

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333152789>

The Social Price of Constant Connectivity: Smartphones Impose Subtle Costs on Well-Being

Article in *Current Directions in Psychological Science* · May 2019

DOI: 10.1177/0963721419847200

CITATIONS

0

READS

63

3 authors:



Kostadin Kushlev

Georgetown University

40 PUBLICATIONS 669 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Ryan Dwyer

University of British Columbia - Vancouver

6 PUBLICATIONS 26 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Elizabeth Dunn

University of British Columbia - Vancouver

89 PUBLICATIONS 3,934 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Demographic Factors in Subjective Well-Being [View project](#)



Dual-Earner Couples [View project](#)



The Social Price of Constant Connectivity: Smartphones Impose Subtle Costs on Well-Being

Journal:	<i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>
Manuscript ID	CDPS-18-0173.R1
Manuscript Type:	Invited Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Kushlev, Kostadin; Georgetown University, Psychology Dwyer, Ryan; University of British Columbia, Psychology Dunn, Elizabeth; University of British Columbia, Psychology
Keywords:	Subjective well-being, social interactions, smartphones, cyberpsychology, mobile computing
Abstract:	Smartphones provide people with a variety of benefits, but they may also impose subtle social costs. We propose that being constantly connected undercuts the emotional benefits of face-to-face social interactions in two ways. First, smartphone use may diminish the emotional benefits of ongoing social interactions by preventing us from giving our full attention to friends and family in our immediate social environment. Second, smartphones may lead people to miss out on the emotional benefits of casual social interactions by supplanting them altogether. Across field experiments and experience sampling studies, we find that smartphones consistently interfere with the emotional benefits people could otherwise reap from their broader social environment. Contrary to proclamations in the popular press that smartphones are ruining our social lives, however, we find that the costs of smartphones use are fairly subtle. By highlighting how smartphones affect the benefits we derive from our broader social environment, this work provides a foundation for building theory and research on the consequences of mobile technology for human well-being.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**The Social Price of Constant Connectivity:
Smartphones Impose Subtle Costs on Well-Being**

Word count: 2764

For Peer Review

Abstract

Smartphones provide people with a variety of benefits, but they may also impose subtle social costs. We propose that being constantly connected undercuts the emotional benefits of face-to-face social interactions in two ways. First, smartphone use may diminish the emotional benefits of ongoing social interactions by preventing us from giving our full attention to friends and family in our immediate social environment. Second, smartphones may lead people to miss out on the emotional benefits of casual social interactions by supplanting them altogether. Across field experiments and experience sampling studies, we find that smartphones consistently interfere with the emotional benefits people could otherwise reap from their broader social environment. Contrary to proclamations in the popular press that smartphones are ruining our social lives, however, we find that the costs of smartphones use are fairly subtle. By highlighting how smartphones affect the benefits we derive from our broader social environment, this work provides a foundation for building theory and research on the consequences of mobile technology for human well-being.

Keywords: subjective well-being; social interactions; smartphones; cyberpsychology; mobile computing.

The Social Price of Constant Connectivity:

Smartphones Impose Subtle Costs on Well-Being

Smartphones have been adopted faster than any other technology in human history (Pew Research Center, 2018). These hand-held computers have become so integral to daily life that most users declare that they cannot imagine living without one (Pew Research Center, 2015). Given how eagerly people around the world have embraced smartphones, it stands to reason that these devices enhance human well-being. Indeed, smartphones offer ubiquitous access to valuable information, entertainment, and far-flung friends and family. While acknowledging these obvious benefits, we propose that being constantly connected may also carry subtle costs, by partially undermining the important well-being benefits of face-to-face social interactions (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Diener et al., 2017).

