THE

Screen Time

PLAYBOOK

A research-backed guide to screens, kids, and keeping your sanity

JACK HARTLEY

Dad of Two

FamilyForce Publishing | familyforce.com

Published by FamilyForce Publishing

familyforce.com

First published 2026

Contents

A few disclaimers

- A note on medical advice: This book is based on published clinical studies, academic journals, pediatric guidelines, books, the author's experience, and a variety of other studies. It is not a substitute for guidance from your child's pediatrician. Every child is different. If something in this book doesn't match what you're seeing, trust your doctor over this guidebook.

- A note on individual children: This book is written for typically developing kids. If your child has ADHD, is on the autism spectrum, or has sensory processing differences, these timelines and thresholds may not fit as written. Check with your pediatrician before holding these guidelines too tightly.

- A note on pronouns: I refer to the child as "he" throughout because I have two sons. Everything in this book applies equally to daughters unless stated otherwise.

- If you are parenting solo: everything in this book applies. Where the book refers to a partner or co-caregiver, substitute whoever is your primary support: a grandparent, a trusted adult, a daycare provider. The consistency principle is the same: the fewer mixed signals your child receives across caregivers, the better the outcomes.

Preface: The Restaurant

My First Son was three years old.

We were at a barbecue place in Dallas, the kind where you wait forty minutes and it's worth it, and he started losing his mind. Crying, going boneless, rejecting everything we offered. The booth next to us had gone quiet. The booth across had stopped pretending not to watch.

My wife tried a snack. I tried the menu. He got louder.

Then I reached into my pocket, pulled up YouTube Kids, and handed him my phone.

He was quiet in four seconds.

I remember the relief. I also remember something else I couldn't name at the time: the specific feeling of having solved the wrong problem. It wasn't the first time I'd used a screen to stop a meltdown. But it was the first time I felt clearly what I was doing. In the car on the way home, he asked for the phone again. Then at bedtime. Then first thing the next morning.

I had taught him something in that restaurant booth. Not what I meant to teach him.

When Second Son came along, I'd done the reading. Not blogs. Not parenting forums. The actual research: developmental psychology, pediatric media studies, the science of reward loops and emotional regulation. What I found was more specific and more actionable than anything the headlines were telling me.

The goal isn't a screen-free childhood. The goal is a kid who can put the phone down. This book is what I found.

> - If you want to go straight to your child's age, start with Appendix A at the back, then come back to read the chapters that apply.

CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1: You Haven't Ruined Them

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

I want to start with the thing most screen time books skip.

You have not ruined your child.

I know that's not how it feels. I know it's not what the pediatrician implied at the two-year well visit. The guilt around screen time is different from the guilt around other parenting decisions. It's not "did I do this right." It's "have I already done the damage." It sits heavier.

There's also a second kind of guilt I want to address: the guilt of the parent who used screens not out of carelessness but out of necessity. The mom who's been on since six in the morning, touched-out by noon, hasn't finished a hot meal in two years, and hands over the phone in the grocery store parking lot because there's no backup coming and this is the only tool left. That's not a parenting failure. That's what happens when you're running the whole thing alone and something has to give.

This book is for when you have capacity to look at the patterns. Not for when you're just getting through the day. Those are different moments. If you're in the hard season right now and can only do one thing, turn off autoplay. That's it. Everything else can wait.

My First Son got screens early. He was eight months old when I started sitting him in front of a tablet. It worked. He'd sit still for forty-five minutes, and I could get things done. By eighteen months he was getting two to three hours a day. Some days more. The background TV was on most of the time. I thought I was within a reasonable range.

What I was doing, which I didn't understand yet, was building a set of patterns, in him and in myself, that would take years to unlearn.

First Son is fine. He's curious and funny and argues about everything. The screens didn't break him. But they made things harder than they needed to be. And most of what they made harder was preventable.

By the time Second Son arrived, I had the research. I made specific changes based on specific findings. Same house, same parents, same imperfect everything. The difference was information.

THE SCIENCE

Screen time research has a reporting problem. The studies are precise. The headlines are blunt. What gets lost in translation is the nuance that actually tells you what to do.

A 2019 study by Madigan and colleagues, published in JAMA Pediatrics, followed 2,500 children from age two through five. Higher screen time at age two was associated with poorer developmental scores at three and five. Real, documented. What the headlines missed: the effect was dose-dependent and context-dependent. The largest negative outcomes appeared in children watching four or more hours per day of passive, fast-paced content with no parental involvement. Children at one to two hours of quality content showed weaker associations.

A separate study by economists Kearney and Levine, who analyzed Sesame Street's early broadcast reach, found that children with access to the show were significantly more likely to stay at grade level in elementary school. Educational screen content, well-designed, delivers measurable cognitive gains.

The picture isn't "screens harm children." It's more specific: passive, high-volume, fast-paced, unsupported screen use displaces the things that matter most: conversation, play, sleep, responsive adults. That displacement has costs. When screen use is intentional and bounded, the picture is different.

The effects are also malleable. A 2023 review found that parental changes to screen habits, reducing passive viewing, improving content quality, shifting timing away from meals and bedtime, produced measurable improvements in child outcomes within weeks. Not years. Weeks.

The next four years of your child's screen life will matter more than the last two.

> THE LESSON
>
> Guilt is the wrong response to this information. Specific changes are the right response.
>
> That's what the rest of this book is.

TRY THIS

1. Don't start with guilt. Start with one change. If you're in the hard season right now, the only thing on your list is turning off autoplay. That's it. Everything else waits.
2. Read Appendix A now. Find your child's age range and see where you are. Don't score yourself. Just get oriented.

