

Adolescents' Experiences of Online Harms by Platform

Angela Y. Lee, PhD; Carmen H. J. Lim, MPhil; Sunny Xun Liu, PhD; R. Kang Xing Jin, AB; Anneke Buffone, PhD; Ravi Iyer, PhD; Zachary Rausch, MS; Jonathan Haidt, PhD; Nathanael J. Fast, PhD; Jeffrey T. Hancock, PhD; Eleni Linos, MD, MPH, DrPh

[+ Supplemental content](#)

IMPORTANCE Concerns about the risks adolescents face online are rising, and existing research on online harms rarely examines platform-level differences.

OBJECTIVE To estimate the prevalence of negative experiences reported by US adolescents online, offline, and across 20 different online platforms using a national survey.

DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS This was a cross-sectional, nationally representative, pilot survey of US adolescents aged 13 to 17 years conducted from February to December 2025 through the probability-based Understanding America Study panel. Self-reported use and negative experiences on 20 online platforms (eg, Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok, and YouTube) were assessed.

EXPOSURES Self-reported use of 20 online communication platforms (eg, Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, Snapchat, and YouTube) in the past 4 weeks.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES Prevalence of adolescents' reporting experiencing major risks and harms online, offline, and for each of 20 online platforms in the last 4 weeks. Harms include harassment, sexual solicitation, exposure to violent content, and technology-related sleep disruption. Survey-weighted logistic regression examined demographic associations.

RESULTS The weighted sample included 472 adolescents (mean [SE] age 14.9 [0.1] years; 46.8% female) from 47 states. Across online and offline contexts, 44.7% witnessed harassment and 29.8% reported experiencing it directly in the past 4 weeks. Online exposure exceeded offline exposure for several harms, including reported exposure to violent imagery (10.7% vs 1.6%), unwanted sexual images (13.4% vs 2.0%), and content encouraging self-harm (9.7% vs 5.2%), while direct harassment was reported at similar rates offline and online (18.5% vs 16.4%). More than half (51.5%) self-reported sleep disruption due to technology use. Prevalence varied by platform.

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE The findings suggest that negative online experiences are commonly reported by US adolescents and vary across platforms and subgroups of adolescents. Measuring the prevalence of negative online experiences is feasible and analogous to public health risk monitoring frameworks.

JAMA Pediatr. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.4692
Published online September 18, 2026.

Author Affiliations: Center for Digital Health, Stanford University, Stanford, California (Jin, Linos); Tech Impact & Policy Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California (Lee, Liu, Hancock); School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison (Lee); Stern School of Business, New York University, New York (Lim, Rausch, Haidt); Neely Center, University of Southern California Marshall School, Los Angeles (Buffone, Iyer, Fast); School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Wisconsin-Madison, (Lee).

Corresponding Author: Angela Y. Lee, PhD, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Vilas Hall 5170, Madison, WI, 53705 (alee327@wisc.edu).

Concerns about children's online safety have spurred efforts among parents, policymakers, and technology companies to reduce risks.^{1,2} A growing literature has examined adolescents' exposure to online harms, including probability-based, age-stratified work that compares online and offline victimization (eg, Pew Research Center,³ EU Kids Online,⁴ and Common Sense Media⁵). Several opportunities remain to strengthen measurement in this area. First, existing studies tend to focus on one category of harm at a time (eg, cyberbullying⁶ and sexual solicitation^{7,8}) rather than the full range of harms young people may encounter. Assessing multiple harm types in a single survey may facilitate comparisons across harm categories. Second, harm prevalence estimates rarely differ-

tiate between specific platforms (ie, comparing cyberbullying on TikTok to Instagram). Platform-specific estimates may inform targeted prevention efforts.^{9,10} Studies including younger adolescents (aged 13 to 14 years) rarely combine age-stratified reporting with broad, cross-platform harm assessment; doing so may clarify how reported harms relate to youth development.^{11,12}

To help address these gaps, we conducted a national survey estimating the prevalence of reported negative experiences among US adolescents online, offline, and by platform in a representative probability-based survey of US youth aged 13 to 17 years. The goal of this study was to demonstrate that such assessment is feasible, enabling the detection of platform-specific patterns.

Methods

We conducted a nationally representative, probability-based cross-sectional survey of US adolescents aged 13 to 17 years between February and December 2025. This was fielded through the Understanding America Study (UAS) panel, which is maintained by the Center for Economic and Social Research at the University of Southern California.¹³ The panel was weighted to be nationally representative for adolescents aged 13 to 17 years (Table 1). Participants were recruited from UAS household panel members with parental permission and teen assent. All study protocols were approved by the University of Southern California institutional review board.

The survey collected information on demographic characteristics, use of online platforms, and negative experiences online and offline (eg, bullying and sexual solicitation). These were assessed for offline experiences and across 20 online communication platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok, YouTube, Discord, and Pinterest (up to 102 total items, conditional on skip logic). Platforms with fewer than 100 users were not reported. Survey items were adapted from existing instruments including the University of Southern California Neely Indices¹⁴ and Meta's Bad Experiences and Encounters Framework survey,^{15,16} standardized to a 4-week recall window. The adapted instrument was cognitively tested with 6 in-person interviews and piloted online with approximately 500 respondents aged 18 to 25 years. Household income, education, and state of residence were obtained from UAS.

The study was not preregistered and no a priori hypotheses were made; all analyses were exploratory. No a priori sample size was calculated; the achieved sample reflects the full set of eligible UAS Teen panel members during the study period. Analyses used UAS survey-specific poststratification weights, correcting for unequal selection probabilities, panel nonresponse, and deviations from the US population on demographic characteristics, including age, sex, race, and ethnicity. To identify demographic correlates of reported harm exposure, we fit separate survey-weighted logistic regression models, regressed on demographic characteristics, platforms used daily, and parental-control status, for each harm outcome using the survey package in R version 4.4 (R Foundation). See eMethods in Supplement 1 for details. This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline.

