

What happens when you are not on social networks? A survey among middle-school teens in Switzerland

Joan-Carles SURÍS, Sophie STADELMANN, Lorraine CHOK, Yara BARRENSE-DIAS

Research Group on Adolescent Health, Department of Epidemiology and health Systems,
Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté), University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Short title: Teens not on social networks

Corresponding author: Prof. JC Surís

GRSA / Unisanté

Route de la Corniche 10

1010 Lausanne, Switzerland

Telephone: +4121 314 7375

Email: joan-carles.suris@unisante.ch

Conflict of interest: None to declare

Authorship: JCS contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, and analysis and interpretation of data, drafted the article, and approved the final version; SS contributed to the conception of the study and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, and approved the final version; LC contributed to the conception the study and acquisition and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, and approved the final version; YB-D contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, and interpretation of data, revised the manuscript critically, and approved the final version.

Funding: the study was funded by the Direction générale de la santé du canton de Vaud

ABSTRACT

Aim. To describe the differences between users and non-users of social networks controlling for explanatory factors.

Methods. Data were drawn from a survey on media and Internet use carried out among 2893 10th graders in Switzerland. Participants were asked whether they were active in 10 different social networks and divided into two groups: *Not active* (answering *no* to the 10 networks; n=176) and *Active* (answering positively to at least one; n=2717). The groups were compared on sociodemographic, health, and screen-related variables. All variables significant in the bivariate analysis were included in a backward logistic regression.

Results. The backward logistic regression revealed that inactive participants were more likely to be males, younger, to live in an intact family, and to assess their screen-time as below average, and less likely to practice extracurricular sport, to spend ≥ 4 hours of screen-time per day, to be around their Smartphone at all times, to have parental rules about Internet content or to discuss Internet use with parents.

Conclusion. Most young adolescents use social networks. However, this activity does not seem to be associated to academic problems. Therefore the use of social networks should not be demonized but considered part of their social life.

Keywords: Adolescents; Screen use; Social networks

1. Introduction

Adolescents are among the most active users of social networks and these have become integrated in their daily life[1], as social interactions increasingly take place through them[2]. Research indicates that youths spend a lot of time communicating through social networks[3], and this trend has increased in recent years. Moreover, almost two out of every five adolescent social networks users use 4 or more platforms[4]. Swiss data collected in 2018 indicated that 94% of adolescents aged 12-19 years were on social networks[5].

Excessive use of social networks has been associated with negative health consequences[1], both physical[6] and mental[7-9], and with conflicts with parents[10, 11]. Most of these indicators are usually more marked in females than in males[7-9]. However, some authors[12] suggest that social networks use may be an indicator rather than a risk factor for poor mental health, while others[13] conclude that daily social networks use is not an important risk factor for depressive symptoms. Research also shows that passive use of social networks is associated to greater symptoms of anxiety and depression, while active use decreases them[9]. Besides, problematic media use is also related to lower academic achievement[1, 14].

Nevertheless, even though there are still some adolescents not using social networks, this phenomenon has been rarely studied. Australian data published in 2011[15] indicated that 30% of adolescents were not using social networking platforms at the moment of the survey, and this phenomenon was more marked among males (41%) than females (22%). In Switzerland, non-users represent 5-6% [5, 16], similar to a study carried out in the United States (7%)[2].

According to the literature, not being on social networks may be due to two main reasons. On the one side, some adolescents consider that it is too much time consuming and prefer engaging in other activities[15]. On the other, they may be less likely to be socially

driven[17]. However, parental control or interdiction may also play a role in it. It is thus important to elicit which are the characteristics of adolescents who are not on social networks and to what extent it protects them or not regarding health and social consequences.

The objective of this research was to describe the differences between users and non-users of social networks taking into account potential explanatory factors. We hypothesized that adolescents with no social network accounts would report a better academic performance.