3. Identify one pattern you want to change. Not five. One. Write it down. "I want to stop using the phone to stop tantrums." That's a chapter. Start there.
4. If you have a co-parent, share what you just read before going further. The rest of this book only works if you're aligned. You don't need to agree on everything today. You need to read the same pages.
5. Let go of the last two years. The research showing significant harm measures years of sustained, high-volume, unsupported screen use. A parent who just read a book and is ready to make changes is not that parent. You're starting now. That's what matters.

CHAPTER 2

Chapter 2: The First Eighteen Months

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

When First Son was around a year old, I found a YouTube playlist of educational videos: letters, shapes, colors, and played it while he was on the floor nearby. I figured he might absorb something.

I didn't understand what learning actually is at that age.

Learning at twelve months is contingent. It requires a real human to respond to what the child does and says. The video couldn't respond to First Son. It played whether he looked at it or left the room. It wasn't teaching him. It was occupying him.

With Second Son, one rule for the first eighteen months: no passive screens. The one exception was video calls, and watching those calls is what made the research real to me.

My mother was on FaceTime when Second Son was around sixteen months. She held up a rubber duck. "What's that?" He pointed at the screen and said something close to "duck." She lit up and held up a spoon. He responded again. She responded back. I was sitting across the room watching my son have a conversation, through a screen, with a person who was responding to him in real time. That's what the research is measuring. Not the screen. The response.

THE SCIENCE

The "video deficit effect" is what researchers call it: young children learn significantly less from two-dimensional screens than from the same content delivered by a live person. The gap exists because learning from a screen requires a level of representational thinking (connecting a flat image to a three-dimensional reality) that the brain is still building before age two.

The deficit is largest at twelve months, decreases through the second year, and mostly resolves for simple content around age three.

The exception is video calls. A 2014 study by Roseberry, Hirsh-Pasek, and Golinkoff published in Child Development divided toddlers ages twenty-four to thirty months into three groups: live in-person interaction, live video call, or a recording of the same interaction. The first two groups learned new verbs. The third didn't. The variable wasn't the screen. It was contingency, the loop where your child does something and a real person responds to it. Whether the adult could actually respond to the child in real time.

FaceTime with a grandparent who responds when the child points and laughs and babbles is developmentally different from YouTube. Even for a twelve-month-old.

If your child has already had more passive screen time before eighteen months than this chapter recommends (most have), what matters most is what you do from here. The brain is still building. Keep reading.

Background TV matters here too. Research by Christakis and colleagues found that when adult TV plays in a room with an infant or toddler, parents speak approximately 770 fewer words per hour to the child. Not because they're bad parents. Because the TV competes for partial attention and reduces the frequency and depth of parent speech. The TV doesn't have to be aimed at the child to affect them.

> THE LESSON
>
> Before eighteen months: no passive screens.
>
> Video calls with real people who actually respond to your child are the exception. Everything else waits.

TRY THIS

1. If your child is under eighteen months, the rule is simple: no passive screens. Put it on the fridge. Video calls with grandparents and family who interact in real time are fine. Everything else waits.
2. Set up one video call this week with a family member who will actually engage: hold up objects, ask questions, respond to what your child does. Watch what happens when a real person responds versus when a video plays.
3. Turn off the background TV during floor time. Do it for one hour today. Notice how many more times your child looks at you rather than toward the TV.
4. If your child is already past eighteen months and has had passive screens, don't restart the clock. Just apply the rules from here. The brain is still building. You haven't missed the window.
5. When you want to put a video on for your under-18-month-old, ask yourself: is a real person available instead? A sibling, a neighbor, a call to grandma? The live option is almost always better. Default to it first.

CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3: What the Screen Sees

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

When First Son was two and a half, I checked the watch history on the tablet one evening after he went to bed.

I didn't recognize half of what was on the list. Fast-talking hosts. Toy unboxing. A genre I later learned was called "surprise egg videos," someone opening plastic eggs for thirty minutes. I had been in the room. I hadn't been watching.

With Second Son, my wife and I chose every episode before it played. No autoplay. No default queue. When he was two, he latched onto a Ms. Rachel episode about shapes and wanted to watch it every day for two weeks. My wife had had enough by day five. "Can we please show him something new?"

I explained the repetition research. She looked at me over her coffee. "You're telling me the twelfth time is the good one?"

We left it on. Three days later, Second Son pointed at the corner of the coffee table and said "triangle." My wife didn't say anything. She didn't have to.

THE SCIENCE

Pacing is the most studied variable in children's content design. A 2011 study by Lillard and Peterson, published in Pediatrics, showed preschoolers nine minutes of SpongeBob, nine minutes of Caillou, or nine minutes of nothing. The SpongeBob group performed significantly worse on executive function measures immediately after. SpongeBob averages approximately 5 to 6 scene changes per minute (one every 11 seconds, per Lillard and Peterson). Caillou averages around 2. Fast-paced content primes the brain for passive stimulation and makes deliberate, slow cognitive tasks harder.

Content quality is real. Ms. Rachel uses five specific practices supported by language acquisition research: parentese (slower, higher-pitched speech), repetition of target vocabulary, multimodal anchoring (word plus gesture plus image), deliberate pauses that invite a child's response, and simplified concrete vocabulary. The AAP noted in 2024 that her methods align with what's known to help children learn from media. She is the best option available for a child watching alone.

She is not the same as a live interaction. Her pause invites a response but can't receive one. Pseudo-contingency is better than nothing. It's not the same as actual contingency.

Here's the fastest way to tell if a show is too fast: count the scene changes in sixty seconds. More than 6 cuts and you're in SpongeBob territory. Fewer than 3 and you're in the right range.

