JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL LAUREATES ACADEMY

www.rlaindia.org

DIGITAL ERA PARENTING AND EMOTIONAL MATURITY: EMERGING CHALLENGES IN THE HOME ENVIRONMENT

Aditi Vyas[1], Dr. Kuldeep Singh Tomar[2]

[1]Department of Psychology, Shri Venkateshwara University (SVU), India

[2]Department of Psychology, Shri Venkateshwara University (SVU), India

Email: Aditi_a2a@yahoo.com **(Corresponding Author)**, kuldeeptomar.edu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The home has long served as the primary developmental setting in which children acquire the affective, regulatory, and relational competencies that constitute emotional maturity. The rapid integration of personal digital devices into family life over the past two decades has reorganised this setting in ways that earlier models of parenting did not anticipate. This discussion paper examines how parenting in the digital era reshapes the emotional environment of the home, with particular attention to four interrelated phenomena: parental technoference, children's screen exposure, parental mediation styles, and the bidirectional feedback between parent and child digital behaviour. Drawing on contemporary peer-reviewed evidence, theoretical frameworks from developmental, ecological, and communication research, and culturally specific data from Indian and other Asian contexts, the paper argues that emotional maturity outcomes depend less on the quantity of screen exposure than on the quality of parent-child attunement that surrounds it. Active mediation, warm authoritative parenting, and parental modelling of regulated device use emerge as protective factors, while restrictive control without dialogue and chronic technoference appear to undermine emotional development. The paper highlights gaps in the literature, particularly the underrepresentation of fathers, the scarcity of longitudinal Indian data, and the dominance of risk-focused over opportunity-focused research designs. Implications for clinical practice, school counselling, parent education, and family policy are discussed, along with directions for future empirical inquiry.

Keywords: digital parenting, emotional maturity, technoference, parental mediation, screen time, child development, family environment, home environment

1. INTRODUCTION

The household into which a child is born today differs in important ways from the household of even a single generation ago. Smartphones, tablets, smart televisions, voice assistants, and connected toys are no longer peripheral devices reserved for adults; they sit on dining tables, in nurseries, and on bedside lockers. Caregivers consult them dozens of times each waking hour, often during the very moments that, in earlier eras, would have been reserved for face-to-face exchange with their children. This reorganisation of the domestic environment has happened so quickly, and with so little public deliberation, that the conceptual vocabulary used to describe parenting and child development has only recently begun to catch up with it.

Emotional maturity, the capacity to recognise, regulate, and express feelings in ways that are appropriate to context and adaptive over time, has long been understood as a developmental achievement that depends on the quality of early caregiving relationships. Singh and Bhargava, whose Emotional Maturity Scale remains widely used across South Asian research, conceptualise emotional maturity as the inverse of five forms of immaturity: emotional instability, emotional regression, social maladjustment, personality disintegration, and a lack of independence. Each of these dimensions is shaped, at least in part, by the affective climate of the home and by the responsiveness of primary caregivers during sensitive developmental windows.

It is precisely this affective climate that digital devices have come to mediate, and at times to interrupt. Recent meta-analytic and scoping reviews have documented a growing body of evidence linking parental smartphone use, children's screen exposure, and the style of parental mediation around digital media to a range of emotional and behavioural outcomes in children and adolescents. Findings have been mixed in important ways, but a consistent pattern is beginning to emerge: it is the relational quality of digital engagement, rather than its sheer quantity, that most reliably predicts whether a child develops the regulatory and relational skills associated with emotional maturity.

The purpose of this discussion paper is threefold. First, it synthesises contemporary evidence on the intersection of digital parenting and emotional maturity, drawing primarily on peer-reviewed work published between 2015 and 2025. Second, it situates this evidence within established theoretical frameworks from developmental psychology, attachment research, and media studies, with the aim of clarifying the mechanisms through which digital practices in the home environment shape emotional outcomes. Third, it identifies gaps in the current literature and proposes directions for future empirical inquiry, with particular attention

to the Indian context, where digital penetration has accelerated faster than research infrastructure has been able to track.