2. Methods

Data were drawn from a survey on media and Internet use carried out among 10th graders (aged 13-14 years) in the canton of Vaud, Switzerland, from November 2019 to February 2020[16]. A random sample of 3814 students (response rate 92.6%) accessed the questionnaire and, among them, 808 were discarded because they did not want to participate (n=108), they did not answer honestly (they answered *no* at the end of the questionnaire when asked whether their responses were honest; n=127), they did not complete the questionnaire until the end (n=435) or had completed it more than once (n=138). Out of the 3006 questionnaires that were considered valid, 113 participants (67 males) reported not owning a Smartphone and were not included in the analysis as youths use mainly this device for social networking. The analytic sample included 2893 youths (50.2% males).

Participants were asked whether they were active in 10 different social networking sites (Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, Pinterest, Twitter, Musical.ly, TikTok, Discord, Houseparty, Reddit). Based on these results we divided the sample into two groups: *Not active on social networks* (those having answered *no* to all 10 of them) and *Active on social networks* (those having answered positively to at least one social network). In this study, as in a similar research[5], we have not considered the Whatsapp messaging service as a social network because it does not allow public communication. Moreover, as the objective was to compare

users with non-users, we did not consider the number of social media used among the latter. The two groups were compared on sociodemographic, health, and screen-related variables. Sociodemographic variables included age, gender, nationality (*Swiss-born/other*), residence (*urban/rural*), family structure (parents together/other), relationship with father and mother (on a scale from 1 [*poor*] to 10 [*excellent*]), and perceived family socioeconomic status compared to other families in Switzerland with 7 possible answers ranging from *very much below average* to *very much above average* and trichotomized into *above average*, *average* and *below average*[18].

Health-related variables included overweight/obesity (using self-reported weight and height to calculate the body mass index and then comparing it to international standards[19]), extracurricular sport practice (at least twice a week), sleep troubles (at least weekly) and emotional wellbeing using the WHO-5 index[20]. The WHO-5 index is a 5-item questionnaire (e.g. I have felt calm and relax) related to the previous two weeks with 6 possible answers ranging from *At no time* (0) to *All of the time* (5). The addition of the items ranges from zero to 25, with a value under 13 indicating poor emotional wellbeing. To assess the perception of their academic performance we asked them whether compared to the other students in their class they thought that they were above average, average or below average students. We dichotomized the answers into *below average/other*.

Screen-related variables comprised the short version (12 items) of the internet addiction test[21], self-reported time spent on screen per day (*4 hours or more/less than 4 hours*)[22], perceived screen-time (*above average*, *average*, *below average*), whether they sleep close to their Smartphone (*yes/no*), whether their Smartphone is on plane mode at night (*yes/no*), whether they look at their Smartphone at night (*yes/no*), whether they have their Smartphone close by while doing their homework (*yes/no*). We also inquired about parental rules regarding time spent online (6 items on a scale from 1 [*Completely disagree*] to 5 [*Completely*

agree], range 6-30, with a higher score indicating stricter rules), content of what is seen online (3 items on a scale from 1 [*Absolutely false*] to 5 [*Absolutely true*], range 3 to 15, with a higher score indicating stricter rules), and discussions about screen use with parents (4 items on a scale from 1 [*Never*] to 5 [*Very often*], range 4 to 20, with a higher score indicating more communication between the teenager and the parents)[23]. To assess Smartphone use, we used the short version of the Smartphone Addiction Scale[24]. This 10-item scale (e.g., *The people around me tell me that I use my smartphone too much*) is rated on a scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree) for a total score ranging from 10 to 60. A score above 32/60 is considered as problematic Smartphone use. Finally, we listed 12 activities and asked participants whether they performed any of them for at least one hour on school days. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the canton of Vaud (protocol# 2019-01232).

2.1 Statistical analysis

We first run a bivariate analysis comparing both groups using chi-square test for categorical variables and student's t test for continuous ones. All significant variables ($p < .05$) were then included in a backward stepwise logistic regression using *Active on social networks* as the reference category. Using a backward selection, non-significant variables were thus consecutively eliminated until no more variables could be excluded from the model. Results are presented as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals.

In addition, for the daily activities, we first compared the two groups at the bivariate level. Afterwards, significant daily activities were included separately in a logistic regression controlling for age, gender and screen-time (4 hours of more, less than 4 hours). Results are presented as OR with 95% confidence intervals.