The co-viewing multiplier: a parent who watches with the child and connects what's on screen to the real world dramatically increases the value of the content. The show introduces the concept. The parent anchors it. Ten engaged minutes with a slow-paced show beats sixty passive ones.

The learning hierarchy, strongest to weakest:

1. Live conversation with a caregiver
2. Video call with a person who responds
3. High-quality educational content, slow-paced: Ms. Rachel, Sesame Street
4. Quality entertainment with rich language: Daniel Tiger, certain Bluey episodes
5. Fast-paced stimulation content

> THE LESSON
>
> You are the algorithm. Choose the content before it plays. Be there when you can.

TRY THIS

1. Count the scene changes on whatever is playing right now. Sixty seconds. More than 6 and you're in fast-paced territory. Fewer than 3 and you're in the right range. One number tells you a lot.
2. Queue up one Ms. Rachel episode before your child's next screen time. Watch it with them. Talk about what's happening. The show works better when you're in the room.
3. Turn off autoplay today on every device your child uses. It's a setting. It takes thirty seconds. This is the single highest-leverage action in this book.
4. Run the learning hierarchy on your child's current playlist. Slot each show into the five levels. If most of what they're watching is at level four or five, swap one show per week moving up the list.
5. Resist the urge to introduce new content as soon as they've mastered the current show. Repetition builds comprehension before it builds boredom. When your two-year-old wants to watch the same episode for the tenth time, let them.

CHAPTER 4

Chapter 4: The Off Switch

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

Here's the moment I knew something had gone wrong.

First Son was two and a half. We were at a park he loved, and he scraped his knee on the slide. Not a serious fall. But instead of coming to me, instead of crying it out, he looked at me and said one word.

"Phone."

Not "Daddy." Phone.

I had built an association so consistent that when he was hurt, his first instinct was to reach for a screen. Not his father.

I had been using screens to manage his emotions since he was around eighteen months. Meltdown at a restaurant: phone. Upset in the car: phone. Refusing to get dressed: phone. It worked every time in about thirty seconds. So I stopped thinking of it as a strategy. It was just what I did.

What I didn't understand was what I was teaching him every time.

With Second Son, the screen was never the first option. When he was upset I went through the actual sequence: get down on the floor with him, hold him, say the feeling out loud, "you're frustrated, I can see that," even when he couldn't confirm it or respond. For a toddler with few words, naming the feeling isn't a conversation. It's a signal that you understand. That signal alone, said calmly, often stopped the escalation before it peaked. Then redirection: outside, a truck, anything physical. If all of that failed and the situation was genuinely past managing (a long flight, a restaurant miscalculation), a screen might come out.

It felt harder in the short term. It was the actual work.

THE SCIENCE

Researchers call it "Parental Digital Emotion Regulation," or PDER, using a screen specifically to soothe a distressed child.

A June 2024 study in Frontiers in Psychology tested what happened when parents regularly used devices as the primary response to toddler distress. The children showed significantly poorer anger and frustration management at follow-up. The mechanism is straightforward: emotional regulation is a learned skill. It develops through practice. A child whose distress is consistently interrupted by a screen at the thirty-second mark never completes that learning.

A 2024 longitudinal study found that regular screen-soothing in the first three years was associated with altered brain networks governing emotional regulation at age thirteen: higher anxiety, slower decision-making. The effect was delayed and compounding.

The key word in this research is "habitual." The harmful pattern is consistent, reflexive use as the first response. Occasional use as a last resort, after real comfort strategies have been tried and failed, is different.

Here's the test: when your child is distressed, what do they reach for first? If they reach for you, you're in the occasional pattern. If they reach for the device before reaching for you, the screen has displaced you as the primary source of comfort.

> THE LESSON
>
> When you hand over the screen to stop a tantrum, you're not protecting your child from discomfort.
>
> You're teaching them they can't handle it. They can.

TRY THIS

1. Memorize the sequence before you need it: get on the floor, hold them, name the feeling out loud, then redirect. "You're frustrated, I can see that." Practice saying it right now. You'll need it when you're tired and in a parking lot.
2. Identify the one high-tension moment that reliably triggers the screen reflex for you. Morning routine? Car rides? Grocery store? Choose that one moment and commit to running the sequence instead, for one week.
3. When the sequence fails and a screen comes out, that's okay. The goal isn't perfection. The goal is making the screen the last option, not the first. One week of making it second changes the pattern.
4. Ask yourself the test question: when my child is upset, what do they reach for first? You or the device? If it's the device, the pattern is already set. The sequence is how you reset it.

5. Talk to your co-parent before the next hard moment, not during it. Agree on the sequence. Agree on what "last resort" means for your family. Alignment here matters more than in almost any other chapter.

CHAPTER 5

Chapter 5: The Algorithm Doesn't Know Your Kid

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

There is no person on the other end of the queue.

When one video ends and the next one starts, nobody made that choice. A system made it, a system with one goal: keep watching. Not whether the next video is appropriate for a tired three-year-old who should be heading to bed. Watch time.

With First Son, I let the queue run. I told myself I'd redirect if something inappropriate appeared. I wasn't present enough. Nobody is. The queue moved faster than my attention.

With Second Son: no autoplay, ever. It's a device setting. Takes ten seconds to change. A planned thirty-minute window stays thirty minutes when a human controls what comes next.

We were also slow to add new content. When he found something he liked, we watched it again for weeks before introducing something new. Repetition feels boring to adults. For a two-year-old, it's how comprehension builds.

THE SCIENCE

The distinction between educational apps and addictive apps is structural, not cosmetic.