The paper does not attempt a systematic review in the strict PRISMA sense; it is, by design, a discussion paper that integrates evidence with conceptual analysis. Such papers occupy a recognised methodological space in social science publication, particularly when a field is fast moving and when conceptual clarity is required before further empirical work can be productively designed. The argument advanced is not that digital media are inherently harmful to emotional development, nor that parents bear sole responsibility for outcomes shaped by industry design choices and platform affordances. Rather, the argument is that the home has become a contested attentional space, and that emotional maturity in children today is shaped by how families negotiate that contest.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Discussion paper design and rationale

A discussion paper, sometimes described as a critical narrative review or a position paper, is an established academic genre that synthesises existing evidence around a defined question and advances an argument or set of propositions, without attempting the exhaustive coverage and protocol-driven inclusion criteria of a systematic review. The discussion paper format was selected for the present work for three reasons. First, the substantive question — how digital era parenting shapes emotional maturity — sits across multiple disciplines (developmental psychology, communication studies, paediatrics, family sociology), and a discussion paper allows for cross-disciplinary integration in a way that single-discipline systematic reviews typically do not. Second, much of the most recent and methodologically informative evidence is dispersed across cohort studies, qualitative analyses, scoping reviews, and clinical guidelines, the kind of heterogeneity that discussion papers are well suited to digest. Third, the field is moving quickly, and the conceptual ground itself remains unsettled; a discussion paper provides space to clarify constructs and identify productive research questions for the next phase of empirical work.

2.2 Search strategy

Literature was identified through searches of PubMed, PsycINFO, Scopus, ScienceDirect, Springer Link, Wiley Online Library, Taylor & Francis Online, and Google Scholar, with comprehensive coverage of publications from 2015 onwards. The primary search strings combined terms relating to digital parenting ("digital parenting," "parental mediation,"

"technoference," "phubbing," "screen time," "smartphone use"), the home environment ("family," "parent-child," "home environment," "family climate"), and emotional outcomes ("emotional maturity," "emotional regulation," "social-emotional development," "attachment," "behavioural problems," "mental well-being"). Reference lists of identified reviews were hand-searched for additional relevant work, and key clinical guidelines (notably those of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Indian Academy of Pediatrics) were retrieved directly from issuing bodies.

2.3 Inclusion approach and synthesis

Sources were prioritised when they were peer-reviewed, published in or after 2015, and reported empirical or meta-analytic findings, although foundational theoretical works of earlier date (for example, Bowlby on attachment, Bandura on social cognitive theory, and Bronfenbrenner on ecological systems) were retained for conceptual grounding. Sources from Indian and broader South Asian contexts were specifically sought to address the geographic underrepresentation noted in earlier reviews. The synthesis was thematic rather than statistical: evidence was clustered around recurring constructs, contradictions and gaps were noted explicitly, and conclusions were framed as propositions for further investigation rather than as definitive findings. This approach is consistent with the discussion paper genre and with current guidance on integrative literature review methodology in the social sciences.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Four theoretical traditions inform the discussion that follows.

3.1 Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model and the techno-microsystem

Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory situates child development within nested environments, with the family microsystem closest to the developing child. More recent extensions of the model have proposed a techno-subsystem, recognising that digital technologies now mediate interactions across all levels of the ecological hierarchy, from intimate parent-child exchanges to macro-level cultural narratives about childhood. The home environment, in this view, is no longer a relatively bounded microsystem; it is constantly permeated by content, notifications, and social comparison processes flowing in from the wider digital ecology.

3.2 Attachment theory and parental responsiveness

Bowlby's foundational formulation of attachment, and the substantial empirical tradition built upon it, establishes that secure attachment depends on caregiver availability, sensitivity, and

contingent responsiveness during moments of infant or child distress. The neurobiological substrate of emotion regulation is built, in significant part, through repeated experiences of co-regulation with an attuned caregiver. Any factor that systematically reduces parental availability or responsiveness during these moments has the potential, over time, to alter the developmental trajectory of emotional regulation. Digital devices have become one such factor, although not the only one.

3.3 The Process Model of Emotion Regulation

Gross's Process Model conceptualises emotion regulation as a sequence of strategies deployed at different points in the generation of an emotional response, ranging from situation selection and modification to cognitive reappraisal and response modulation. Children acquire these strategies in part through observational learning and in part through scaffolded practice with caregivers. When caregivers themselves model maladaptive regulation, for example by reaching reflexively for a phone in moments of boredom, frustration, or social discomfort, children may internalise these patterns even before they have access to devices of their own.