Results

The final weighted sample included 472 participants (mean [SE] age, 14.9 [0.1] years; 46.8% female; 1.7% American Indian or Alaska Native; 5.3% Asian; 14.6% Black; 1.5% Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 65.4% White, and 10.9% multiple races; 24.5% Hispanic) from 47 states (response rate, 96.3%; completion rate, 98.7%; median completion time, 13.8 minutes). Table 1 shows weighted demographic characteristics overall and by users of each platform. The mean (SE) age at first acquiring a personal smartphone was 11.1 (0.1) years; 91.5% of adolescents had their

Key Points

Question How often do US adolescents report having negative experiences online, and does prevalence vary across different online platforms?

Findings This cross-sectional pilot survey of 472 US adolescents aged 13 to 17 years found that reported negative online experiences varied substantially across platforms.

Meaning These findings provide baseline, platform-level prevalence estimates that may inform future measurement and monitoring of adolescents' online experiences.

own smartphone, 26.9% reported parental controls on their smartphone, and 96.1% used at least 1 of the social media platforms.^{17,18} The most commonly used social media platforms were YouTube (77.1%), Instagram (55.1%), TikTok (54.4%), and Snapchat (51.2%). Adolescents from families with highest socioeconomic status (>\$150 000 annual income) were more likely to have parental controls (46.2%).

Table 2 shows weighted percentages of adolescents that reported experiencing each specific harm in the last 4 weeks: overall, online, offline, and on each platform. Across both online and offline contexts, 44.7% witnessed harassment, and 29.8% reported experiencing harassment directly. Online exposure exceeded offline exposure for several harms, including seeing violent imagery (10.7% vs 1.6%), unwanted sexual images (13.4% vs 2.0%), and content encouraging self-harm (9.7% vs 5.2%). More than half (51.5%) reported sleep disruption due to technology use. Parental education, income, and parental controls on smartphones were not significantly associated with online harm experiences.

Between-platform variation was substantial, and harms concentrated on specific platforms. For instance, 9.1% of individuals using Instagram reported seeing violent imagery, compared to 1.9% of individuals using YouTube. Feeling worse about oneself due to other people's posts was most common on Instagram (16.6%) and TikTok (13.4%) compared to YouTube (4.1%) and text messaging (5.6%). A total of 42.2% of individuals using TikTok and 27.8% of individuals using Instagram attributed disrupted sleep to those platforms, compared with 10.2% of individuals using text messaging. Some subgroups were more likely to experience certain harms online (Table 3), with sex and age correlated with different harms (see the eMethods in Supplement 1 for details).

Discussion

This cross-sectional study found that reports of negative online experiences were common among US adolescents and varied by platform. Reported exposure to negative content was more common online than offline for some harms: more than 6 times more common for both violent imagery and unwanted sexual images, and 2 times more for content encouraging self-harm. Notably, more than half of adolescents reported that their use of technology interfered with their sleep, 1 in 10 had seen someone harm themselves online, and 1 in 8

Table 1. Characteristics of Adolescent Respondents (Aged 13-17 Years) in the Full Sample and by Platform Used in the Past 4 Weeks (Weighted)