We begin with the assumption that smartphones are theoretically distinct from their closest cousins—computers—because of their pervasiveness throughout daily life. Indeed, approximately 95% of smartphone owners report having used their phones during their most recent social activity (Pew Research Center, 2015). Over the past six years, we have documented how smartphones can subtly curtail the emotional benefits of face-to-face social interactions, thereby partially undercutting the overall value of this technology for well-being. We propose that smartphones negatively affect the benefits people reap from social interactions through two key pathways. First, smartphone use may diminish the emotional benefits we reap from concurrent social interactions; by providing constant access to information and entertainment, smartphones can distract us from giving our full attention to friends and family in our immediate social environment. Second, smartphones may supplant casual social interactions; by making it easy to order food or find directions without talking to anyone, smartphones obviate the need to

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

4

1
2
3 interact with other people across a range of daily tasks. As shown in Figure 1, we argue that the
4
5 vast potential benefits of smartphones for human happiness (Path a) may be at least partially
6
7 offset by these subtle costs to social life (Paths b & c).
8
9

Distraction Undermines the Benefits of Social Interactions

10
11
12 We start with the assumption that smartphones have been intentionally designed to
13
14 capture attention, suggesting that phones should provide a potent source of distraction in daily
15
16 life (Path b, Figure 1). Indeed, we found that students ($N=221$) experienced more symptoms of
17
18 inattentiveness during a week when they were assigned to keep their phones in reach with alerts
19
20 on than when assigned to keep their phones out of reach with alerts off ($d = .44$; Kushlev, Proulx,
21
22 & Dunn, 2016). To examine whether such distraction interferes with the benefits of face-to-face
23
24 social interactions, we conducted a pre-registered field experiment at a science museum in
25
26 Vancouver (Kushlev & Dunn, 2019). We recruited 200 parents who were visiting the museum
27
28 with their children and randomly assigned them to use their phones as much as possible or as
29
30 little as possible while at the museum. Before leaving the museum, parents were asked to
31
32 complete a questionnaire about their experience at the museum, including how distracted they
33
34 were, how close to others they felt, and to what extent they experienced a sense of purpose and
35
36 meaning in life. Compared to parents who minimized their phone use, parents who were assigned
37
38 to maximize their phone use felt less socially connected ($d = -.73$) and reported lower feelings of
39
40 meaning ($d = .30$). Parents assigned to maximize phone use also felt more distracted ($d = -.63$),
41
42 which mediated the effects on social connectedness and meaning. Thus, by providing a source of
43
44 distraction in a potentially rewarding social context, phones interfered with the well-established
45
46 benefits of spending time with children (Nelson, Kushlev, & Lyubomirsky, 2014).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

5

1
2
3 An important limitation of this study was that, ethically, we had to tell parents upfront
4 that they might be asked to minimize or maximize their phone use, so they could decide whether
5 they felt comfortable following either instruction while caring for their children. Because parents
6 knew that our study was about phone use, their responses to our questionnaire may have been
7 influenced by their own theories about smartphones or by their assumption about our hypotheses.
8
9

10
11 To minimize demand characteristics while extending our research to another important
12 social activity, we conducted a pre-registered field experiment at a local café (Dwyer, Kushlev,
13 & Dunn, 2018; Study 1). We invited 304 participants to dine out with several friends or family
14 members at the café, while concealing that the study had anything to do with smartphones. To
15 manipulate phone use, we told participants in half the groups that after the food order, we would
16 need them to complete a one-item survey, via text message; we asked them to keep their phones
17 on the table in ring or vibrate mode, so they could receive the survey. The remaining groups
18 were told they would complete this survey on paper; we asked participants in these groups to put
19 their phones away in a basket on the table, an instruction we embedded within other minor
20 procedural details about the study. After their meal, all participants completed a questionnaire
21 about their experience during the meal. Participants who had access to their phones reported
22 enjoying the experience less compared to participants who did not have access to their phones (d
23 = $-.56$). Participants also reported feeling more distracted when they had access to their phones
24 ($d = -.71$), and distraction partially mediated the negative effect of phones on enjoyment. Beyond
25 enjoyment, we also measured a variety of other aspects of participants' subjective experience,
26 including pleasant affect, social connection, and boredom; although we did not observe
27 significant effects on these variables, combining across all our outcome variables revealed that
28 participants' overall subjective experience was reliably diminished when they had access to their
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

6

phones. Thus, in this rewarding social environment, phones produced feelings of distraction and undercut the well-being benefits of sharing a meal with friends or family.