3.4 Emotional maturity as a developmental construct

The construct of emotional maturity used in this paper draws on the framework operationalised by Singh and Bhargava in their widely cited Emotional Maturity Scale, which assesses the inverse of five immaturity dimensions: emotional instability, emotional regression, social maladjustment, personality disintegration, and lack of independence. Emotional maturity, so defined, encompasses both intrapersonal capacities (such as tolerance of frustration and stable self-image) and interpersonal capacities (such as empathy, cooperation, and adaptive social functioning). It is an outcome of development, not a fixed trait, and it is shaped by the cumulative quality of the family environment across the early and middle years of childhood and into adolescence.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 The digital home environment as a changed developmental ecology

Households in most middle and high-income settings now contain multiple connected screens per person. In India, where mobile-first internet adoption has been particularly rapid, market research conducted across eight metropolitan cities reported that parents averaged more than five hours of daily smartphone use, while children averaged more than four hours, with smartphone overuse identified as a primary source of conflict by both groups. While such industry-commissioned figures should be treated with appropriate caution, they are consistent

with peer-reviewed evidence that the prevalence of problematic smartphone use among Indian adolescents has risen sharply, with one cross-sectional study in Gujarat reporting a prevalence of 64.6 percent among adolescents aged 15 to 19. These numbers describe an ecology in which devices are not peripheral to family life but are woven into its texture, often present at meals, during bedtime routines, in the car, and in the bedroom.

This shift has consequences for the affective climate of the home that go well beyond the direct effects of any particular content children consume. The persistent presence of devices reshapes the rhythms of family interaction: conversations are interrupted, eye contact is reduced, and the rituals through which families have traditionally communicated emotional availability are altered. From a developmental standpoint, the question is not whether children encounter screens but whether the relational scaffolding around those encounters remains intact.

4.2 Parental technoference and the disruption of attunement

McDaniel and Coyne's introduction of the term technoference, denoting routine intrusions of technology into face-to-face parent-child interactions, has anchored a productive line of research over the past decade. A scoping review of the technoference literature published in 2023 mapped substantial evidence that parental device use during interactions reduces parental responsiveness, increases the likelihood of negative parent-child exchanges, and is associated with elevated reports of child behaviour problems. A more recent meta-analytic synthesis on parental smartphone use and children's emotional and behavioural outcomes drew similar conclusions, while highlighting that effect sizes are typically small to moderate and vary across child age and developmental status.

From the perspective of attachment theory, the mechanism is intuitive. When a young child seeks engagement, whether to share an interesting object, to be soothed after a fall, or to test the social rules of a new situation, the contingent response of the caregiver is the building block of secure attachment. A caregiver who is repeatedly absorbed in a phone is, in those moments, functionally unavailable. Children appear to notice these disruptions: observational research has documented that toddlers respond to even brief parental phone checking with bids for attention that escalate when ignored, and adolescent-report studies indicate that perceived parental technoference is associated with lower-quality parent-child communication and weaker attachment security.

It is important to note, however, that technoference is not synonymous with any particular quantity of parental screen use. Parents who use devices in front of their children but who

remain emotionally available, who narrate what they are doing, and who set down their phones in response to bids for attention may produce very different developmental outcomes than parents who use devices in similar quantities but in a more absorbed and dismissive manner. The construct that matters developmentally is parental emotional availability, of which device use is one increasingly common threat among many.

4.3 Children's screen exposure and emotional outcomes

The literature on children's own screen exposure and emotional outcomes is substantial and, in places, contested. A systematic review of fifty studies on adolescent screen time and mental health published in 2023 reported that excessive screen time, particularly weekday smartphone use and certain patterns of social media engagement, was associated with diminished mental well-being, with girls appearing more vulnerable to depressive outcomes linked to social media. A meta-analysis on the broader relationship between screen exposure and social-emotional development in children and adolescents has likewise reported that greater screen time predicts increases in hyperactivity and emotional dysregulation, although effect sizes vary considerably with age, content type, and contextual moderators.

The most influential clinical guidance, that of the American Academy of Pediatrics, has explicitly moved away from a single time-based threshold and toward a framework that emphasises quality of content, context of use, and conversation between parents and children. Recent updates to the Academy's recommendations are particularly notable for relinquishing fixed daily limits and instead organising guidance around a set of principles often summarised as the five Cs: child characteristics, content, calm, crowding out, and communication. This shift reflects the maturation of the field's understanding: a child who watches an hour of high-quality educational programming with an engaged caregiver is in a different developmental situation from a child who passively scrolls short-form video for an hour while a caregiver does the same nearby.