Characteristic ^a	Among adolescents who reported using each platform in the past 4 wk									
	Full sample	Snapshot	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online gaming	Text messaging
No. (weighted) ^b	472	242	364	257	100	260	158	126	191	360
Mean (SE) age, y	14.9 (0.1)	15.3 (0.1)	14.9 (0.1)	15.2 (0.1)	15.4 (0.1)	15.4 (0.1)	15.1 (0.1)	15 (0.1)	14.8 (0.1)	15 (0.1)
Sex, % (SE)										
Female	46.8 (2.6)	48.6 (3.6)	43.7 (2.9)	47.8 (3.4)	45.3 (5.4)	49.7 (3.4)	79.8 (3.5)	19.6 (3.7)	31.3 (3.6)	51.2 (2.9)
Male	49.6 (2.6)	48.5 (3.6)	53 (2.9)	48.1 (3.5)	52.5 (5.5)	46.4 (3.4)	15.8 (3.2)	70.8 (4.5)	63.2 (3.8)	44.1 (2.9)
Other/nonbinary	3.6 (1)	2.9 (1.2)	3.4 (1.2)	4.1 (1.3)	NA	3.9 (1.3)	4.4 (1.8)	9.7 (3.3)	5.5 (2)	4.7 (1.3)
Race and ethnicity, % (SE)										
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.7 (0.7)	NA	NA	2.7 (1.1)	NA	3.1 (1.2)	NA	NA	NA	1.8 (0.8)
Asian	5.3 (1.2)	2.7 (1.2)	5.4 (1.4)	2.9 (1.1)	NA	5.5 (1.5)	NA	5.3 (2.2)	3.2 (1.4)	4.5 (1.3)
Black	14.6 (1.8)	14.8 (2.5)	15.8 (2.1)	20.1 (2.7)	11 (3.6)	17.6 (2.5)	13.5 (2.8)	16.1 (3.6)	15.5 (2.7)	14.7 (2)
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.5 (0.7)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.5 (0.9)
White	65.4 (2.4)	68.9 (3.4)	64.9 (2.8)	59.7 (3.4)	72.6 (5)	61.1 (3.3)	67.7 (4)	62.8 (4.9)	65.6 (3.8)	66.1 (2.8)
Multiple races	10.9 (1.6)	11.4 (2.4)	11.7 (2)	12.7 (2.4)	7 (2.1)	11.6 (2.3)	14.5 (3.2)	12.8 (3.5)	13.3 (2.9)	11.1 (1.9)
Hispanic, % (SE)										
% Non-Hispanic	75.4 (2.4)	74.5 (3.5)	75.4 (2.7)	68.1 (3.4)	81 (5.1)	73.1 (3.2)	71.3 (4.3)	77.5 (4.8)	77.3 (3.8)	75.9 (2.8)
% Hispanic	24.5 (2.4)	25.5 (3.5)	24.6 (2.7)	31.6 (3.4)	19 (5.1)	26.6 (3.2)	28.7 (4.3)	22.5 (4.8)	22.7 (3.8)	23.9 (2.8)
Household income % (SE)										
<\$25 000	13.7 (1.8)	12.6 (2.4)	11.8 (1.9)	13.9 (2.3)	13.9 (3.8)	13.5 (2.3)	9.3 (2.6)	10.1 (3.1)	12.2 (2.6)	12.9 (1.9)
\$25 000-\$49 000	18.6 (2)	19.1 (2.8)	17.7 (2.2)	24.5 (3)	30.3 (5.2)	22 (2.8)	19.1 (3.4)	16.8 (3.8)	17.6 (3.1)	17.1 (2.2)
\$50 000-\$74 000	6.6 (1.3)	6.6 (1.9)	7.4 (1.6)	7.7 (1.9)	9.6 (3.5)	5.7 (1.6)	4.8 (1.6)	4.9 (2.1)	7.7 (2.4)	6.4 (1.5)
\$75 000-\$150 000	37.9 (2.5)	38.8 (3.5)	38.2 (2.9)	35.4 (3.3)	28.9 (4.9)	35.8 (3.2)	39.4 (4.2)	44.9 (5.1)	34.6 (3.8)	37.4 (2.8)
>\$150 000	22.9 (2.1)	22.3 (3)	24.7 (2.5)	18.5 (2.7)	15.8 (4.1)	23.1 (2.8)	27.4 (3.9)	22.2 (4.1)	27.2 (3.6)	25.7 (2.6)
Parental education, % (SE)										
≤High school	20.2 (2.1)	21.9 (3.2)	20.1 (2.4)	23.1 (3)	34.2 (5.4)	21.4 (2.8)	13 (2.7)	10.6 (3)	18.1 (3.3)	18.2 (2.3)
Some college	33.9 (2.4)	36.9 (3.5)	35.1 (2.8)	43.1 (3.4)	36.5 (5.3)	38.4 (3.3)	38 (4.3)	36.4 (5)	35.6 (3.9)	34.1 (2.8)
≥Bachelor's degree	45.6 (2.5)	40.6 (3.5)	44.4 (2.9)	33.8 (3.2)	27.9 (4.8)	40.2 (3.3)	48.9 (4.3)	51.9 (5.1)	45.6 (4)	47.3 (2.9)
Smartphone ownership										
Own a personal smartphone, % (SE)	91.5 (1.4)	97.4 (1)	91.7 (1.6)	96.4 (1.3)	92.3 (3.1)	98.2 (0.8)	95.9 (1.5)	93.9 (2.5)	93.2 (1.8)	92.7 (1.5)
Mean age first acquired smartphone, y	11.1 (0.1)	11 (0.2)	11.1 (0.1)	10.9 (0.1)	11.3 (0.3)	11.1 (0.2)	10.7 (0.2)	10.9 (0.2)	11.2 (0.2)	11.2 (0.1)

(continued)

Table 1. Characteristics of Adolescent Respondents (Aged 13-17 Years) in the Full Sample and by Platform Used in the Past 4 Weeks (Weighted) (continued)

Characteristic ^a	Among adolescents who reported using each platform in the past 4 wk									
	Full sample	Snapchat	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online gaming	Text messaging
Type of smartphone used, % (SE)										
iPhone	66.2 (2.4)	70.7 (3.3)	65 (2.8)	70.2 (3.2)	68.9 (5.1)	71.9 (3.1)	67 (4.1)	53.8 (5.1)	64.5 (3.9)	70.3 (2.7)
Android	30 (2.4)	29.3 (3.3)	31.7 (2.8)	27.8 (3.1)	28 (4.9)	27.2 (3.1)	31.5 (4.1)	41.7 (5.1)	31.2 (3.8)	26.5 (2.6)
Parents use parental controls to manage smartphone use, % (SE)										
Yes	26.9 (2.2)	20.8 (2.9)	24.8 (2.4)	18.9 (2.6)	16 (4)	19.1 (2.5)	30.1 (3.8)	16.5 (3.5)	22.4 (3.2)	25.8 (2.5)
No	60.7 (2.5)	71.3 (3.2)	65.3 (2.8)	70.8 (3.1)	71.6 (5.1)	72 (2.9)	61.6 (4.1)	71.8 (4.7)	64.5 (3.8)	60.4 (2.9)
Not sure	9 (1.6)	7.9 (2.1)	6.8 (1.5)	8.5 (2)	9.2 (3.4)	8.6 (1.9)	7.2 (2.2)	7.2 (3.2)	9.1 (2.5)	10.7 (2)

Abbreviation: NA, not applicable.