To test this idea across a broader range of situations, we conducted a pre-registered experience sampling study, sending surveys to 123 students multiple times a day for five days (Dwyer et al., 2018; Study 2). Each time, participants were asked to report how they had been feeling over the preceding 15 minutes, and to check off all the activities they had engaged in, including socializing face-to-face, eating, studying, and other common activities. In addition, they reported whether they had been using their phones. We captured over 1200 episodes in which participants reported socializing face-to-face, and we compared episodes that included phone use with those that did not. When participants reported both socializing and using their phones, they felt more distracted than when socializing without their phones ($d = .52$). They also reported enjoying themselves less ($d = -.25$), as well as feeling less socially connected ($d = -.22$), and, overall, being in a worse mood ($d = -.20$). Consistent with the café experiment, the negative effects of phone use on each of these outcomes was mediated by distraction.

Taken together, our café and experience sampling studies provide initial evidence that phone use may undercut the benefits people derive from face-to-face social interactions, at least in part by increasing feelings of distraction. Of course, we relied on mediation analysis in documenting the role of distraction, and this approach does not provide conclusive evidence for the existence of causal chains (Spencer, Zanna, & Fong, 2005). Thus, it would be worthwhile to conduct further research to confirm how and when distraction accounts for the detrimental effects of phone use in social situations.

Supplanting Social Interactions

As well as undermining the benefits of interactions with friends and family, smartphones may reduce the likelihood that we will interact with strangers and acquaintances (i.e., weak ties) in our immediate environment (Figure 1, Path c). Although eliminating these interactions might seem trivial, even fleeting social interactions with weak ties can contribute to day-to-day feelings of happiness and belonging (Epley & Schroeder, 2014; Sandstrom & Dunn, 2014). For example, when adults heading into Starbucks were randomly assigned to chat with the barista, they left Starbucks in a better mood compared to participants who were assigned to place their order efficiently (Sandstrom & Dunn, 2014). Now, the Starbucks app enables customers to order coffee through their phones, eliminating the need to speak to the barista at all, providing just one example of how smartphones can obviate the need for social interactions. Perhaps more importantly, smartphones provide a readily available source of entertainment, potentially reducing people's inclination to chat with those around them.

To test whether smartphones decrease the likelihood that people will exhibit friendly behavior toward strangers, we randomly assigned 90 pairs of students to wait together for 10 minutes either with or without access to their smartphones (Kushlev, Hunter, Proulx, Pressman, & Dunn, 2019). When participants were left phoneless, only 6% of them chose not to interact with each other. But when participants had access to their phones, nearly 30% chose not to interact. To take a closer look at the interactions that did occur, we coded participants' facial expressions, counting how often they exhibited genuine Duchenne smiles. When people had their phones, they exhibited Duchenne smiles 30% less frequently compared to pairs who interacted without their phones ($d = -.59$). These findings suggest that people may be less likely to engage

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

8

1
2
3 in positive interactions with strangers around them when they can pass the time by turning to
4
5 their phones.
6
7

8
9 As well as providing a way to pass the time, phones enable people to accomplish tasks
10 without relying on others. In a pre-registered experiment, we gave students (N=182) thirty
11 minutes to find a campus building that was unfamiliar to them, enabling us to examine a
12
13 prototypical situation in which phones provide valuable information (Kushlev, Proulx, & Dunn,
14
15 2017). Half the students left all their belongings—including their phones—in our lab's locked
16
17 cabinet, while the others were allowed to hang on to their phones.
18
19
20
21
22

