoke both English and another language within the home used devices in a smaller range of locations. As child age increased the range of locations in which devices were used increased.

Child age was the strongest predictor for the breadth of locations where children used digital devices, followed by parent employment status. However, as with other models, the strength of the relationship was generally weak e.g. an increased child age of 10 months increased the range of locations by 0.4, while unemployment reduced the range of locations by 0.7. The model was statistically significant and explained 9% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.911. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.029 to 3.451.

In our survey, children's use of digital devices to play on their own is a dichotomous variable based on parents reporting that their child often plays with devices by themselves across any one of five different device types (Smartphone, mobiles, Tablet, Laptop, PC). In multiple logistic regression, parent gender, education status, ethnicity, child age and child disability status were all associated with parents reporting that their child often plays alone on at least one device (Table 2). Fathers were 1.6 times more likely than mothers to report that their child did this (based on the inverse of OR=0.61). Parents with no qualifications/GSCEs only were 1.6 times more likely to report this than parents with A-Levels, certificates, or diplomas (based on the inverse of OR=0.62) and 2.3 times more likely than those with parents with a degree or higher (based on the inverse of OR=0.44). Parents of 'Black, Asian and Minority' ethnicities were 2.6 times more likely than those of 'White' ethnicity to report that their child often played alone on digital devices (based on the inverse of OR=0.38).

Each unit increase (one month) in child age increased the likelihood of parents reporting that their child often played on devices on their own by 1.03. Parents whose children had a disability were almost twice as likely than parents whose child did not have a disability to report that their child often played on devices on their own (OR=1.94). The model was statistically significant and explained 17% of the variance. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF, as calculated by linear regression) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.451.

Parents' use of digital devices to play with their child is also a dichotomous variable based on parents reporting often using devices to play with their children across any one of five different device types (Smartphone, mobiles, Tablet, Laptop, PC). In multiple logistic regression, parent gender, income, educational status ethnicity, language and child disability status were all associated with parents reporting that they often played with their child on a least one device (Table 3). Fathers were more than 1.4 times as likely than mothers to report often using digital devices to play with their child (based on the inverse of OR=0.72). A unit increase in income increased the odds of parents often using devices to play with their child by 1.11.

Compared with parents with a degree or higher, those with no qualifications/GCSEs only were 1.75 times more likely to report often using devices to play with their children (based on the inverse of OR=0.57) while parents with a 'Black, Asian and Minority' ethnicity were more than twice as likely to report this than those with a 'White' ethnicity (based on the inverse of OR=0.44). Parents who spoke English only were more than three times as likely than those who spoke another language only to report often playing with their child on devices (based on the inverse of OR=0.31). Parents whose children had a disability were nearly twice as likely to report often using a device to play with their child than parents whose child did not have a disability (OR=1.89). The model was statistically significant and explained 10% of the variance. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF, as calculated by linear regression) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.451.

Another important aspect regarding children's use of digital technology that we explored in the survey is the contextual and relational context in which this use occurs. Namely, how and in what ways children's engagement with digital technology is shaped, guided and structured by parental mediation practices. In our survey, we asked respondents to indicate the range and frequency of types of support that they offer to their child when using digital devices. Table 5 highlights that parents reported most frequently 1) showing their child how to use a device, 2) joining their child on an activity, and 3) supervising their child's use of digital technology. Specific activities most frequently indicated included pointing to items on the screen or explaining items to their child, helping their child learn words, letters, sounds, shapes and colours, helping their child physically hold and move the device, talking with their child about the content, suggesting fun activities, giving praise and setting parent controls to make sure their child is safe (see Goodall et al, forthcoming).

These findings are important in reinforcing the contingent, contextual and conditional nature of children's participation rights in a digital environment. Very young children's participation rights are not absolute but are mediated through relational contexts, namely, as shown here through the parent-child relationship. Furthermore, the survey findings illustrate the crucial role of parents and their characteristics in determining how the balance between very young children's provision, protection and participation rights in the digital environment of the family home are negotiated, facilitated and supported. Other important considerations are parental attitudes towards and confidence with digital technology, as reported below.

Parental attitudes towards digital technology and their children (protection rights)

In our survey, we found that in relation to child health and wellbeing nearly half the respondents (49.4%, n=713) strongly/somewhat agreed that digital technology was damaging to children's mental health and that young children use digital technology too much and too early (70%, n=1,011). This compares with parental attitudes towards child learning, where most respondents strongly/somewhat agreed that digital technology offers opportunities for young children to develop skills with numbers (83.4%, n=1,203) and for young children to develop creative skills (e.g., drawing, painting, taking photo, making short videos) (75.2%, n=1,084).