^a Percentages within each demographic category (sex, race, ethnicity, household income, parental education, smartphone type, and parental controls) may not sum to 100% due to a small number of missing responses in the weighted sample.^b The weighted number of respondents who indicated using this platform in the past 4 weeks.

had seen unwanted sexual images online in the last 4 weeks. However, direct interpersonal harassment was reported at comparable rates offline and online, consistent with prior literature showing that online and offline victimization often occur within the same social relationships.¹⁹ Reported harm exposure also differed by adolescent demographics. Together, these findings highlight the importance of considering heterogeneity by different subpopulations and across different online spaces.⁹

In addition, we demonstrated that cross-platform, multi-harm assessment is achievable in a nationally representative adolescent sample. Strengths include detailed platform-specific assessments and a nationally representative survey that can be replicated at scale.

Limitations

This study should be interpreted with respect to its limitations. First, this was a modest sample that, while weighted to the US adolescent population, limits precision for platform-specific and subgroup analyses. Estimates should be treated as preliminary, particularly for less commonly used platforms and low-prevalence outcomes where subgroup sample sizes are small. Second, as this is an observational study, the differences in prevalence across platforms may partly reflect differences in the user populations rather than platform design alone. For example, exposure to content that makes one feel bad about oneself was more prevalent on Pinterest than on Discord. While this could reflect stronger content moderation policies or safer design decisions on Discord, it could also reflect Pinterest's greater popularity among girls, who may be more susceptible to social comparison than boys.²⁰ Third, the study's reliance on self-report is subject to recall bias, social desirability bias, and the limitations of asking individuals to retrospectively recall online experiences over a 4-week window.²¹ Online interactions are frequent and often ambient; more emotionally salient events may be disproportionately likely to be remembered, which may mean estimates reflect memorable rather than representative experiences. Availability heuristics may also lead adolescents to attribute experiences to platforms they use most rather than where the harm occurred, which may inflate estimates for high-use platforms.²¹ Stigmatized experiences (eg, sending explicit images and unwanted sexual contact) may also be underreported.²¹ Selection through parental UAS participation and rapid shifts in platform design and policy may limit generalizability over time. Harms reported may vary based on device or account safety settings and whether the individual registered with their true age. Larger studies, akin to other public health monitoring programs, are needed to examine these trends as policies and norms change.

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that among approximately 22 million US adolescents aged 13 to 17 years, roughly 3 million reported seeing unwanted sexual content in a 4-week

Table 2. Respondents Who Reported Experiencing Harms in the Past 4 Weeks, Overall, Offline, Online, and Among Adolescents Who Used Each Platform^{a,b}

Affirmative response	Weighted %, (SE)													
	Full sample (N = 472)							Among adolescents who used each platform in the past 4 wk						
	Overall ^c	Offline ^d	Online	Snapchat	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online gaming	Text messaging	Facetime	Email
No. (weighted)	472	472	472	243	364	257	100	260	158	127	191	360	216	296
Have you personally witnessed or experienced something that affected you negatively?	41.4 (2.5)	22.9 (2.2)	27.6 (2.3)	6.8 (1.8)	5.7 (1.3)	21.5 (2.8)	NR	16.5 (2.5)	3.2 (1.6)	9.7 (3.4)	6 (2)	6 (1.5)	NR	NR
Have you witnessed or experienced content that you would consider bad for the world?	49.9 (2.6)	15.1 (1.9)	41.9 (2.5)	11.5 (2.4)	16.1 (2.1)	35.6 (3.3)	15.7 (4.3)	24.4 (2.8)	7.1 (2.2)	9.9 (3.2)	7 (2.1)	2.3 (1)	NR	NR
Have you seen nudity or sexual images that you didn't want to see?	15.1 (1.8)	2 (0.7)	13.4 (1.7)	6.1 (1.8)	4.3 (1.2)	5.6 (1.5)	NR	7.7 (1.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Have you felt worse about yourself or your life because of other people's posts, messages, or communications?	22.2 (2.1)	8.7 (1.4)	19.3 (2)	10.8 (2.4)	4.1 (1.2)	13.4 (2.3)	NR	16.6 (2.5)	5.8 (1.9)	NR	3.1 (1.5)	5.6 (1.4)	NR	NR
Has anyone insulted or disrespected you, contacted you in an inappropriate way, damaged your reputation, threatened you, or excluded you or left you out?	29.8 (2.4)	18.5 (2)	16.4 (1.9)	6.4 (1.8)	NR	4.3 (1.3)	5.3 (2.8)	7.2 (1.9)	NR	7.6 (2.6)	4.7 (1.7)	8.5 (1.7)	NR	NR
Have you seen anyone do any of these things to someone else (insult, disrespect, inappropriate contact, damage reputation, threaten, or exclude)?	44.7 (2.6)	26.1 (2.2)	28.9 (2.3)	11.4 (2.2)	10.5 (1.9)	22.7 (2.9)	8 (2.9)	20.5 (2.9)	NR	19.7 (4.2)	16.9 (3.1)	7.2 (1.6)	2.5 (1.1)	NR
Have you received unwanted sexual advances?	5.8 (1.3)	2.9 (1)	3.6 (0.9)	3.5 (1.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Have you gotten involved in an unwanted conversation?	26.2 (2.3)	12.8 (1.7)	16.5 (1.9)	9.5 (2.2)	NR	NR	NR	7.3 (1.7)	NR	9.4 (3)	5.5 (1.8)	10.2 (1.9)	3.9 (1.5)	NR
Have you sent nude or sexually explicit images or messages?	3.5 (0.9)	NR	3.3 (0.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Has anyone used your photos in an inappropriate way?	3.8 (1.1)	1.4 (0.7)	3 (0.9)	2.2 (1.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	2.1 (0.9)	NR	NR
Have you seen any violent, bloody, or disturbing images that bothered you?	13 (1.6)	1.6 (0.6)	10.7 (1.5)	NR	1.9 (0.7)	5.4 (1.4)	NR	9.1 (1.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Have you seen someone harm themselves, or threaten to do so?	15.8 (1.9)	8.6 (1.5)	9.9 (1.6)	3.6 (1.3)	NR	7 (1.8)	NR	3.4 (1.2)	NR	7.8 (3)	NR	2.2 (1)	NR	NR
Have you seen anyone encourage someone to harm themselves?	13 (1.8)	5.2 (1.2)	9.7 (1.5)	4.6 (1.7)	2.2 (0.9)	6.4 (1.7)	NR	5.8 (1.7)	NR	4.8 (2.1)	6.3 (2.2)	2.8 (1)	NR	NR