For emotional maturity specifically, three pathways are most clearly implicated. First, screen exposure displaces other developmentally important activities, including unstructured play, outdoor activity, and direct social interaction with peers and adults, all of which are settings in which emotional regulation is practised. Second, certain forms of digital content, particularly highly stimulating short-form video and adversarial gaming, may train rapid arousal-recovery cycles that interfere with the slower processes underlying frustration tolerance and cognitive reappraisal. Third, social media in particular introduces social

comparison processes that, in adolescence, can amplify normative anxieties about appearance, status, and inclusion in ways that strain emerging emotional resources.

None of these pathways is deterministic. Many children navigate substantial digital exposure without measurable harm, and some forms of digital engagement, including video chat with extended family, collaborative creative tools, and well-designed educational content, appear to support rather than undermine social-emotional outcomes. The challenge for both parents and researchers is to distinguish patterns of use that are protective from those that are corrosive.

4.4 Parental mediation styles and their differential effects

Research on parental mediation, originally developed in the context of television and subsequently extended to digital and mobile media, has converged on a typology that distinguishes active mediation (discussion, co-viewing, contextualisation), restrictive mediation (rules, limits, prohibitions), and parental monitoring (oversight of content and contacts). The relative effectiveness of these strategies has been a recurring question, and a now substantial body of evidence suggests that they are not interchangeable.

Active mediation, characterised by ongoing dialogue between parent and child about online content and experiences, has been associated across multiple studies with improved digital literacy, lower exposure to online risks, lower rates of problematic social media use, and better adolescent mental health outcomes. The mechanism appears to combine cognitive scaffolding (children develop critical evaluation skills through guided practice) and relational warmth (the conversations themselves communicate parental interest and availability). Restrictive mediation produces more mixed outcomes: it can reduce exposure to specific risks in the short term, but when used without warmth or dialogue it has been linked in some studies to higher rather than lower rates of problematic use, possibly because it generates psychological reactance, drives behaviour underground, or fails to build internal regulation skills. Parental monitoring without active mediation has produced similarly inconsistent results.

These findings map closely onto the broader parenting styles literature, in which authoritative parenting (high warmth, high structure, high responsiveness to the developing autonomy of the child) consistently outperforms authoritarian (high structure, low warmth) and permissive (high warmth, low structure) styles across a range of developmental outcomes. A recent Indian study of adolescents in Gujarat reported that authoritative parenting was associated with significantly lower risk of smartphone addiction, while perceived

authoritarian and neglectful parenting were associated with higher risk. The implication is that digital mediation strategies are most effective when they are embedded in an overall parenting style that is warm, responsive, and structured, and that no specific mediation tactic is likely to compensate for an underlying climate of disengagement or harshness.

4.5 The bidirectional loop and the mediation paradox

A theme that has emerged with increasing clarity in recent research is the bidirectional, recursive nature of parent and child digital behaviour. Parents who experience high parenting stress, including the stress generated by their own children's behavioural difficulties, may turn more frequently to digital devices as a form of self-regulation, which in turn increases technoference and reduces the responsive caregiving that might support the child's emerging self-regulation. Adolescents who feel emotionally unmet at home may compensate by deepening their engagement with online networks, which in turn reduces the opportunities for in-person communication that might have repaired the relationship.

This recursive dynamic produces what might be called the mediation paradox: the families whose children would benefit most from active, dialogic mediation are often the families in which such mediation is hardest to mount, because the underlying relational resources have been depleted by the very dynamics one would like to address. Interventions framed as simple parental education about screen time are unlikely to be sufficient in such cases. Effective support more often requires attention to the parent's own emotional regulation, family-level relational repair, and acknowledgment of the structural pressures (long working hours, caregiving overload, economic precarity) that drive both parent and child toward devices in the first place.

4.6 Cultural specificity: the Indian and South Asian context

Most of the published research on digital parenting and emotional outcomes has been conducted in North American and European samples, with growing contributions from East Asia. The evidence base from South Asia, and from India in particular, is comparatively thin given the size of the affected population. The studies that do exist suggest that the broad patterns documented elsewhere apply, but with culturally specific inflections that warrant careful attention.