When analysed in further detail, our survey results showed that parental attitudes towards digital technology and child health and wellbeing were significantly associated both with child age and with the language spoken at home. Those who spoke English only were more positive than those who spoke English and another language and those who spoke another language only (Table 6). Parents of older children were more positive than parents of younger children. The model was statistically significant, although the strength of the associations was weak, and the model only explained 3% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.026. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.441.

With regards to parental attitudes towards digital devices and child learning, in multiple linear regression, parent gender, income, language spoken in the home, child age and gender were all associated with parent attitudes toward digital devices and children's learning (Table 4). Compared to fathers, mothers were significantly less positive and as income decreased, attitudes became less positive. Compared to those who spoke English only, parents who spoke both English and another language, and parents who spoke another language only were significantly less positive. Parents of older children were more positive, while parents of a male

child had significantly more positive attitudes towards learning with digital devices than those who had a female child. Child age and parent income were the strongest predictors, but the associations were weak and, although statistically significant, the model only explained 5% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.035. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.011 to 3.443.

Parents managing and promoting their children's safe digital practice

At a broad level, our survey found that most respondents strongly/somewhat agreed with the statements that they have all the skills to support their child (66.1%, n=953), that they know how to keep their child safe (n=1,049, 72.7%), and that they know where to access support and advice (60.1%, n=868). However, in multiple linear regression, parent gender, employment status, ethnicity, language spoken in home and child age (Table 5) were all associated with parent confidence in using digital devices (higher scores represent more confidence, lower scores less confidence). Mothers were less confident than fathers. Compared to parents in employment, unemployed parents were more confident. Compared to those who spoke English only, parents who spoke both English and another language, and parents who spoke another language only, were significantly less confident than those who spoke English only. Parents of 'Black, Asian and Minority' ethnicities were less confident than parents of 'White' ethnicity. Parents of older children were more confident than parents of younger children. Parent ethnicity and language spoken within the home were the strongest predictors. However, the associations were weak and, although the model was statistically significant, it only explained 6% of the variance. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.945. An examination of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) showed no problems with multicollinearity and all values ranged from 1.028 to 3.451. These differences in parental attitudes and confidence, although small, do have implications for the exercise of children's rights in the digital environment of the home – in particular how and in what ways parents negotiate the complex issues of digital inclusion, privacy and safety and ensure that their children's provision, protection and participation rights are all upheld.

Discussion and implications

Overall, our survey findings lend weight to the existing body of research which indicates that nearly all very young children live in households that are Wi-Fi connected (Ofcom, 2023) and

where digital technology exists in various forms in their daily lives. In addition, far from being passive onlookers to the digital technology that is present in family homes, very young children own and use various digital devices on their own as well as with their parents for a range of educational, social and entertainment purposes. Furthermore, very young children's provision and participation rights in the digital environment of the family home cannot be considered in isolation from the complex interplay of child, parental and wider social structural and contextual considerations.

Our survey has shown that the age and disability of a child, the socio-economic, educational, cultural and linguistic background of parents, and parental attitudes towards and levels of confidence with digital technology, all provide the unique family contexts in which children's rights in a digital environment are negotiated, lived and experienced, concurring with wider research (HL Paper 219, 2023; ONS, 2019; Ofcom, 2023). The significance of some findings in particular that children with a disability owned a significantly wider range of devices compared to those without a disability and were twice as likely to play on digital devices on their own than those who did not have a disability, requires further exploration and is the subject of a forthcoming separate paper, which brings together findings from all three phases of the study and aims to provide rich, deep, meaningful and triangulated consideration of children with disabilities aged 0-3 and digital technology at home.

In summary, the survey findings from the Toddlers, Tech and Talk project lend weight to the urgent need to ensure that our very youngest children's needs and rights are considered in debates about digital inclusion. Our findings highlight that from birth, children are exposed to inequalities of access in ways that have potential to restrict the social, educational and cultural benefits that can be accrued from safe, supported digital technology use (Green et al., 2024). In a recently published guide by UNICEF and the Carnegie Trust (Bowyer et al., 2021), digital inclusion is defined as having several domains which map onto children's provision, protection and participation rights, namely: a strong internet connection; sustainability of access; a device; a safe online environment and the right skills and supports. These recommendations are in tune with our own survey findings that any implementation plans regarding children's rights in a digital environment must take a contextual view that considers the characteristics of the child, their family and their context and must be informed by nuanced knowledge about families' daily lives living with digital technology. Survey research can only point to trends. In this project, we have gained deeper insights through our interviews and case studies conducted with 40 families in their homes. Also significant is the substantial knowledge on children's rights in

a digital environment gained through the work of Livingstone and colleagues (Livingstone et al., 2017; Livingstone and Blum-Ross, 2020; Green et al., 2024).