Educational apps like Khan Academy Kids are built around mastery: the child must do something to progress, and mistakes pause the experience. Rewards are tied to completion. There's no autoplay, no streak mechanic, no push notification.

Addictive games use variable ratio reinforcement, the same schedule B.F. Skinner identified as the most resistant to extinction. Rewards arrive unpredictably after a variable number of actions. This is the schedule used by slot machines. The World Health Organization added gaming disorder to the International Classification of Diseases in 2019.

The three-question test applies to any app or game:

1. Does it work without the child doing anything?

Autoplay, continuous animation, progression without input. If yes: addictive architecture.

2. Does it continue even after mistakes?

No mastery requirement. If yes: addictive architecture.

3. Does it have a streak, notification, or come-back mechanic?

Daily rewards, push notifications, social comparison. If yes: addictive architecture.

Khan Academy Kids has none of these features. Roblox has all three. These are not similar apps rated differently. They're built on opposite design philosophies.

One more thing: even an app that passes all three questions is a ceiling, not a floor. Mastery-based educational apps are better than addictive ones. They are still not outdoor play, conversation, books, or sleep. Pass the test, then set a time limit anyway.

> THE LESSON
>
> You are the algorithm. Turn off autoplay. Know what's playing. Run the three questions on anything new before it goes on the device.

TRY THIS

1. Turn off autoplay right now on every platform your child uses: YouTube Kids, Netflix, Disney Plus, the tablet settings. This is not optional. It's ten seconds per platform.
2. Open your child's device and run the three-question test on every app installed. Any app that passes all three questions gets a time limit. Apps that pass all three questions and have no clear educational purpose come off the device.
3. Replace one high-use addictive app with Khan Academy Kids this week. Don't announce it as a trade. Just swap it and see what happens.
4. Build a short content queue before every screen session, not during it. Three episodes or two apps, chosen by you. When the queue is done, the session is done. No negotiating at the end.
5. Before any new app goes on the device, run the three questions. Make it a household rule. If your co-parent or another caregiver wants to add something, the same test applies.

CHAPTER 6

Chapter 6: The Bedtime Thief

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

For a long time I thought First Son was just a bad sleeper.

He took forty-five minutes to fall asleep most nights. He woke between bedtime and midnight. He was overtired more days than not. I attributed it to temperament.

What I didn't connect, for longer than I should have, was that he was watching television until about thirty minutes before we tried to put him down. The show felt like winding down. It wasn't.

With Second Son, the sixty-minute rule was my wife's idea before it was mine.

She'd read about pre-sleep arousal while I was still focused on blue light. She came to me one evening and said: "I don't think it's the light. I think it's the show. He's wired after screens regardless of what he's watching, and it takes him forever to come down." She wanted to try cutting screens an hour before bed and see what happened. I thought sixty minutes was a lot. She held the line.

I'd come home after a long day, find him in the bath and already winding down, and suggest one episode before bed. "We said sixty minutes," she'd say. Every time. She was right every time. What I eventually understood was that I wasn't trying to break the rule. I was just tired and looking for an easy transition. The rule existed precisely for those moments.

THE SCIENCE

The conventional explanation for why screens disrupt sleep is blue light, the high-frequency wavelength emitted by screens that suppresses melatonin. This is real. For young children especially, a 2022 University of Colorado Boulder study found melatonin suppression of 70 to 99 percent from light exposure in the hour before bed in preschool-aged children, whose eyes are more sensitive than adults'.

But here's the finding that most coverage misses: a November 2025 study from Ruhr University Bochum compared tablet use versus reading a picture book at bedtime. Melatonin levels weren't significantly different between the two groups. The blue light from the tablet, at normal viewing conditions, didn't suppress melatonin meaningfully more than the ambient room light during a bedtime reading session.

The bigger problem is arousal, not light. Fast-paced, stimulating content activates the sympathetic nervous system. A child coming off thirty minutes of any screen is neurologically activated. The shift to sleep-readiness takes time. The research points to a sixty-minute window as what's needed. Calm content helps but doesn't eliminate the window.

This is not about blue light. It's about the show. Blue-light glasses won't fix it.

> THE LESSON
>
> Screens off sixty minutes before bed. Not because of the photons, because of what the show does to the nervous system. Turn it off. That's the rule.

TRY THIS

1. Identify your child's bedtime and count back sixty minutes. That's the screens-off time. Write it on the fridge or set a phone alarm with that label. The rule needs to be visible to survive tired evenings.
2. Tell your co-parent today. The sixty-minute rule only works if both people hold it. Discuss what fills the window instead: bath, books, quiet play. Have an answer before someone asks "can we just watch one more?"
3. When you're tempted to bend the rule, say the phrase out loud: "It's the show, not the light." Blue-light glasses won't fix this. Only the window does.
4. Hold the sixty-minute rule for ten consecutive days before you evaluate it. Sleep changes take time to show up. If you're checking after three days, you're checking too early.
5. If the transition off screens is consistently a battle, try giving a five-minute warning before screens-off every time. The warning isn't a negotiation. It's a clock. "Five more minutes, then we're done." Then be done.

CHAPTER 7

Chapter 7: The TV in the Background

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

One evening when Second Son was about eighteen months, I was on the floor playing blocks with him while the TV was on across the room. He picked up a red block, held it out toward me, and said something. Not a clear word, but clearly directed at me. I said "mm-hmm" without looking.

He tried again. I said "yeah, buddy" and turned back toward the TV.

My wife was in the kitchen and saw the whole thing. She came in, turned the TV off, and sat down next to us. "He's been trying to tell you something for a minute." I looked at him. He was still holding out the block. I took it. His face changed completely.