First, the role of joint and extended family structures in many Indian households complicates straightforward application of dyadic Western models of parent-child interaction. Grandparents, aunts, uncles, and older siblings often participate in caregiving and in

mediation of children's digital use, and their involvement can either dilute or strengthen the effects of parental practices. Second, gender norms shape both parental concerns about online safety, particularly regarding daughters, and the kinds of mediation strategies that are deemed acceptable, with restrictive strategies sometimes preferred over active dialogue for reasons rooted in cultural understandings of family hierarchy. Third, the rapid expansion of affordable smartphones and data plans has compressed into less than a decade a transition that took longer in higher-income contexts, leaving many Indian parents without the inherited cultural script for digital mediation that parents in earlier-adopting countries gradually developed. Qualitative work conducted in Tamil Nadu has documented a wide spectrum of parental engagement with digital technologies, from what the authors describe as enthusiastic users to apathetic and non-users, with corresponding variation in mediation styles toward primary school children.

These features mean that interventions and guidelines developed in Western contexts are unlikely to transfer without adaptation, and that culturally embedded research is needed to inform parent education and clinical practice in India and similar settings. The Indian Academy of Pediatrics has issued guidance broadly aligned with international recommendations, but uptake among parents is reported to be modest, and pediatrician-parent conversations about media use remain uncommon.

5. IMPLICATIONS

5.1 For parents and caregivers

The implications for parents that emerge most clearly from the synthesised evidence are not new prohibitions but a shift in framing. The relevant question is less how many minutes of screen time to permit and more how the family is using digital devices to support, or fail to support, the relational and regulatory development of its children. Practical orientations that the evidence supports include protecting specific times and spaces (meals, bedtime routines, the bedroom) as device-free; treating co-use and conversation about content as the default rather than the exception; modelling visible self-regulation by setting one's own phone aside in front of children; and approaching adolescent autonomy in digital matters as a developmental task to be scaffolded with dialogue rather than only restricted with rules. None of these practices requires technical expertise, and all of them are within reach of most families, although structural pressures on parental time will affect their feasibility differently across households.

5.2 For clinicians, paediatricians, and school counsellors

For practitioners working with families, the evidence suggests that screen-related concerns are rarely best addressed in isolation. Problematic digital use in a child or adolescent is often a signal of broader emotional or relational difficulty, and screening for underlying conditions (anxiety, depression, attentional difficulties), as well as assessing the family's emotional climate, is more likely to produce durable change than time-limit advice alone. Brief, structured guidance using frameworks such as the AAP family media plan can be a useful starting point for conversation, but should be paired with assessment of parental emotional availability and parental digital habits. Online and blended parenting programmes have shown promise in supporting parents of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties, and may be particularly suited to settings in which in-person support is difficult to access.

5.3 For schools and educational policy

Schools sit at the intersection of formal education, peer culture, and family practice, and they are increasingly being asked to take on responsibility for digital wellness instruction. Evidence-based curricula on media literacy, social-emotional learning, and digital citizenship can complement family efforts, but only if they are integrated with rather than substituted for parental engagement. Schools can also play a role in reducing pressure on parents by clarifying their own use of digital homework platforms, communication apps, and one-to-one device programmes, all of which can extend children's screen time in ways that fall outside the family's control.

5.4 For research and family policy

Public discussion of children and screens has often outrun the available evidence, oscillating between catastrophic and dismissive narratives. The evidence base supports a more measured stance: digital media in the home are neither uniformly harmful nor benign, and the outcomes that matter for children's emotional maturity depend on family-level practices that are themselves shaped by structural conditions. Policy that takes this seriously will invest in parent education that goes beyond screen-time messaging, in workplace policies that protect parental time and attention, and in research infrastructure capable of producing the longitudinal, culturally specific evidence the field still lacks.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THIS DISCUSSION

Several limitations of the present discussion should be acknowledged. As a discussion paper rather than a systematic review, it does not claim exhaustive coverage of the empirical

literature, and the selection of cited evidence inevitably reflects the author's judgments about salience and quality. The empirical base on which the synthesis rests is itself uneven: cross-sectional designs predominate, longitudinal evidence is more limited, fathers are systematically underrepresented in samples, and effect sizes for many of the relationships discussed are small to moderate, with substantial heterogeneity across studies. The construct of emotional maturity, while operationally defined for the purposes of this paper, is itself culturally inflected, and the dimensions emphasised by Singh and Bhargava in an Indian context may not map exactly onto constructs used in Western research. Finally, the field is moving quickly, and findings reported here will require updating as new evidence accumulates, particularly with respect to the emotional implications of generative artificial intelligence companions, immersive media, and platform design changes that have occurred since most of the cited studies were conducted.

7. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Several priorities for future research follow from the present synthesis. First, longitudinal designs that track parent and child digital practices alongside emotional outcomes across developmental transitions are needed to clarify the directionality of associations that cross-sectional research can only describe. Second, the development and validation of culturally appropriate measurement tools, particularly for South Asian and other underrepresented contexts, would strengthen the comparability and generalisability of findings. Third, the role of fathers, grandparents, and other secondary caregivers in digital mediation requires far more attention than it has received. Fourth, intervention research should move beyond brief educational programmes to test more comprehensive family-level approaches that address parental emotional regulation, relational repair, and structural supports alongside digital mediation skills. Fifth, the rapidly emerging interface between children, generative artificial intelligence, and the home environment, including AI-enabled toys, tutoring systems, and conversational companions, opens an entirely new research agenda whose implications for emotional maturity are at present largely unknown.

8. CONCLUSION

The home remains the developmental crucible in which emotional maturity is forged. The integration of personal digital devices into family life has not displaced this basic fact; it has reshaped the conditions under which it operates. The evidence reviewed in this paper supports the proposition that emotional maturity outcomes depend less on the quantity of children's or

parents' screen exposure than on the quality of attunement, mediation, and modelling that surrounds it. Families who manage to preserve responsive engagement in the presence of devices, who treat digital experience as a topic for ongoing dialogue rather than only for prohibition, and whose own digital habits are visibly regulated appear to support emotional development effectively. Families in which devices have come to substitute for relational engagement, or in which restrictive control has displaced dialogue, appear to face greater risk.

None of these conclusions licenses complacency. The structural pressures driving both parents and children toward devices are real, the affordances of platforms are designed to capture attention rather than support development, and the cultural scripts for digital parenting are still being written in real time. Yet the evidence also supports a measure of optimism: the same caregiving capacities that have always supported emotional maturity, warmth, responsiveness, dialogue, and modelling, remain effective in the digital era. The challenge for parents, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers is to create the conditions under which these capacities can be exercised, and to continue building the evidence base that will inform their exercise in the years to come.

DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author Contributions

Aditi Vyas: Conceptualisation, Literature Search, Data Synthesis, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing. Kuldeep Singh Tomar: Supervision, Conceptualisation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing. Both authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were generated or analysed in preparing this review. All studies discussed are publicly available through the cited references.

Ethics Approval

Ethical approval was not required for this narrative review, as it draws entirely on previously published literature and does not involve the collection of primary data from human or animal participants.

Use of Artificial Intelligence

The authors acknowledge the use of an artificial intelligence language model (Claude, developed by Anthropic) during the preparation of this manuscript. The AI tool assisted with literature synthesis, structural organisation, and early drafting. All AI-generated content was subsequently reviewed, critically evaluated, verified against primary sources, and substantially revised by the authors, who take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript. This disclosure follows the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). The AI tool was not listed as an author, as it does not meet ICMJE authorship criteria.

REFERENCES

American Academy of Pediatrics, Council on Communications and Media. (2016). Media and young minds. *Pediatrics, 138*(5), e20162591.

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2023). *Digital media use in childhood and adolescence: Policy statement and technical report*. American Academy of Pediatrics.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Boniel-Nissim, M., Tabak, I., Mazur, J., Borraccino, A., Brooks, F., Gommans, R., van der Sluijs, W., Zsiros, E., Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Pickett, W., de Matos, M. G., & Finne, E. (2015). Supportive communication with parents moderates the negative effects of electronic media use on life satisfaction during adolescence. *International Journal of Public Health, 60*(2), 189-198.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. Basic Books.

Braune-Krickau, K., Schneebeli, L., Pehlke-Milde, J., Gemperle, M., Koch, R., & von Wyl, A. (2021). Smartphones in the nursery: Parental smartphone use and parental sensitivity and responsiveness within parent-child interaction in early childhood (0-5 years). *Infant Mental Health Journal, 42*(2), 161-175.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Commodari, E., La Rosa, V. L., Carnemolla, G., & Parisi, J. (2024). The psychological impact of the lockdown on Italian university students during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: Psychological experiences, health risk perceptions, distance

learning, and future perspectives. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, 12*(2).

Coyne, S. M., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Fraser, A. M., Fellows, K., & Day, R. D. (2017). Media time = family time: Positive media use in families with adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 32*(5), 583-608.