Through our own findings we aim to lend weight to this significant body of work by firstly insisting that the UK national survey carried out by Ofcom (Ofcom, 2024), which focuses on children's and parents' media use, attitudes and informs policy developments, and currently omits consideration of children under the age of three years, is amended to include children from birth to 36 months old. Secondly, we are working to ensure our findings support ongoing work regarding implementation ideas and plans associated with General Comment No. 25, noting that parents in family homes require accessible, constructive, consistent, and clear advice based on the realities of their daily lives, of which digital technology forms a significant part (Livingstone and Sylwander, 2025). Our findings indicate that guidelines developed *with* parents and children rather than *for* them are likely to be most helpful. Tailored to take account of the differing needs, characteristics, contexts and experiences of children and their parents, made available through the various networks in which families are embedded (such as health, early years education and childcare services, for example) and based where possible on delivery through these informal support groups, might best help support parents to facilitate their very young children's rights in a digital environment.

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to thank the parents, their children and all the professionals who participated in this study. The authors would also like to thank Angie Cooke who managed the administrative aspects of the project so efficiently and lastly the reviewers for their helpful comments which have been invaluable.

Data availability statement: The data on which this article is available on request and will be deposited on the UK Data Service in line with funding requirements from the Economic and Social Research Council.

Funding statement: This is an ESRC funded project ES/W001020/1.

Conflict of interests: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: All aspects of the project have been approved by the ethics committees of all partner institutions involved.

Patient consent statement: In line with ethical approvals all participants involved in the study were engaged in a voluntary consent process, supported by access to participant information sheets.

Permission to reproduce material from other sources: The paper does not contain such material but has been appropriately referenced throughout.

References

- Alroqi, H., Serratrice, L. and Cameron-Faulkner, T. (2022). The home literacy and media environment of Saudi toddlers. *Journal of Children and Media*, 16(1), 95-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2021.1921819>.
- Arnott, L., Palaiologou, I. and Gray, C. (2019). An ecological exploration of the internet of toys in early childhood everyday life. In: Mascheroni, G., Holloway, D. (eds) *The Internet of Toys. Studies in Childhood and Youth*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10898-4_7 pp.135-157.
- Azevedo, E. C., Riter, H. d. S., Pieta, M. A. M. and Frizzo, G. B. (2022). Digital media use on interactions between mother and child: differences in infants' early years. *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-4327e3210>.
- Bellagamba, F., Presaghi, F., Di Marco, M., D'Abundo, E., Blanchfield, O. and Barr, R. (2021). How infant and toddlers' media use is related to sleeping habits in everyday life in Italy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.589664>.
- Bowyer, G., Grant, A., and Nielsen, A. (2021) *Closing the Digital Divide for Good*. London: Carnegie Trust/UNICEF UK. Available for download https://dlssu070pg2v9i.cloudfront.net/pex/pex_carnegie2021/2021/06/05091733/CUKT-Time-for-Action-Advocacy-FINAL.pdf (last accessed 14.08.24).
- Chaudron, S., Beutel, M. and Černikova, M. (2015). *Young Children (0-8) and Digital Technology: A Qualitative Exploratory Study Across Seven Countries*. P. O. o. t. E. Union.
- Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC). (2021). *General Comment No. 25. Children's Rights in Relation to the Digital Environment*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Dardanou, M., Unstad, T., Brito, R., Dias, P., Fotakopoulou, O., Sakata, Y. and O'Connor, J. (2020). Use of touchscreen technology by 0-3-year-old children: Parents' practices and perspectives in Norway, Portugal and Japan. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 20(3), 551-573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798420938445>.
- Digital Poverty Alliance, *UK Digital Poverty Evidence Review* (2022): <https://digitalpovertyalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/UK-Digital-Poverty-Evidence-Review-2022-v1.0-compressed.pdf> [accessed 11 May 2022] Ofcom, *Digital exclusion review* (2022): https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/234364/digital-exclusion-review-2022.pdf.
- Dong, C. M., Cao, S. M. and Li, H. (2022). Profiles and predictors of young children's digital literacy and multimodal practices in Central China. *Early Education and Development*, 33(6), 1094-1115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2021.1930937>.
- Flewitt, R. and Clark, A. (2020). Porous boundaries: reconceptualising the home literacy environment as a digitally networked space for 0-3 year olds. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 20(3), 447-471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798420938116>.