3. Results

Overall, 6.1% of the sample (n=176) were not active on social networks. In the bivariate analysis (Table 1), compared to those who were active (n=2717, 93.9%), they were significantly more likely to be males and slightly younger, to have an intact family, to have a better relationship with their father, to assess their screen-time as below average, and to have more parental rules about screen use. Additionally, they were less likely to perceive themselves as below average students, to be overweight, to practice extracurricular sport, to spend four or more hours of screen-time per day, to sleep by their smartphone, to wake up at night to look at it, to have it close by when doing their homework, to report a problematic Smartphone use, to have parental rules about Internet content or to discuss about Internet use with parents. It is worth noting that no association was found for nationality, residence, relationship with mother, perceived family socioeconomic status, emotional wellbeing, sleep problems or problematic internet use.

The backward logistic regression (Table 2) revealed that those who were inactive on social networks were more likely to be males and younger, to live in an intact family, and to assess their screen-time as below average. Similarly, they were less likely to practice extracurricular sport, to spend four or more hours of screen-time per day, to sleep by their Smartphone or to have it close by when doing their homework, to have parental rules about Internet content or to discuss Internet use with parents.

Regarding other activities during schooldays, those inactive on social networks were more likely to read a book and less likely to watch series or videos, to listen to music, to use social networks, to send messages or to game online both at the bivariate and at the multivariate levels (Table 3). No differences were found for watching TV, extracurricular sport practice, doing their homework, gaming offline or spending time with their family.

4. Discussion

Young teenagers not using social networks were a minority showing clear differences with their social networks active peers and, contrary to our hypothesis, they did not report better academic results.

The main difference was that they had a higher probability to be males, with an adjusted odds ratio of 3.51. This finding is in agreement with the literature indicating that girls spend more time on social networks while boys are more likely to play online games[25]. Furthermore, they were also younger and probably still more closely monitored by their parents regarding their screen use, including social networks. Additionally, most social networks have a minimum age requirement of 13 years, and that could partially explain it. The fact that they were twice more likely to live with both their parents could also go in this sense as it has been found that parents living together show higher levels of monitoring[26].

As it could be expected, non-active teenagers were less likely to use screens in general and more likely to assess their screen-use time as below average. This lower screen-use could explain their minor setting of parental rules about content or discussions about screen use, as setting rules seems to be more a reactive than a proactive parental behavior[27]. It could be hypothesized that rules and discussions about screen use are more likely to arise when teenagers start using social networks and, thus, spend more time online, than rather as a primary prevention. Moreover, it could also be assumed that for youths with low screen use, content is not a parental concern. Yet, a study[28] found that parental rules are more effective among young people less engaged in social networks.

Contrary to earlier studies[7, 12, 29], we did not find an association with physical or mental health after controlling for confounding factors. This seems to confirm a Dutch research concluding that the association between social networks use and emotional wellbeing differs across adolescents[30] and one from the United States[13] inferring that social networks use is not a risk factor for depressive symptoms.

Interestingly, teenagers not using social networks were less likely to practice extracurricular sport. This finding seems to point out that using social networks is not a restraint for sport practice and could imply that sport practice, as a social activity, benefits from its use. This result is partially in line with a study carried out in the United States[2] where they found that social networks use was associated with higher physical activity levels among physically active students, but not among sedentary ones.

When looking at the activities done on schooldays, again as expected, all those related to screen use (except for gaming offline) were less frequent among non-active teens. Still, the only daily activity non-active teens did more often was reading a book. This finding seems to contradict a previous research[15] indicating that one of the reasons brought up by teenagers for not using social networks was their preference for engaging in other activities.

The main strength of this research is that it is based on a large representative sample of young adolescents in the canton of Vaud. Nevertheless, some limitations need to be stated. First, the survey being cross-sectional, causality cannot be assumed. Second, results are based on self-report and it cannot be excluded that socially desirable answers were given. However, the fact that the questionnaire was anonymous should minimize it. Third, with the data collected in the survey we are unable to assess whether participants consider that online gaming is a way of socialization. Fourth, we do not know whether some of these youths do not use social networks because they do not want to or simply because they are not allowed by their parents. Even more, a small percentage (5.5%) of inactive youths still report using social media. That would mean that they could access them even without having an account, maybe just to see what their peers do. How these youths live this situation and to what extent it is their own choice are important points that need to be included in future research.