Doty, J. L., Nesbit, T. S., LaMontagne, L. G., & Rabideau, C. R. (2023). Longitudinal associations of perceived media parenting with adolescent mental health: Mediation by social efficacy and online risk. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 34*.

Glassman, J., Humphreys, K. L., Yeung, S., Smith, M., Jauregui, A., Milstein, A., & Sanders, L. (2021). Parents' perspectives on using artificial intelligence to reduce technology interference during early childhood: Cross-sectional online survey. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23*(3), e19461.

Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry, 26*(1), 1-26.

Indian Academy of Pediatrics. (2022). *Guidelines for screen time and digital wellness in children*. Indian Academy of Pediatrics.

Komanchuk, J., Toews, A. J., Marshall, S., Mackay, L. J., Hayden, K. A., Cameron, J. L., Duffett-Leger, L., & Letourneau, N. (2023). Impacts of parental technoference on parent-child relationships and child health and developmental outcomes: A scoping review. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 26*(8), 565-585.

Konok, V., Bunford, N., & Miklósi, Á. (2019). Associations between child mobile use and digital parenting style in Hungarian families. *Journal of Children and Media, 14*(1), 91-109.

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2018). European research on children's internet use: Assessing the past and anticipating the future. *New Media & Society, 20*(3), 1103-1122.

Mackay, L. J., Komanchuk, J., Hayden, K. A., & Letourneau, N. (2022). Impacts of parental technoference on parent-child relationships and child health and development: A scoping review protocol. *Systematic Reviews, 11*(1), 45.

McDaniel, B. T., & Coyne, S. M. (2016). "Technoference": The interference of technology in couple relationships and implications for women's personal and relational well-being. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 5*(1), 85-98.

McDaniel, B. T., & Radesky, J. S. (2018). Technoference: Parent distraction with technology and associations with child behavior problems. *Child Development, 89*(1), 100-109.

Modecki, K. L., Goldberg, R. E., Wisniewski, P., & Orben, A. (2022). What is digital parenting? A systematic review of past measurement and blueprint for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 17*(6), 1673-1691.

Nathanson, A. I. (2008). Parental mediation strategies. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Coyne, S. M. (2011). "Turn that thing off!" Parent and adolescent predictors of proactive media monitoring. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*(4), 705-715.

Patel, B., Trivedi, M., Solanki, A., Patel, J., Bansal, R. K., & Patel, S. (2024). Associations between smartphone addiction, parenting styles, and mental well-being among adolescents aged 15-19 years in Gujarat, India. *BMC Public Health, 24*, 2470.

Radesky, J. S., Schaller, A., Yeo, S. L., Weeks, H. M., & Robb, M. B. (2024). *Constant companion: A week in the life of a young person's smartphone use*. Common Sense Media.

Reid Chassiakos, Y. L., Radesky, J., Christakis, D., Moreno, M. A., & Cross, C. (2016). Children and adolescents and digital media. *Pediatrics, 138*(5), e20162593.

Santos, R. M. S., Mendes, C. G., Bressani, G. Y. S., Ventura, S. A., Nogueira, Y. J. A., Miranda, D. M., & Romano-Silva, M. A. (2023). The associations between screen time and mental health in adolescents: A systematic review. *BMC Psychology, 11*(1), 127.

Singh, Y., & Bhargava, M. (1990). *Manual for Emotional Maturity Scale (EMS)*. National Psychological Corporation.

Sohn, S. Y., Rees, P., Wildridge, B., Kalk, N. J., & Carter, B. (2019). Prevalence of problematic smartphone usage and associated mental health outcomes amongst children and young people: A systematic review, meta-analysis and GRADE of the evidence. *BMC Psychiatry, 19*(1), 356.

Stockdale, L. A., Coyne, S. M., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2018). Parent and child technoference and socioemotional behavioral outcomes: A nationally representative study of 10- to 20-year-old adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior, 88*, 219-226.

Tan, T. X., Wang, Y., Cheah, C. S. L., & Wang, G.-H. (2024). Digital parenting and child outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 14*, 100413.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Associations between screen time and lower psychological well-being among children and adolescents: Evidence from a population-based study. *Preventive Medicine Reports, 12*, 271-283.

Vasconcellos, R. P., Lopes, B. M., Ribeiro, T. T. S. B., & Pinheiro, M. H. (2021). Adolescents' screen time and mental health: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Adolescence, 91*(1), 49-71.

World Health Organization. (2019). *Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age*. World Health Organization.