(continued)

Table 2. Respondents Who Reported Experiencing Harms in the Past 4 Weeks, Overall, Offline, Online, and Among Adolescents Who Used Each Platform^{a,b} (continued)

	Weighted %, (SE)													
	Full sample (N = 472)													
	Among adolescents who used each platform in the past 4 wk													
Affirmative response	Overall ^c	Offline ^d	Online	Snapchat	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online gaming	Text messaging	Facetime	Email
Have you seen anyone discriminating against people because of their gender, religion, race, sexual orientation, or another part of their identity?	44.4 (2.5)	19.3 (2)	36.7 (2.5)	10.1 (2.3)	12.1 (1.8)	34.3 (3.3)	16.2 (4)	31.6 (3.1)	5.9 (1.8)	14.1 (3.3)	11.1 (2.5)	4.5 (1.3)	2.6 (1.3)	NR
How often do you feel that your use of technology gets in the way of your sleep? (sometimes/often)	51.5 (2.6)	NR	47.5 (2.6)	20 (2.9)	27.7 (2.7)	42.2 (3.4)	5.6 (3.1)	27.8 (3)	8.2 (2.3)	8.2 (2.7)	18.8 (3.3)	10.2 (1.8)	9.8 (2.2)	NR
Abbreviation: NR, not reported (cells with count responses <5 are masked in line with UASTeen's data policy for ensuring data is unidentifiable).														
Full sample columns report the prevalence of each experience among all 472 respondents. For example, the second row shows that 41.4% of respondents reported experiencing something that affected them negatively in any context (offline, online, or both); of these, 22.9% experienced it offline (regardless of whether they also experienced it online) and 27.6% experienced it online (regardless of whether they also experienced it offline). As such, the offline and online columns are not mutually exclusive and may sum to more than the offline or/and online column. The online column considers responses across the 11 online platforms that are the focus of this article as well as additional platforms asked about in the survey (any dating app, Bluesky, LinkedIn, Nextdoor, Pinterest, Reddit, Threads, Twitch, Twitter/X, WhatsApp, and some other online communications service).														
Columns showing data by those who used each platform reflect experiences that occurred specifically on that platform, for example, 6.7% of individuals using Snapchat reported experiencing something that affected them negatively on Snapchat. Values represent weighted percentages; standard errors are shown in parentheses. Additionally, the online column value for this item is lower than the offline or/and online figure, as it excludes respondents who selected other or none of the above when asked which app or platform interfered with their sleep.														
c Overall values include individuals who responded that they experienced a harm in other contexts, with a write-in response. As a result, overall values may be greater than the sum of the offline and online values.														
d Online prevalence indicates the number of adolescents who reported experiencing this harm on at least 1 of the 20 platforms assessed.														

Abbreviation: NR, not reported (cells with count responses <5 are masked in line with UASTeen's data policy for ensuring data is unidentifiable).

^a Full sample columns report the prevalence of each experience among all 472 respondents. For example, the second row shows that 41.4% of respondents reported experiencing something that affected them negatively in any context (offline, online, or both); of these, 22.9% experienced it offline (regardless of whether they also experienced it online) and 27.6% experienced it online (regardless of whether they also experienced it offline). As such, the offline and online columns are not mutually exclusive and may sum to more than the offline or/and online column. The online column considers responses across the 11 online platforms that are the focus of this article as well as additional platforms asked about in the survey (any dating app, Bluesky, LinkedIn, Nextdoor, Pinterest, Reddit, Threads, Twitch, Twitter/X, WhatsApp, and some other online communications service).

^b Columns showing data by those who used each platform reflect experiences that occurred specifically on that

platform, for example, 6.7% of individuals using Snapchat reported experiencing something that affected them negatively on Snapchat. Values represent weighted percentages; standard errors are shown in parentheses. Additionally, the online column value for this item is lower than the offline or/and online figure, as it excludes respondents who selected other or none of the above when asked which app or platform interfered with their sleep.

^c Overall values include individuals who responded that they experienced a harm in other contexts, with a write-in response. As a result, overall values may be greater than the sum of the offline and online values.

^d Online prevalence indicates the number of adolescents who reported experiencing this harm on at least 1 of the 20 platforms assessed.