- Flewitt, R., El Gemayel, S., Arnott, L., Gillen, J., Goodall, J., Winter, K., Dalziell, A., Liu, M., Savadova, S. and Timmins, S. (2024). *Toddlers, Tech and Talk: Very Young Children's Language and Literacy Learning at Home in a Post-Digital Age. Summary Report*. Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University. <https://doi.org/10.23634/MMU.00636881>.
- Gillen, J., Matsumoto, M., Aliagas, C., Bar-lev, Y., Clark, A., Flewitt, R., Jorge, A., Kumpulainen, K., Morgada, M., Pacheco, R. and Poveda, D. (2018). *COST Action IS1410. A Day in the Digital Lives of Children Aged 0-3: Final Report*. Available for download https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/files/61897985/o_3sreport.pdf (last accessed 14.08.24).
- Goodall, J., Flewitt, R., El Gemayel, S., Arnott, L., Dalziell, A., Gillen, J., Lui, MC., Savadova, S., Timmins, S. and Winter, K (forthcoming) Parental mediation of very young children's experiences with digital media at home. *Educational Review* (forthcoming).
- Green, L., Haddon, L., Livingstone, S., O'Neill, Stevenson, K. and Holloway, D. (2024). *Digital Media Use in Early Childhood: Birth to Six*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Griffith, S.F. and Arnold, D.H. (2019). Home learning in the new mobile age: parent-child interactions during joint play with educational apps in the US. *Journal of Children and Media*, 13(1), 1-19.
- House of Lords. (2023). *Digital Exclusion. HL Paper 219*. London: House of Lords. <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/40662/documents/198365/default/>.
- Krogh, M. T., Egmoose, I., Stuart, A. C., Madsen, E. B., Haase, T. W. and Væver, M. S. (2021). A longitudinal examination of daily amounts of screen time and technoference in infants aged 2–11 months and associations with maternal sociodemographic factors. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 63, 101543. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2021.101543>.
- Livingstone, S. and Third, A. (2017). Children and young people's rights in the digital age: An emerging agenda. *New Media and Society*, 19(5), 657-670.
- Livingstone, S. and Blum-Ross, A. (2020) *Parenting for a Digital Future. How Hopes and Fears about Technology Shape Children's Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, S., Third, A. and Lansdown, G. (2024) 'Children vs adults: negotiating UNCRC General comment No. 25 on children's rights in the digital environment', Chapter in Manuel Puppis & Robin Mansell and Hilde Van den Bulck (eds.), *Handbook of Media and Communication Governance*, p. 414-428. London: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Livingstone, S. and Sylwander, K. R. (2025) There is no right age! The search for age appropriate ways to support children's digital lives and rights. *Journal of Children and Media*, 19(1), 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2024.2435015>.
- Mantilla, A. and Edwards, S. (2019). Digital technology use by and with young children: A systematic review for the Statement on Young Children and Digital Technologies. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(2), 182-195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939119832744>.
- Marsh, J., Lahmar, J., Plowman, L., Yamada-Rice, D., Bishop, J., & Scott, F. (2020). Under threes' play with Tablets. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 19(3), 283-297. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718x20966688>.

McArthur, B.A., Volkova, V., Tomopoulos, S. and Madigan, S. (2022). Global prevalence of meeting screen time guidelines among children 5 years and younger: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA pediatrics*, 176(4), pp.373-383.

O'Connor, J. and Fotakopoulou, O. (2016). A threat to childhood innocence or the future of learning? Parents' perspectives on the use of touch-screen technology by 0-3 year-olds in the UK. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(2), 235-247.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949116647290>.

Ofcom. (2024) *Children and Parents: Media use and Attitudes*. London: Ofcom. Available for download <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/media-use-and-attitudes/media-habits-children/children-and-parents-media-use-and-attitudes-report-2024/> (last accessed 14.08.24).

Ofcom. (2023). *Adults' Media Use and Attitudes Report*. London: Ofcom. Available for download https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0028/255844/adults-media-use-and-attitudes-report-2023.pdf (last accessed 14.08.24).

Office for National Statistics (ONS). (2019). *Exploring the UK's Digital Divide*. London: Office for National Statistics. Available for download <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/householdcharacteristics/homeinternetandsocialmediausage/articles/exploringtheuksdigitaldivide/2019-03-04> (last accessed 14.08.24).

Przybylski, A. K. and Weinstein, N. (2019). Digital Screen Time Limits and Young Children's Psychological Well-Being: Evidence From a Population-Based Study [Article]. *Child Development*, 90(1), e56-e65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13007>.

Shin, E., Choi, K., Resor, J. and Smith, C. L. (2021). Why do parents use screen media with toddlers? The role of child temperament and parenting stress in early screen use. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 64, 101595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2021.101595>.

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Geneva: United Nations.

Veldman, S.L.C., Altenburg, T.M., Chinapaw, M.J.M. and Gubbels, J.S. (2023). Correlates of screen time in the early years (0–5 years): A systematic review. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 33, 102214.

Wan, M. W., Fitch-Bunce, C., Heron, K. and Lester, E. (2021). Infant screen media usage and social-emotional functioning. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 62, 101509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2020.101509>.

Zhao, S. and Flewitt, R. (2020). Young Chinese immigrant children's language and literacy practices on social media: A translanguaging perspective. *Language and Education*, 34(3), 267-285.