5. Conclusions

The vast majority of young adolescents use social networks. However, this activity does not seem to be associated to academic problems. This means that, although rules on how to use them correctly must be taught and learned to avoid problematic use, using social networks should not be demonized but seen as an extension of their social life. Yet, what we do not know is how these youths who are not active on social networks will evolve over time, whether they will become users later on or they will continue to self-exclude themselves from this kind of social interactions. Further longitudinal research is needed.

ACCEPTED VERSION

References

1. Paakkari L, Tynjala J, Lahti H, Ojala K, Lyyra N. Problematic Social Media Use and Health among Adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(4).
2. Shimoga SV, Erlyana E, Rebello V. Associations of Social Media Use With Physical Activity and Sleep Adequacy Among Adolescents: Cross-Sectional Survey. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(6):e14290.
3. Ostendorf S, Wegmann E, Brand M. Problematic Social-Networks-Use in German Children and Adolescents-The Interaction of Need to Belong, Online Self-Regulative Competences, and Age. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(7).
4. Vente T, Daley M, Killmeyer E, Grubb LK. Association of Social Media Use and High-Risk Behaviors in Adolescents: Cross-Sectional Study. *JMIR Pediatr Parent*. 2020;3(1):e18043.
5. Suter L, Waller G, Bernath J, Külling C, Willemse I, Süss D. JAMES - Jeunes, activités, médias - enquête Suisse. Zurich: Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften; 2018.
6. Sampasa-Kanyinga H, Colman I, Goldfield GS, Hamilton HA, Chaput JP. Sex differences in the relationship between social media use, short sleep duration, and body mass index among adolescents. *Sleep Health*. 2020.
7. Barthorpe A, Winstone L, Mars B, Moran P. Is social media screen time really associated with poor adolescent mental health? A time use diary study. *J Affect Disorders*. 2020;274:864-70.
8. Thorisdottir IE, Sigurvinsdottir R, Kristjansson AL, Allegrante JP, Lilly CL, Sigfusdottir ID. Longitudinal association between social media use and psychological distress among adolescents. *Prev Med*. 2020;141:106270.

9. Thorisdottir IE, Sigurvinsdottir R, Asgeirsdottir BB, Allegrante JP, Sigfusdottir ID. Active and Passive Social Media Use and Symptoms of Anxiety and Depressed Mood Among Icelandic Adolescents. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. 2019;22(8):535-42.
10. Wang M, Xu Q, He N. Perceived interparental conflict and problematic social media use among Chinese adolescents: The mediating roles of self-esteem and maladaptive cognition toward social network sites. *Addict Behav*. 2021;112:106601.
11. Sampasa-Kanyinga H, Goldfield GS, Kingsbury M, Clayborne Z, Colman I. Social media use and parent-child relationship: A cross-sectional study of adolescents. *J Community Psychol*. 2020;48(3):793-803.
12. Beeres DT, Andersson F, Vossen HGM, Galanti MR. Social Media and Mental Health Among Early Adolescents in Sweden: A Longitudinal Study With 2-Year Follow-Up (KUPOL Study). *J Adolesc Health*. 2020.
13. Kreski N, Platt J, Rutherford C, Olfson M, Odgers C, Schulenberg J, et al. Social Media Use and Depressive Symptoms Among United States Adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020.
14. Schwartz D, Kelleghan A, Malamut S, Mali L, Ryjova Y, Hopmeyer A, et al. Distinct Modalities of Electronic Communication and School Adjustment. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2019;48(8):1452-68.
15. Baker RK, White KM. In their own words: why teenagers don't use social networking sites. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. 2011;14(6):395-8.
16. Barrense-Dias Y, Akre C, Berchtold A, Leeners B, Morselli D, Suris JC. Sexual health and behavior of young people in Switzerland. Lausanne: IUMSP; 2018.
17. Ljepava N, Orr RR, Locke S, Ross C. Personality and social characteristics of Facebook non-users and frequent users. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2013;29(4):1602-7.