Table 3. Logistic Regressions Examining Demographic Correlates of Reported Online Harm Experiences^a

Predictor	Outcome, weighted % (SE) ^b														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Intercept	-4.41 ^d	-2.01	-3.56	-5.41 ^d	-1.52	-3.59 ^d	-3.61	0.36	-10.86 ^c	-3.8	-4.79 ^d	1.64	-1.38	-2.87 ^c	-3.22 ^c
Sex (reference: female)	-1.5	-1.36	-1.89	-1.69	-1.67	-1.38	-4.35	-1.61	-4.6	-3.47	-1.67	-2.27	-1.9	-1.39	-1.3
Male	-0.17	0.1	0.28	-1.22 ^e	0.11	0.51 ^c	-0.82	0.39	-0.28	0.48	-0.37	0.19	0.74	-0.08	-0.22
Other/nonbinary	-0.25	-0.23	-0.33	-0.33	-0.32	-0.25	-0.74	-0.31	-0.78	-0.84	-0.34	-0.4	-0.38	-0.23	-0.23
Hispanic	1.65 ^c	2.07 ^d	0.46	-0.34	-0.03	1.4 ^c	0.4	0.06	1.57	-15.98 ^e	0.95	1.59 ^c	0.09	0.8	1.13
Age	-0.64	-0.77	-0.79	-0.64	-0.8	-0.6	-0.91	-0.77	-1.04	-0.82	-0.71	-0.7	-1.15	-0.63	-0.61
	0.22	0.17	-0.08	-0.53	-0.4	0.2	-0.32	0.17	1.01	1.85 ^c	-0.16	-0.01	0.18	0.07	0.27
	-0.33	-0.29	-0.47	-0.45	-0.44	-0.32	-1.07	-0.39	-0.96	-0.77	-0.46	-0.49	-0.51	-0.3	-0.29
	0.19	0.09	0.12	0.31 ^d	-0.06	0.15	0	-0.18	0.4	-0.08	0.16	-0.29 ^c	-0.1	0.15	0.18 ^c
	-0.1	-0.09	-0.12	-0.11	-0.11	-0.09	-0.25	-0.11	-0.31	-0.21	-0.11	-0.15	-0.12	-0.09	-0.08
Race and ethnicity (reference: White)															
American Indian/Alaska Native	-1.48	-3.72 ^d	-0.42	-0.35	-0.56	0.91	0.84	1.97 ^c	-15.98 ^e	-17.34 ^e	-14.12 ^e	1.8	-14.47 ^e	-0.39	-1.16
Asian	-1.02	-1.19	-1.21	-0.95	-1.07	-0.71	-1.18	-0.89	-0.7	-0.87	-0.56	-1.19	-0.69	-0.77	-0.71
Black	0.09	0	0.15	1.5 ^d	-0.51	1.25 ^c	-1.51	-0.33	0.95	-16.35 ^e	1.1	-0.67	-0.56	-0.68	-0.27
	-0.59	-0.48	-0.66	-0.58	-0.69	-0.52	-1.14	-0.69	-1.66	-0.64	-0.57	-0.88	-0.98	-0.59	-0.54
	0.13	-1.32 ^e	0.59	-1.81 ^d	-1.25 ^c	-0.29	0.55	0.49	0.59	0.6	0.71	-0.47	-0.33	-0.11	-0.09
	-0.37	-0.35	-0.41	-0.62	-0.58	-0.38	-0.62	-0.4	-0.86	-0.68	-0.42	-0.72	-0.56	-0.34	-0.33
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-1.91	-0.59	-0.88	1.24	0.44	-1.69	-14.66 ^e	-0.59	2.49 ^d	-16.81 ^e	0.32	-0.23	-0.3	0.79	0.66
Multiple races	-1.2	-0.93	-1.16	-1.09	-0.86	-0.95	-1.04	-1.03	-0.95	-0.86	-1.03	-1.19	-1.01	-1.06	-1.07
	0.64	0.54	-0.49	0.59	0.29	0.34	-1.18	0.88 ^c	-16.3 ^e	-1.21	0.23	0.57	-0.25	0.08	0.35
	-0.37	-0.36	-0.64	-0.45	-0.49	-0.37	-1.16	-0.44	-0.82	-1.32	-0.54	-0.47	-0.57	-0.39	-0.35
Annual household income (reference: >\$150 000)															
<\$25 000	-0.18	-0.08	-1.07	-0.68	-0.93	-0.68	-0.2	-0.46	-0.69	-0.1	-0.98	-0.4	-0.28	0.26	-0.59
\$25 000-\$49 000	-0.52	-0.47	-0.61	-0.57	-0.75	-0.53	-1.07	-0.67	-1.2	-1.17	-0.67	-1.03	-0.86	-0.48	-0.44
\$50 000-\$74 000	-0.01	0.2	-0.66	-0.91	-0.63	-0.57	-0.11	0.23	-1.53	0.29	0.12	0.05	0.19	0.4	0.31
\$75 000-\$150 000	-0.42	-0.4	-0.5	-0.54	-0.58	-0.44	-0.88	-0.58	-1.02	-1.1	-0.45	-0.69	-0.72	-0.39	-0.38
	-0.68	0.24	-1.04	0.11	-1.02	-0.28	-15.7 ^e	-0.1	-0.87	-16.85 ^e	-0.16	0.86	-0.04	-0.29	-0.25
	-0.55	-0.56	-0.84	-0.56	-0.76	-0.52	-1	-0.82	-0.97	-1.23	-0.77	-0.82	-0.98	-0.5	-0.47
	-0.14	-0.1	-0.28	-0.59	0.06	-0.17	-0.7	0.16	-1.41	-0.23	-0.35	0.5	0.51	-0.24	-0.34
	-0.33	-0.31	-0.39	-0.37	-0.45	-0.33	-0.85	-0.46	-0.79	-0.98	-0.42	-0.49	-0.47	-0.31	-0.29

(continued)

Table 3. Logistic Regressions Examining Demographic Correlates of Reported Online Harm Experiences^a (continued)