23 Stripped of their phones, participants spent four minutes longer searching for the
24 building, and rated this task as being much more difficult compared to participants with phones
25 ($d = -1.14$). In the absence of phones, participants tended to rely on other people to find the
26 building, typically talking to two or three other people during their search; in contrast,
27 participants who had their phones typically talked to no one ($d = -1.93$). Although eliminating
28 these brief conversations might seem trivial, participants who had their phones reported feeling
29 less socially connected compared to participants who did not have their phones ($d = -.43$);
30 specifically, they were less likely to agree with statements like "I felt close to people" and "I saw
31 people as friendly and approachable." Thus, phones offered clear benefits by making the task
32 much easier and faster—but at the same time, this technology exerted a subtle cost by
33 supplanting casual social interactions.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Overall, people who had their phones reported being in a slightly better mood by the end
50 of the study compared to people who did not have their phones. Notably, the overall positive
51 effect on mood was small ($d = .25$) because the benefits of making the task easier were partially
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

9

1
2
3 undercut by the loss of social connection that people experienced. These results provide the
4
5 clearest evidence for the countervailing effects of smartphones on well-being proposed in Figure
6
7
8 1: Smartphones boosted well-being by making it easier to solve an everyday problem (Path a),
9
10 but some of the well-being benefits of this convenience were offset by the missed opportunities
11
12 to feel more connected with others (Path c). These countervailing pathways point to the
13
14 conclusion that when opportunities for social interactions are unavailable (e.g., looking for a
15
16 building late at night on a deserted campus), phone use may have considerable positive effects on
17
18 well-being.
19
20
21
22

What We Have Learned

23
24
25 While past research has shown that phone use can impede learning (Chen & Yan, 2016)
26
27 and increase the risk of traffic accidents (Fitch, Hanowski, & Guo, 2015), our research shows
28
29 that it can also interfere with everyday social life. In contrast to attention-grabbing headlines
30
31 about the devastating effects of phone use on the fabric of society, however, our research shows
32
33 that the social and emotional costs of smartphones are fairly subtle. For example, in our café
34
35 study, the difference in enjoyment between participants with versus without phones was less than
36
37 half a point on a 7-point scale (Dwyer et al., 2018). Phone use also led to a half-point decrease in
38
39 the meaning that parents derived from spending time with their kids at a science museum
40
41
42 (Kushlev & Dunn, 2018). Although the detrimental effects of phone use in a specific social
43
44 setting may be fairly minimal, the fact that we have so many opportunities to use our phones in
45
46 daily life could lead to more substantial cumulative consequences for well-being (c.f., Abelson,
47
48
49
50
51 1985).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

What We Still Need to Learn

Our research suggests that the benefits of being constantly connected are offset when phone use distracts people during social interactions or supplants social interactions altogether. Of course, these effects may be moderated by a variety of individual differences, which should be investigated in future research and meta-analyses, potentially drawing on our freely available datasets. Although we have not observed any consistent effects of age or gender, our studies were underpowered to detect such effects and did not utilize representative samples, highlighting the need for work with bigger, broader samples.

A key tenet of our model is that the costs of phone use should depend on the rewards available in people's immediate social environment. Thus far, we have focused on examining potentially rewarding social contexts, such as a restaurant and science museum, where people have opportunities for meaningful interactions with close others; in these contexts, we consistently observe negative effects of phone use on individuals' subjective experience. Perhaps more surprisingly, after searching for an unfamiliar building, people experienced lower feelings of social connection when they relied on their phones rather than the strangers around them; this suggests that phone use may lead people to miss out on rewarding social interactions in a diverse array of contexts, even when no close friends or family members are around. When the environment offers little or no opportunity for positive social interactions, however, our model predicts that phone use should, on average, promote well-being (see Path a).