That was the last week we had the TV on as background noise.

The house felt strange at first. My wife said it felt too quiet. I told her what I'd read: that when the TV is on, we talk to him less, we respond to him less, and he knows it. She thought about that for a moment. "So it's not background noise for him. It's static." That was a better way to put it than anything I'd found in the research.

THE SCIENCE

Dimitri Christakis and colleagues at Seattle Children's Research Institute produced a consistent finding across multiple studies: when adult TV plays in a room with a parent and a young child, the parent speaks approximately 770 fewer words per hour to the child.

Not because they're bad parents. Because the TV claims partial attention and reduces the frequency and depth of parent speech. The child notices. Studies using gaze-tracking show toddlers orient toward background TV on average once every two minutes, even when the content is designed for adults. Their play is fragmented. The parent-child interaction, the most important thing happening in that room, is diminished.

The quality of speech also shifts. Parent language becomes more directive ("stop that," "come here") and less conversational and elaborative. Both matter for language development. Background TV nudges parents in the wrong direction on both measures.

> **THE LESSON**
>
> The TV doesn't have to be aimed at your child to affect them. It affects them through you. Turn it off when it's not for anyone.

TRY THIS

1. Make a rule for your household: the TV is on for a reason, and off when that reason ends. Not "on" as the default state. Off as the default state.
2. Replace one daily background-TV session with music or silence. Pick the window when your child is most likely to be reaching for you: morning play, post-nap floor time, dinner prep. Try it for one week.
3. The next time the TV is on and your child tries to show you something, turn the TV off. Not down. Off. Then look at what they were trying to show you. Notice what happens to them when you do.
4. If silence feels uncomfortable, that's information. It means the TV has been filling a gap. That gap is okay to sit with. Your child will fill it.
5. If your co-parent is the one who tends to leave the TV on, have the conversation before the next session, not during it. "I read something interesting about background TV and kids" is a better opener than reaching for the remote in the middle of their show.

CHAPTER 8

Chapter 8: Your Phone

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

When First Son was two and a half, he brought me a truck to show me. A small plastic dump truck, holding it at about my eye level. I was looking at my phone.

He stood there for a few seconds. Made the sound again, louder. I looked up, said "cool truck," and looked back down. He stood a moment longer. Then he put the truck down and walked away.

He'd tried to show me something. Twice. I'd communicated, twice, that what I was doing mattered more.

I'm not telling this story for the guilt. I'm telling it because it's the story that makes the research legible.

With Second Son, one rule for floor time: phone face-down, across the room. Not turned off. Not in another building. Far enough away that reaching for it required a deliberate choice. I broke the rule. Breaking it was the point, because breaking it meant I knew I had a rule, and I noticed when I broke it.

THE SCIENCE

Brandon McDaniel and Jenny Radesky have studied "technoference," technology interfering with parent-child interaction, more than any other researchers in this field. Their consistent finding: parental phone use during time with young children is negatively associated with language, emotional regulation, behavior, and attachment outcomes.

The mechanism is the broken contingency loop. A child's development depends on sending a signal (a look, a sound, a word) and having an adult respond. That cycle, repeated thousands of times a day, is how language is built and how attachment forms. When the phone wins in that moment, the cycle breaks.

The critical finding from a 2025 study following 1,200 families over four years: harm was driven by frequency, not duration. A parent who checked their phone thirty times for thirty seconds during a play session produced worse outcomes than a parent who made one uninterrupted fifteen-minute call in another room. Constant small interruptions break the contingency loop more damagingly than one long break followed by repair.

It's not about total minutes. It's about whether you're reliably available when your child reaches for you.

> **THE LESSON**
>
> Your child is watching you more than they're watching the screen. What they see you do with technology is their first lesson in what technology is for. The phone face-down is not about your habits. It's about what attention looks like when it's actually given.

TRY THIS

1. Pick two daily windows when your child is most likely to reach for you: morning floor time, after-nap play, dinner. Phone goes face-down across the room during those windows. Not in your pocket. Across the room.
2. Don't try to be perfect. The goal is to notice when you break the rule. Breaking it means the rule exists. Noticing means you're changing the pattern.
3. When your child tries to show you something this week, put the phone down completely before responding. Eye contact first. Then words. That sequence is the whole lesson.
4. Do a one-week count: how many times do you check your phone during a floor-time session? You don't have to change it yet. Just count it. The number will motivate the change more than any chapter can.
5. Ask yourself the question: is this the relationship with technology I want my child to have? What you model is their first curriculum. The phone face-down is not a sacrifice. It's a demonstration.

CHAPTER 9

Chapter 9: The Eyes

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

Something is happening to children's eyes.

In Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan, myopia rates in children have reached 50 to 80 percent, rates that didn't exist a generation ago. The genetics of those populations haven't changed. What changed is how children spend their time: more close work, less outdoor light.

The same trend is tracking in the United States and Europe, roughly twenty years behind.

My wife noticed it first. Second Son was three, watching something on the tablet, and she looked up from across the room and said "that's too close, right?" I walked over and tried the rule I'd read about: arm bent, elbow to fingertip is the minimum distance. His fingertip was practically on the screen. I moved the tablet back. He looked annoyed for about four seconds, then forgot about it.

We started calling it the elbow rule. By the time he was four, he'd correct himself without being asked.

THE SCIENCE

Myopia happens when the eyeball grows too long, just a millimeter or two past where it should stop, and light ends up focusing in front of the retina instead of on it. Two things drive that growth: too much close work, and not enough outdoor light.