Predictor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Outcome, weighted % (SE) ^b															
Parental education (reference: ≥Bachelor's degree)															
≤High school	-0.17	-0.85 ^c	-0.16	-0.04	0.05	-0.47	-0.6	-0.25	-0.26	0.08	0.18	-1.12	-0.61	-1.25 ^e	0.22
	-0.43	-0.4	-0.56	-0.55	-0.58	-0.45	-1.11	-0.54	-0.92	-1.23	-0.48	-0.79	-0.79	-0.37	-0.38
Some college	0.04	-0.52	0.02	0.02	0.53	-0.12	-0.03	-0.09	0.57	0.29	-0.3	0.06	-0.42	-0.38	0.08
	-0.31	-0.3	-0.39	-0.39	-0.41	-0.32	-0.87	-0.41	-0.77	-0.97	-0.4	-0.47	-0.49	-0.29	-0.28
No. of platforms used daily	0.19 ^c	0.2 ^d	0.05	0.13	0.28 ^d	0.14	0.35	0.14	0.42	0.13	0.11	0.1	0.15	0.21 ^d	0.16 ^c
	-0.08	-0.07	-0.11	-0.09	-0.1	-0.08	-0.19	-0.1	-0.24	-0.26	-0.1	-0.11	-0.11	-0.07	-0.07
Parental control (reference: No)															
Not sure	-0.24	1.04 ^c	0.3	-0.54	0.84	0.66	0.45	0.31	0.73	-17.14 ^e	0.19	-1.42	-0.95	-0.95 ^c	0.57
	-0.61	-0.49	-0.58	-0.58	-0.57	-0.44	-1.12	-0.6	-1.21	-0.69	-0.55	-1.09	-0.82	-0.45	-0.45
Yes	0.25	-0.08	-0.2	-0.1	-0.17	-0.02	0.2	-0.73	0.22	-0.24	0.22	-0.68	-0.28	-0.26	0.05
	-0.28	-0.25	-0.37	-0.32	-0.35	-0.27	-0.86	-0.38	-0.75	-0.89	-0.39	-0.47	-0.47	-0.26	-0.25
No.	448	447	448	448	448	448	448	448	447	447	448	448	448	448	447
McFadden R ²	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.07	0.22	0.17	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.08	0.07

^a Separate logistic regressions were fitted with the survey.glm package in R version 4.4 (R Foundation).

Dependent variables were dichotomous indicators of whether adolescents reported experiencing a given harm online, on any platform, in the last 4 weeks.

^b 1, Personally experienced something negative; 2, Experienced content bad for the world; 3, Seen unwanted nudity/sexual images; 4, Felt worse about self due to others' posts; 5, Been insulted, threatened, or excluded; 6, Witnessed harassment of others; 7, Received unwanted sexual advances; 8, Involved in an unwanted conversation; 9, Sent explicit images or messages; 10, Photos used inappropriately; 11, Seen violent or disturbing images; 12, Seen self-harm or threats of self-harm; 13, Seen encouragement of self-harm; 14, Seen discrimination

based on identity; 15, Technology interferes with sleep sometimes/often. Respondents were only included in each analysis if they had valid responses to all variables; as a result, regression Nos. may differ slightly from the weighted Nos.

^c $P < .05$.^d $P < .01$.^e $P < .001$.

period and more than 10 million reported experiencing sleep disruption. This study provides baseline prevalence estimates of negative online experiences across platforms and demographic groups. Similar measurement is already in place for other public health risks for youth, such as the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System for substance use,

sexual behavior, and violence.²² Although stakeholders may disagree on how to reduce these harms, we still need a consistent way to measure them to evaluate what is working. Understanding the evolving experiences of US adolescents is essential to support evidence-based interventions to protect youth in an increasingly digital world.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Accepted for Publication: August 15, 2026.

Published Online: September 18, 2026.
doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.4692

Open Access: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [CC-BY-NC-ND License](#), which does not permit alteration or commercial use, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
© 2026 Lee AY et al. *JAMA Pediatrics*.

Author Contributions: Dr Lee and Ms Lim had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Lim, Liu, Jin, Iyer, Rausch, Haidt, Fast, Hancock, Linos.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Lee, Lim, Liu, Jin, Buffone, Iyer, Fast, Linos.

Drafting of the manuscript: Lee, Liu, Jin, Iyer.

Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Lee, Lim.

Obtained funding: Iyer, Fast, Linos.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Liu, Jin, Iyer, Rausch, Linos.

Supervision: Liu, Jin, Buffone, Iyer, Hancock.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Lee reported personal fees from BetterUp Labs outside the submitted work and participation in the Social Media Lab, the lead academic partner evaluating Australia's social media delay legislation. Dr Liu served on YouTube's Family Advisory Board beginning in January 2026 and reported personal fees from YouTube, honoraria for speaking engagements, and participation in the Social Media Lab outside the submitted work. Mr Jin was employed by Meta from 2006 to 2023 and continues to own Meta stock and provided unpaid testimony related to his work at Meta as part of social media litigation. Dr Buffone was employed by Meta from January 2019 through December 2025, including work on excessive use, youth safety, and age assurance, and is chief executive officer and founder of CLARA Standards, a nonprofit organization evaluating youth-facing digital platforms; she also engages in unpaid advocacy and testimony related to child online safety legislation and regulation. Dr Iyer, who previously worked at Meta/Facebook from 2018 to 2022, reported grants from the Knight Foundation, Omidyar Foundation, and Schmidt Foundation during the conduct of the study; personal fees from Anxious Generation, the Kentucky Attorney General's Office, and the Office of Communications outside the submitted work; honoraria for speaking engagements; and paid expert witness work in trials involving online platforms. Mr Rausch reported honoraria for speaking engagements related to social media and youth mental health. Dr Haidt reported book royalties and honoraria for speaking engagements; his nonprofit activities are supported by philanthropic funding from Bancel