At the extreme end of the spectrum—when the immediate social environment is uncomfortable or hostile—phone use should be especially beneficial by providing a source of distraction or reducing the need to engage with unfriendly people. Providing initial support for

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

11

1
2
3 this prediction, researchers have shown that smartphones can act as a buffer against social
4
5 exclusion: After being socially excluded, people showed a gradual increase in a salivary
6
7 hormone associated with stress when they did not have access to their phones, whereas those
8
9 assigned to use their phones during this time showed no increase in stress hormones (Hunter,
10
11 Hooker, Rohleder, & Pressman, 2018).
12
13
14

15
16 The net effects of phone use on well-being should, of course, depend not only on the
17
18 immediate social environment, but also on how people use their phones. For example, recent
19
20 research has shown that using Facebook to actively engage with friends can provide emotional
21
22 benefits, whereas scrolling passively through others' posts may be emotionally costly (for a
23
24 review, see Verduyn, Ybarra, Résibois, Jonides, & Kross, 2017). Our model assumes that phone
25
26 use would supplant and distract from social interactions regardless of whether people are using
27
28 Facebook passively or actively—or using a different app altogether. Accordingly, our studies
29
30 manipulated *whether or not* people used their phones, rather than *how* they used their phones.
31
32 Our model does imply, however, that if phones are used to complement social interactions (e.g.,
33
34 watching funny videos together), then no distraction should occur (eliminating Path b). Indeed,
35
36 in our museum study, we found preliminary evidence that using phones to enhance the visit to
37
38 the museum was beneficial (Kushlev & Dunn, 2019). Furthermore, some types of phone use
39
40 (e.g., playing games such as Pokémon Go) may generate additional face-to-face interactions that
41
42 would not otherwise occur.
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 By considering how phone use affects the quality and quantity of face-to-face social
50
51 interactions, our model offers a practical approach for designing and evaluating new forms of
52
53 mobile computing technology. Smartphones may be only the foot soldiers of the revolution in
54
55 pervasive computing technology; global sales of smartwatches, for example, have increased
56
57
58
59
60

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

12

1
2
3 exponentially, with sales forecasted to double in the near future (Llamas, Ubrani, & Shirer,
4
5 2018). Meanwhile, people in Sweden are already inserting microchips under their skin—
6
7 designed, much like smartphones, to make daily tasks easier (Savage, 2018). Our research
8
9 suggests that developers and users of these new technologies should consider not only the
10
11 obvious benefits mobile devices bring, but also their subtle costs in detracting from social
12
13 interactions or supplanting them all together.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Further Reading

- Dunn, E. W. & Dwyer, R. (2018). Technology and the future of happiness. In Forgas, J. P. & Baumeister, R. F. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Living Well*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Kushlev, K. (2018). Media technology and well-being: A complementarity-interference model. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of Well-Being*. Noba Scholar Handbook Series: Subjective well-being. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF publishers.
doi:nobascholar.com
- Kushlev, K., & Heintzelman, S. J. (2018). Put the phone down: Testing a complement-interfere model of computer-mediated communication in the context of face-to-face interactions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9, 702-710.
doi:10.1177/1948550617722199
- Okdie, B. M., Ewoldsen, D. R., Muscanell, N. L., Guadagno, R. E., Eno, C. A., Velez, J. A., ... & Smith, L. R. (2014). Missed programs (you can't tivo this one): Why psychologists should study media. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(2), 180-195.
doi:10.1177/1745691614521243
- Sbarra, D. A., Briskin, J. L., & Slatcher, R. B. (in press). Smartphones and close relationships: The case for an evolutionary mismatch. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
doi:10.31234/osf.io/rqu6f

References

- Abelson, R. P. (1985). A variance explanation paradox: When a little is a lot. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(1), 129–133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.1.129>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Chen, Q., & Yan, Z. (2016). Does multitasking with mobile phones affect learning? A review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *54*, 34e42. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.047>
- Diener, E., Heintzelman, S. J., Kushlev, K., Tay, L., Wirtz, D., Lutes, L. D., & Oishi, S. (2017). Findings all psychologists should know from the new science on subjective well-being. *Canadian Psychology*, *58*(2), 87–104. <http://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000063>
- Dwyer, R., Kushlev, K., & Dunn, E. (2018). Smartphone use undermines enjoyment of face-to-face social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *78*, 233–239. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.10.007>
- Epley, N., & Schroeder, J. (2014). Mistakenly seeking solitude. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(5), 1980–1999. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0037323>
- Fitch, G. M., Hanowski, R. J., & Guo, F. (2015). The risk of a safety-critical event associated with mobile device use in specific driving contexts. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, *16*(2), 124–132. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2014.923566>
- Hunter, J. F., Hooker, E. D., Rohleder, N., & Pressman, S. D. (2018). The use of smartphones as a digital security blanket: The influence of phone use and availability on psychological and physiological responses to social exclusion. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *80*(4), 345–352.
- Kushlev, K., & Dunn, E. W. (2019). Smartphones distract parents from cultivating feelings of