18. Hibell B, Guttormsson U, Ahlström S, Balakireva O, Bjarnason T, Kokkevi A, et al. The 2007 ESPAD Report. Substance Use Among Students in 35 European Countries. Stockholm: The Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs (CAN); 2009.
19. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *BMJ*. 2000;320(7244):1240-3.
20. de Wit M, Pouwer F, Gemke RJ, Delemarre-van de Waal HA, Snoek FJ. Validation of the WHO-5 Well-being Index (WHO-5) in Adolescents with Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2007;30(8):2003-6.
21. Pawlikowski M, Altstötter-Gleich C, Brand M. Validation and psychometric properties of a short version of Young's Internet Addiction Test. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2013;29(3):1212-23.
22. Berchtold A, Akre C, Barrense-Dias Y, Zimmermann G, Suris JC. Daily internet time: towards an evidence-based recommendation? *Eur J Public Health*. 2018;28(4):647-51.
23. van den Eijnden RJ, Spijkerman R, Vermulst AA, van Rooij TJ, Engels RC. Compulsive internet use among adolescents: bidirectional parent-child relationships. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2010;38(1):77-89.
24. Lopez-Fernandez O. Short version of the Smartphone Addiction Scale adapted to Spanish and French: Towards a cross-cultural research in problematic mobile phone use. *Addict Behav*. 2017;64:275-80.
25. Dufour M, Brunelle N, Tremblay J, Leclerc D, Cousineau MM, Khazaal Y, et al. Gender Difference in Internet Use and Internet Problems among Quebec High School Students. *Canadian journal of psychiatry Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*. 2016;61(10):663-8.

26. Tornay L, Michaud PA, Gmel G, Wilson ML, Berchtold A, Suris JC. Parental monitoring: a way to decrease substance use among Swiss adolescents? *European journal of pediatrics*. 2013;172(9):1229-34.
27. Bjelland M, Soenens B, Bere E, Kovacs E, Lien N, Maes L, et al. Associations between parental rules, style of communication and children's screen time. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:1002.
28. van den Eijnden R, Geurts SM, Ter Bogt TFM, van der Rijst VG, Koning IM. Social Media Use and Adolescents' Sleep: A Longitudinal Study on the Protective Role of Parental Rules Regarding Internet Use before Sleep. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(3).
29. Boer M, van den Eijnden R, Boniel-Nissim M, Wong SL, Inchley JC, Badura P, et al. Adolescents' Intense and Problematic Social Media Use and Their Well-Being in 29 Countries. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020;66(6S):S89-S99.
30. Beyens I, Pouwels JL, van D, II, Keijsers L, Valkenburg PM. The effect of social media on well-being differs from adolescent to adolescent. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):10763.

Table 1. Bivariate analysis comparing the *Not active* and *Active* groups.