The outdoor light part surprised me. Daylight above 1,000 lux triggers dopamine release in the retina. That dopamine tells the eye to stop growing. Indoors, even a bright room rarely hits 500 lux. Outside, even on a cloudy day, you're at 10,000 or more. Any outdoor environment, on any weather day, exceeds 1,000 lux.

Taiwan's national intervention is the clearest evidence. In 2010, the government launched "Tian-tian 120": 120 minutes of outdoor time daily for all primary school children. Before the program, myopia rates in preschool-aged children were around 15 percent. After two years, rates dropped to 8 percent. Nature covered the results in June 2024.

Two hours outside. That was the entire intervention.

On viewing distance: the minimum recommended distance for tablets is 35 to 45 centimeters. Below 25 centimeters, myopia progression risk increases significantly. Children hold devices closer than this naturally. The Elbow Rule: with the child's arm bent, the elbow-to-fingertip distance is the minimum. If they can touch the screen with a bent arm, they're too close.

Blue-light glasses don't prevent myopia. The evidence doesn't support them for axial elongation. Outdoor time does.

> THE LESSON
>
> You can't filter your way out of this problem. Two hours outside, most days, starting now. Any outdoor space counts.

TRY THIS

1. Check viewing distance right now. Walk over to wherever your child watches their screen and test the Elbow Rule. Bent arm, elbow to fingertip. If they can touch the screen, the device moves back. Do it today.
2. Put a sticky note on the tablet case: "Elbow Rule." That reminder will do more work than you think over a year of daily use.
3. Start the outdoor habit this week. You don't have to hit two hours on day one. Start with thirty minutes outside every day and build from there. Any outdoor space on any weather day counts.
4. Book an eye appointment if your child hasn't had one in the past year. Myopia often starts without obvious symptoms. An annual check at the optometrist is the right cadence once your child is regularly using screens.
5. Teach your child the 20-20-20 rule in a way they can remember: every twenty minutes, look at something twenty feet away for twenty seconds. For a preschooler, make it concrete: "See that tree? Look at it and count to twenty." Attach it to a regular break point in their screen session.

CHAPTER 10

Chapter 10: The Three Rules

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

At some point when Second Son was two, I tried to explain our approach to a friend at a birthday party. I listed everything: content selection, no autoplay, the sixty-minute rule, phone face-down, background TV, outdoor time.

He looked at me the way people look at someone who has read too much about something.

"Is it really that complicated?" he asked.

He was right. I'd given him the inventory when he needed the structure.

My wife and I went home and wrote three things on an index card and put it on the refrigerator. It's still there.

THE THREE RULES

Rule 1: You choose the content. The algorithm doesn't.

Before anything plays, a person in this family has made an active choice about what's playing. No autoplay. No default queue. If we haven't decided, the screen stays off. When you're choosing, you control the pacing, the design, what comes next. When the algorithm is choosing, it's optimizing for watch time.

Rule 2: Screens off sixty minutes before bed.

Not winding down. Off. The sixty minutes protect the nervous system's shift from activated to ready-to-sleep. The screen-off anchor protects the routine that was already there.

Rule 3: Phone face-down when you're with them.

During floor time, mealtimes, the moments when your child is most likely to be reaching for your attention: phone face-down, across the room. Not always. But consistently during the windows that count.

THE SCIENCE

Each rule targets one specific thing. Rule 1 is about who controls the content. Rule 2 is about the arousal window before sleep. Rule 3 is about the contingency loop and what breaks it. Three different problems. Three direct responses.

Rules that require daily tracking or complex decision-making collapse exactly when they matter most: tired evenings, disrupted routines, sickness, travel. Three rules you can hold most of the time, across years, without doing math. That's what actually works.

> THE LESSON
>
> Simple is not the same as easy. Simple means you know exactly what you're trying to do. Start here.

TRY THIS

1. Write the three rules on an index card and put it on the refrigerator today. Not as a reminder for your child. As a reminder for you on tired evenings when the shortcuts feel necessary.
2. Do it with your co-parent. Read this chapter together. Agree on what "mostly" means for your family. You're not aiming for perfect. You're aiming for consistent enough that the pattern holds across years.
3. If all three rules feel like too much, start with Rule 1 only. Turn off autoplay and choose the content for one week. Add Rule 2 in week two. Add Rule 3 in week three. Sequential beats simultaneous.
4. In two weeks, review the index card. Which rule is holding? Which one is slipping? Reinforce the slip. Don't restart the whole thing. Patch the one that's weak.
5. When someone in your household bends a rule, don't treat it as a failure. Treat it as information. "Rule 2 keeps getting bent on Friday nights" tells you something. Either the rule needs adjustment or the Friday night routine does. Figure out which.

CHAPTER 11

Chapter 11: When It Falls Apart

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

When Second Son was four, we moved.

Three weeks of boxes and disrupted routines. He watched more than an hour of screens most days. Autoplay slipped back on. I found it running and couldn't remember turning it on. The sixty-minute rule became a suggestion, then stopped being that.

By week three, he was having meltdowns when screens went off that I recognized from First Son. Demanding the phone when he was upset. Taking longer to fall asleep.

I had been careful for four years and had slid, in three weeks, into a pattern I knew.

What I didn't do was treat it as a catastrophe.

I turned off autoplay. Reinstated the sixty-minute rule. Went back to the emotional regulation sequence. The first three days were harder. Day five was better. Day ten we were largely back to the baseline we'd built. The move took three weeks to break the pattern. The reset took ten days.

THE SCIENCE

Habits don't disappear when disrupted. They're suppressed. The underlying neural pathway remains. This is discouraging in one direction: the old pattern waits for the conditions that built it, stress, exhaustion, disruption. It's encouraging in the other direction: rebuilding after a relapse is faster than building from scratch. You're restoring a path you already established, not creating a new one.