Philanthropies, the Walton Family Foundation, the Bezos Courage and Civility Award, and other charitable donors, and he has served pro bono as an expert witness on social media and adolescent mental health. Dr Fast reported honoraria for speaking and advisory engagements and currently serves on artificial intelligence advisory boards at Meta and Ernst & Young. Dr Hancock reported consulting for Google and YouTube on social media issues, including legal consulting related to social media, outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by the Stanford Center for Digital Health and University of Southern California's Marshall Neely Center, which together provided funding for the collection, distribution, and analysis of the survey data. The Stanford Center for Digital Health funded the collection, management, and analysis of the data. Dr Lee's salary was funded by the Center for Digital Health as a postdoctoral researcher. The project described in this paper relies on data from survey(s) administered by the Understanding America Study, which is maintained by the Center for Economic and Social Research at the University of Southern California.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: Authors who are faculty and staff of Stanford and the University of Southern California participated in the design and conduct of the study; preparation and review of the manuscript, consistent with their role as contributing authors. The decision to submit the manuscript for publication was made independently by the author team.

Disclaimer: The content of this paper is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of USC or UAS.

Data Sharing Statement: See [Supplement 2](#).

REFERENCES

- Thériault-Couture F, Blangis F, Dooley N, et al. Cybervictimisation and mental health conditions in young people: findings from a nationally representative longitudinal cohort. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2026;10(2):94-102. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(25)00311-6
- Livingstone S, Smith PK. Annual research review: Harms experienced by child users of online and mobile technologies: the nature, prevalence and management of sexual and aggressive risks in the digital age. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2014;55(6):635-654. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12197
- Vogels EA. Teens and cyberbullying 2022. Pew Research Center. Published December 15, 2022. Accessed August 7, 2026. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2022/12/15/teens-and-cyberbullying-2022/>
- Smahel D, Machackova H, Mascheroni G, et al. EU Kids Online 2020: survey results from 19 countries. EU Kids Online. Published 2020. Accessed August 7, 2026. <https://www.eukidsonline.ch/files/Eu-kids-online-2020-international-report.pdf>
- Rideout V, Peebles A, Mann S, Robb MB. Common Sense Census: media use by tweens and teens, 2021. Common Sense Media. Published 2022. Accessed August 7, 2026. <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/the-common-sense-census-media-use-by-tweens-and-teens-2021>
- Kasturiratna KTAS, Hartanto A, Chen CHY, Tong EMW, Majeed NM. Umbrella review of meta-analyses on the risk factors, protective factors, consequences and interventions of cyberbullying victimization. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2025;9(1):101-132. doi:10.1038/s41562-024-02011-6
- Fry D, Krzeczowska A, Ren J, Lu M, Fang X; Into the Light Index Study Group. Prevalence estimates and nature of online child sexual exploitation and abuse: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2025;9(3):184-193. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(24)00329-8
- Finkelhor D, Turner H, Colburn D. Prevalence of online sexual offenses against children in the US. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(10):e2234471. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.34471
- Meier A, Reinecke L. Computer-mediated communication, social media, and mental health: a conceptual and empirical meta-review. *Commun Res*. 2020;48(8):1182-1209. doi:10.1177/0093650220958224
- Hudson N, David M, Haux T, et al. Content and activity that is harmful to children within scope of the online safety bill: a rapid evidence assessment prepared for: department for digital, culture, media and sport. Published 2022. Accessed September 3, 2026. https://natcen.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2022-12/Content_and_Activity_that_is_Harmful_to_Children_within_Scope_of_the_Online_Safety_Bill_REA_accessible.pdf
- Orben A, Przybylski AK, Blakemore SJ, Kievit RA. Windows of developmental sensitivity to social media. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):1649. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-29296-3
- Orben A, Matias JN. Fixing the science of digital technology harms. *Science*. 2025;388(6743):152-155. doi:10.1126/science.adt6807
- Alattar L, Messel M, Rogofsky D. An introduction to the Understanding America Study internet panel. *Soc Secur Bull*. 2018;78(2):13-28.
- Fast N, Schroeder J, Iyer R, Motyl M. Unveiling the Neely ethics & technology indices. Designing Tomorrow. Published June 22, 2023. Accessed August 10, 2026. <https://psychoftech.substack.com/p/unveiling-the-neely-ethics-and-technology>
- Béjar A. Testimony before the US Senate Committee on the Judiciary. November 7, 2023. Accessed August 7, 2026. https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2023-11-07_-testimony_-bejar.pdf
- Sippel B, Greb N, Park E, Rausch Z, Haidt J. Meta's internal research: what the co learned about social media and harms to mental health from dozens of internal studies. Tech and Society Lab,

NYU Stern School of Business. Published January 13, 2026. Updated March 27, 2026. Accessed August 10, 2026. <https://metasinternalresearch.org/>

17. Carr CT, Hayes RA. Social media: defining, developing, and divining. *Atl J Commun*. 2015;23(1):46-65.

18. Bayer JB, Triêu P, Ellison NB. Social media elements, ecologies, and effects. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2020;71:471-497. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050944

19. Mitchell KJ, Finkelhor D, Wolak J, Ybarra ML, Turner H. Youth internet victimization in a broader victimization context. *J Adolesc Health*. 2011;48(2):128-134. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.06.009

20. Nesi J, Prinstein MJ. Using social media for social comparison and feedback-seeking: gender and popularity moderate associations with depressive symptoms. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2015;43:1427-1438. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-0020-0

21. Krumpal I. Determinants of Social Desirability Bias in Sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Qual Quant*. 2013;47(4):2025-2047. doi:10.1007/s1135-011-9640-9

22. Brener ND, Mpofu JJ, Krause KH, et al. Overview and methods for the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System—United States, 2023. *MMWR Suppl*. 2024;73(4):1-12. doi:10.15585/mmwr.su7304a1