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

15

1
2
3 connection when spending time with their children. *Journal of Social and Personal*
4
5 *Relationships*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518769387>
6

7
8 Kushlev, K., Hunter, J. F., Proulx, J., Pressman, S. D., & Dunn, E. (2019). Smartphones reduce
9
10 smiles between strangers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *91*, 12–16.
11
12 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.09.023>
13

14
15 Kushlev, K., Proulx, J., & Dunn, E. W. (2016). “Silence your phones”: Smartphone notifications
16
17 increase inattention and hyperactivity symptoms. *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference*
18
19 *on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1011–1020.
20
21 <http://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858359>
22

23
24 Kushlev, K., Proulx, J., & Dunn, E. W. (2017). Digitally connected, socially disconnected: The
25
26 effects of relying on technology rather than other people. *Computers in Human Behavior*,
27
28 *76*, 68–74. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.07.001>
29

30
31 Llamas, R., Ubrani, J., & Shirer, M. (2018, June 18). New wearables forecast from IDC shows
32
33 smartwatches continuing their ascendance while wristbands face flat growth. Retrieved
34
35 November 13, 2018, from <https://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS44000018>
36

37
38 Nelson, S. K., Kushlev, K., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2014). The pains and pleasures of parenting:
39
40 When, why, and how is parenthood associated with more or less well-being? *Psychological*
41
42 *Bulletin*, *140*(3), 846–895. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0035444>
43

44
45 Pew Research Center (2015). *The smartphone difference*. Retrieved on May 22, 2015 from
46
47 <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/01/us-smartphone-use-in-2015/>
48

49
50 Pew Research Center (2018). *Demographics of mobile device ownership and adoption in the*
51
52 *United States*. Retrieved on October 22, 2018 from [http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-](http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/)
53
54 [sheet/mobile/](http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/)
55

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

16

1
2
3 Sandstrom, G. M., & Dunn, E. W. (2014). Is efficiency overrated?: Minimal social interactions
4
5 lead to belonging and positive affect. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(4),
6
7 437–442. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613502990>
8
9

10 Savage, M. (2018, October 22). Thousands of swedes are inserting microchips under their skin.
11
12 Retrieved November 12, 2018, from
13
14 <https://www.npr.org/2018/10/22/658808705/thousands-of-swedes-are-inserting->
15
16 [microchips-under-their-skin](https://www.npr.org/2018/10/22/658808705/thousands-of-swedes-are-inserting-)
17
18

19 Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: Why
20
21 experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological
22
23 processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 845–851.
24
25 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.845>
26
27

28 Verduyn, P., Ybarra, O., Résibois, M., Jonides, J., & Kross, E. (2017). Do Social Network Sites
29
30 Enhance or Undermine Subjective Well-Being? A Critical Review. *Social Issues and Policy*
31
32 *Review*, 11(1), 274–302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12033>
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE SOCIAL PRICE OF CONSTANT CONNECTIVITY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Figures




Figure 1. Theoretical mechanisms of the effects of smartphone use on well-being in the context of face-to-face social interactions.

Path a is intentionally thicker than Paths b and c because we assume the benefits of phone use can potentially outweigh the subtle costs documented in our research, although there is still much to be learned about this positive pathway.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Theoretical mechanisms of the effects of smartphone use on well-being in the context of face-to-face social interactions. Path a is intentionally thicker than Paths b and c because we assume the benefits of phone use can potentially outweigh the subtle costs documented in our research, although there is still much to be learned about this positive pathway.

444x138mm (72 x 72 DPI)