The pattern over months and years is the variable that predicts outcomes, not a single bad week. The studies showing significant developmental harm measure sustained, high-volume, low-quality exposure over years. A three-week slide during a household move is not that.

For resetting the digital pacifier pattern specifically: don't try to change everything at once. Choose one predictable high-tension moment, the meltdown that happens at the same time every day, and hold the sequence for that one situation for a week. Then expand. All-at-once resets fail because the intensity of the first days, multiplied across every transition, is unsustainable.

THE LESSON

You are not trying to be perfect. You're trying to maintain a pattern that's good enough, most of the time, across years.

When it breaks, and it will, notice it, name it, rebuild it.

TRY THIS

1. When the pattern breaks, name it out loud: "We've slid. Here's what slipped." No spiral. No catastrophizing. Just the diagnosis. Then start the reset.
2. Start the reset on a Monday. It gives the week a clean structure and makes the first few harder days easier to absorb.
3. Don't try to reset everything at once. Pick one rule to reinstate first. The bedtime rule is usually the easiest place to rebuild from because the timing is fixed. Autoplay second. Everything else third.
4. Write down what caused the slide. Travel? Illness? A new sibling? A work crunch? When you know the trigger, you can prepare for it next time. The slide isn't the failure. Being surprised by it twice is.
5. Expect the reset to take seven to ten days. Not two. Not thirty. Seven to ten. If day three is hard, that's on schedule. Hold the rules. Day seven will be different.

CHAPTER 12

Chapter 12: The Next Stage

FIRST SON & SECOND SON

First Son came home from school one afternoon and announced that his friend had gotten a phone for his birthday.

"Can I have one? Everyone has one."

I asked him what he'd use it for. He thought about it. "Texting my friends. And games."

I didn't give him the whole book. I gave him two sentences: not yet, and here's why. A phone means the whole internet, and the whole internet isn't built for seven-year-olds. What I got him instead was a smartwatch: GPS, a list of approved contacts, two-way calling. He wasn't happy about it for about a week. Then he called my mother on it while she was visiting and figured out he could reach her whenever he wanted. The phone stopped coming up.

He has friends who play video games together and he knows the games and the scores. That social world is real and it matters. But when the screen goes off, he moves on. He has other things. That's what I was building toward at eighteen months. Not a screen-deprived kid. A kid with enough of the real world that the screen is one option among many.

THE SCIENCE

On smartphones. The research doesn't specify a universal safe age. It shows that earlier entry into the full smartphone ecosystem (open internet, social media, app stores) means more exposure during the developmental windows when adolescents are most susceptible to its specific risks. Jonathan Haidt's 2024 book The Anxious Generation synthesizes the evidence: the cohort who received smartphones before high school shows measurable increases in anxiety, depression, and loneliness compared to prior cohorts, with effects concentrated in girls but present across genders. Delay if you can.

On smartwatches. A 2024 study found lower reported anxiety in elementary-aged children who owned smartwatches compared to those who owned smartphones. The logic is sound: GPS plus approved contacts plus no open internet solves the real problem (I need to reach my kid, my kid needs to reach me) without opening everything else. The research is still early though. Ask your pediatrician before you go buy one.

On the model. By six, your child has been watching you use technology for six years. They have a mental model of what screens are for, built entirely from observation. What you put down when they need you. What you're doing when you say "just a second." That model will shape their own relationship with technology for years. The most durable thing you can do is have a relationship with screens that you'd want them to have.

> THE LESSON
>
> The goal was never zero screens. The goal was a kid who can put the phone down.
>
> If you've held the three rules, been there when they reached for you, gone outside, and chosen the content, you've built that. Trust the foundation.

TRY THIS

1. Before your child asks for a phone, have your answer ready. Decide now, with your co-parent, what age means smartphone-eligible in your family. Say it out loud to each other before you need to say it to them.
2. Research smartwatch options before you're put on the spot. GPS, approved contacts, two-way calling: that's the spec. There are several options in the $50-$100 range. Know what you'd offer before the conversation starts.
3. Look at your own screen use this week through your child's eyes. What are they seeing? Is this the relationship with technology you want them to model? You don't have to change everything. Just notice.
4. Run the three-question test on any gaming platform your elementary-aged child is asking to join. Roblox, Minecraft, Fortnite: they are not equivalent. Know the difference before the download happens.
5. When your child is old enough to ask why the rules exist, tell them the truth: screens are built to be hard to put down. These rules are how our family stays in charge of that. You're not protecting them from technology. You're teaching them how to use it.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Content Guide by Age

0 to 18 months

No passive screen content. Video calls with responsive adults are the exception. Background TV off.

18 to 24 months

Up to 30 minutes per day of quality, co-viewed content. Parent selects each episode. No autoplay.

Best options: Ms. Rachel, simple nursery rhyme videos, short Sesame Street segments.

2 to 3 years

Up to 30 to 60 minutes per day. Parent selects. Co-view when possible.

Best options: Ms. Rachel, Daniel Tiger, Sesame Street. Short educational apps with mastery design.

No autoplay. No fast-paced content. No screens 60 minutes before sleep.

3 to 5 years

Up to 1 hour per day of quality content. Parent selects, not the algorithm.

Run the 3-question test on any new app.

Screens off 60 minutes before bed. Non-negotiable.

Elbow rule for viewing distance. Two hours outdoor time daily.

5 to 6 years

Up to 1 hour of recreational screen time.

No open YouTube. Curated content only.