	Not Active	Active	P	OR [95% CI]	P
Gender (male)	69.6%	48.1%	<.0001	2.47 [1.77:3.44]	<.0001
Age (mean±SE)	13.48±.05	13.72±.02	<.0001	0.61 [0.49:0.76]	<.0001
Swiss-born (yes)	85.2%	80.8%	.15	1.37 [0.89:2.10]	.153
Residence (urban)	48.8%	53.4%	.26	0.83 [0.61:1.14]	.258
Student (below average)	2.4%	8.2%	<.001	0.28 [0.12:0.35]	.003
Family structure (parents together)	82.2%	67.7%	.0001	2.20 [1.48:3.27]	<.0001
Relationship with mother (mean±SE)	8.46±.13	8.59±.04	.35	0.96 [0.89:1.04]	.332
Relationship with father (mean±SE)	8.45±.14	7.86±.05	.0001	1.13 [1.05:1.21]	.001
Perceived familial socioeconomic status			.46		
Above average	20.1%	16.6%		1.26 [0.84:1.88]	0.259
Average	75.1%	78.1%		Reference	
Below average	4.8%	5.3%		0.96 [0.51:1.80]	.899
Emotional wellbeing (poor)	23.3%	25.7%	.52	1.14 [0.79:1.64]	.500
Overweight/obesity (yes)	9.4%	14.6%	<.05	0.62 [0.38:0.99]	<.05
Sleep problems (at least weekly)	26.1%	30.7%	.23	0.80 [0.55:1.16]	.232
Extracurricular sport (at least twice a week)	45.9%	54.6%	<.05	0.71 [0.51:0.97]	<.05
Internet addiction test (problematic)	7.6	11.6%	.17	0.62 [0.32:1.23]	.174
Screen-time >4 hours/day (yes)	15.6%	32.8%	<.0001	0.38 [0.24:0.59]	<.0001
Perceived screen-time			<.0001		
Above average	21.2%	40.3%		0.46 [0.30:0.72]	.001
Average	62.3%	54.9%		Reference	
Below average	16.5%	4.8%		3.05 [1.83:5.08]	<.0001
Sleep by smartphone (yes)	34.6%	54.3%	<.0001	0.44 [0.32:0.62]	<.0001
Smartphone shut down/on plane mode at night (yes)	48.5%	50.1%	.69	0.94 [0.69:1.29]	.694
Wakes up to look at smartphone during night (yes)	14.6%	30.6%	<.0001	0.39 [0.25:0.60]	<.001
Smartphone close by during homework (yes)	58.0%	75.5%	<.0001	0.50 [0.33:0.62]	<.0001

Problematic smartphone use (yes)	7.8%	18.9%	<.0001	0.36 [0.19:0.70]	.003
Parental rules about screen-time (mean±SE)	17.99±.35	16.38±.11	<.0001	1.06 [1.03:1.09]	<.0001
Parental rules about Internet content (mean±SE)	7.40±.26	8.50±.26	<.0001	0.90 [0.85:0.95]	<.0001
Discuss Internet use with parents (mean±SE)	8.65±.26	9.20±.08	<.05	0.95 [0.91:0.99]	<.05

ACCEPTED VERSION

Table2. Backward logistic regression using the *Active group* as the reference category. Results are presented as adjusted odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals.

	Not active	P
Gender (male)	3.51 [2.38:5.20]	<.0001
Age	0.64 [0.50:0.82]	.0001
Family structure (parents together)	2.05 [1.31:3.20]	.002
Extracurricular sport (at least twice a week)	0.46 [0.32:0.66]	<.0001
Screen-time >4 hours/day (yes)	0.52 [0.32:0.87]	<.05
Perceived screen-time (below average)	2.54 [1.52:4.26]	<.0001
Sleep by smartphone (yes)	0.65 [0.45:0.94]	<.05
Smartphone close by during homework (yes)	0.63 [0.43:0.90]	<.05
Parental rules about Internet content	0.91 [0.85:0.96]	<.01
Discuss Internet use with parents	0.93 [0.88:0.99]	<.05

Variables eliminated: Relationship with father; Student (below average); Overweight/obesity; Wakes up to look at smartphone during night; Smartphone addiction; Parental rules about screen-time.

Table 3. Activities lasting at least one hour on schooldays. Bivariate and multivariate analyses comparing *Not active* and *Active* groups.

	Not active	Active	P	aOR*
Watching TV	21.3%	26.5%	.14	
Watching series	24.5%	53.0%	<.0001	0.39 [0.26:0.56]
Watching videos	50.2%	58.2%	<.05	0.70 [0.51:0.98]
Listening to music	33.3%	63.3%	<.0001	0.37 [0.26:0.53]
Reading a book	28.4%	11.9%	<.0001	3.13 [2.98:4.70]
Sport practice	49.5%	55.8%	.11	
Doing homework	39.3%	42.9%	.37	
Using social media	5.5%	55.7%	<.0001	0.06 [0.03:0.12]
Send messages	10.8%	35.3%	<.0001	0.29 [0.17:0.48]
Gaming (offline)	23.2%	17.9%	.11	
Gaming (online)	26.2%	35.4%	<.05	0.43 [0.29:0.63]
Spending time with family	67.1%	70.0%	.43	

*Odds ratios adjusted for age, gender, and screen-time (over 4 hours/day), using the Active group as the reference category