3-question test applies to anything new.

APPENDIX

Appendix B: The 3-Question App Test

Before any app, game, or platform enters your child's life:

1. Does it work without the child doing anything?

(Autoplay, continuous animation, progression without input)

If YES: addictive architecture.

2. Does it continue even after mistakes?

(No mastery requirement, no retry moment)

If YES: addictive architecture.

3. Does it have a streak, notification, or come-back mechanic?

(Daily rewards, push notifications, social comparison)

If YES: addictive architecture.

Any YES: use with defined time limits. Don't expect educational value.

All NO: educational design. Monitor, but the structure is working with you.

Appendix C: Eye Health Cheat Sheet

Viewing distance: The Elbow Rule

Arm bent, elbow to fingertip is the minimum distance from eyes to screen (35 to 45 centimeters).

If they can touch the screen with a bent arm, they're too close.

Under 25 centimeters: significant myopia risk.

Break schedule: The 20-20-20 Rule

Every 20 minutes, look at something 20 feet away for 20 seconds.

For preschoolers: build breaks into the viewing structure, not just the rule.

Outdoor time: The real intervention

2 hours of outdoor daylight daily. Any outdoor environment on any weather day exceeds the 1,000 lux protective threshold.

Blue-light glasses, screen coatings, and supplements don't prevent myopia. Outdoor time does.

APPENDIX

Appendix D: Red Flags: When to Talk to Your Pediatrician

Talk to your child's doctor if:

- Your child cannot play independently for more than a few minutes without requesting a screen
- Meltdowns when screens are removed last more than 20 to 30 minutes, consistently
- Screen use is escalating despite limits, workarounds, hiding use, lying
- Your child shows markedly reduced interest in play, socializing, or outdoor activity
- Sleep disruption persists more than 3 to 4 weeks despite consistent pre-bed screen limits
- You are genuinely struggling to manage screen use and it's affecting daily functioning

None of these alone is a diagnosis. All of them are worth a conversation.

APPENDIX

Appendix E: If You're Already in the Deep End

Maybe you're reading this with a four-year-old who's been getting three hours of screens a day since before they were two. Maybe you recognize the digital pacifier pattern. Maybe you handed this book to your partner without explaining why.

You have not ruined your child. I said it at the beginning of this book, and I mean it here at the end.

The research showing significant developmental harm measures years of consistent high-volume, low-quality, unsupported screen use, not the situation of a parent who just read a book and is ready to make changes. The brain is plastic. The patterns can change.

Here's the reset. One step at a time.

This week: Turn off autoplay on every device your child uses. That's it. Nothing else this week.

Next week: Add the 60-minute pre-bed rule. Hold it for ten days before adding anything else.

Week three: Begin the emotional regulation sequence, comfort first, before the screen. Start with one predictable high-tension moment. Hold it for that one moment only.

Week four and beyond: Add outdoor time. Start with thirty minutes and build toward two hours. Add the Elbow Rule for viewing distance. Add the background TV change when you're ready.

Don't rush to week four while week one is shaky.

I started this book with the restaurant. First Son, three years old, quiet in four seconds.

What I felt wasn't just relief. It was the awareness that I'd solved the wrong problem. That I had a tool that worked, and I was using it in a way that would cost us both something later.

If you're reading this, you have that awareness too. That's the beginning. Everything else follows from it.

Selected References

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2016). American Academy of Pediatrics announces new recommendations for children's media use. AAP News.

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2024). Media and young minds: Updated guidance on content quality and co-viewing. Pediatrics.

Christakis, D.A., Gilkerson, J., Richards, J.A., et al. (2009). Audible television and decreased adult words, infant vocalizations, and conversational turns. Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 163(6), 554–558.

Haidt, J. (2024). The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness. Penguin Press.

Lillard, A.S., and Peterson, J. (2011). The immediate impact of different types of television on young children's executive function. Pediatrics, 128(4), 644–649.

Madigan, S., Browne, D., Racine, N., et al. (2019). Association between screen time and children's performance on a developmental screening test. JAMA Pediatrics, 173(3), 244–250.

Roseberry, S., Hirsh-Pasek, K., and Golinkoff, R.M. (2014). Skype me! Socially contingent interactions help toddlers learn language. Child Development, 85(3), 956–970.

Ruhr University Bochum. (2025). Tablets versus picture books at bedtime: Melatonin and sleep outcomes in young children. Sleep Medicine.

Twenge, J.M., and Campbell, W.K. (2019). Media use is linked to lower psychological well-being: Evidence from three datasets. Psychiatric Quarterly, 90(2), 311–331.

University of Colorado Boulder. (2022). Screen light exposure and melatonin suppression in preschool-aged children. Current Biology.

World Health Organization. (2019). Guidelines on Physical Activity, Sedentary Behaviour and Sleep for Children under 5 Years of Age. WHO.

World Health Organization. (2019). International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11): Gaming disorder. WHO.

About the Author

Jack Hartley is a father of two boys who taught him everything he knows, mostly by going in opposite directions.

His first son was the experiment. His second son was the redemption arc.

In the years between, Jack immersed himself in the research: clinical studies, academic journals, pediatric guidelines, books, podcasts, and more late-night conversations with other parents than he can count. He cross-referenced the conflicting advice, cut through the noise, and figured out what actually holds up.

None of it would have been possible without his wife, who has been doing this work longer, better, and with far less recognition than she deserves.

Jack is not a pediatrician. He is not a consultant, a nutritionist, or a child psychologist. He's a parent who did the reading so you don't have to and came out the other side with a clearer head, a more confident instinct, and two boys who proved that the second time around, it really does get easier.