

Supplemental Online Content

Lee AY, Lim CHJ, Liu SX, et al. Adolescents' experiences of online harms by platform. *JAMA Pediatr*. Published online September 18, 2026. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.4692

eMethods

eTable 1. Characteristics of Adolescent Respondents in the Full Sample and by Platform Used in the Past Four Weeks (Unweighted)

eTable 2. Percentage of Respondents Who Experienced Harms in the Past Four Weeks, Overall, Offline, Online, and Among Users of Each Platform (Unweighted)

eTable 3. Logistic Regressions Examining Demographic Correlates of Reported Online Harm Experiences (Unweighted)

This supplemental material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

Supplemental Materials

eMethods 1. About the Understanding America Study Teen Panel

All survey data was collected through the Understanding American Study Teen Panel. The UAS is a nationally representative, probability-based internet survey panel of US households that is maintained by the University of Southern California Dornsife Center for Economic and Social Research (see Alattar et al., 2018). Panel members are recruited through address-based sampling, drawn from a series of recruitment batches targeting the general US population using 1) simple random sampling of addresses and 2) an adaptive sampling algorithm that oversamples geographic areas expected to improve the panel's demographic representativeness over time. A small number of recruitment batches target specific subpopulations (i.e., Native American households). Once recruited, panel members complete surveys online on a recurring basis and update core demographic information on a quarterly basis. According to the CESR, the household-level UAS sample weights were constructed by 1) constructing base weights correcting for each household's unequal probability of being sampled given the panel's recruitment design and 2) constructing poststratification weights with an iterative raking algorithm that aligns the weighted sample to external population benchmarks on gender, race/ethnicity, age, education, and Census region, with extreme weights trimmed to limit variability. For the general adult UAS panel, benchmark distributions are derived from the Current Population Survey (CPS).

The data for this survey was obtained through the UASTeen Panel, which began in spring 2025 when AUS expanded to recruit adolescents aged 13-17 directly from participating UAS households. After a parent or legal guardian provided permission, UAS staff invited teens directly by text and email; participating teens received their own survey invitations and monetary incentives independent of other household members, using the same survey platform and research infrastructure as the adult panel. At the time of data analysis, 539 participants attempted the survey; 532 completed it (weighted sample = 490; 96.3% completion rate for weighted; 98.7% completion rate for unweighted); and 509 were in the targeted age range of 13-17-year-olds (weighed sample = 472). This means that 23 in the unweighted sample and 18 in the weighted sample were excluded for being out of the target age range, which was required for using the weights from UASTeen. Teen-level poststratification weights were constructed separately from the general adult approach: household-level base weights were combined with teen-specific benchmarking on gender, age, race, and geographic location, using estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS) (UAS Weighting Procedure, USC Dornsife CESR, June 2022; <https://uasdata.usc.edu/page/UASTeen>).

We expect UASTeen data to support reasonably accurate population-level inference, consistent with prior use of the general UAS weighting approach, for sufficiently powered cells. In addition, we note that selection facts into the panel at the household level and at the individual teen level (e.g., differences in parental permission, teen interest) may depend on factors not fully captured by these weights.

eMethods 2. Analytical approach

We conducted a nationally representative, probability-based survey of American adolescents aged 13-17 through the Understanding America Panel (Center for Economic Research at University of Southern California) between February to December 2025. The panel is nationally representative for adolescents aged 13-17. Participants were recruited from existing UAS household panel members with parental permission and teen assent. This study was approved by the USC Institutional Review Board (#UP-24-00750).

All analyses use the survey-specific post-stratification weights provided by UASTeen, which correct for unequal selection probabilities, panel non-response, and deviations from the U.S. adolescent population on key demographic characteristics including age, sex, and race/ethnicity. This was benchmarked against the American Community Survey (ACS).

The weighted data file included 539 participants, out of whom 532 completed the survey (completion rate of 98.7%). Only 509 participants (weighted sample of 472 participants) were within the targeted age range of 13-17-year-olds. The median completion time among these participants was 13.38 minutes.

The final weighted sample included 472 participants from 47 states (see Table 1 for detailed demographics; S1 for unweighted demographics). Household income, education, and state of residence were matched to teens using the UAS household identifier and demographic data from My Household. Given that the adolescents were recruited through parents in the UAS panel who consented for their children to take part in the survey, UAS My Household data also provided the household income, education, and state of residence for adult respondents (matched using the uashhid household-level identifier). The majority of adolescent respondents were matched to a single adult in their household who completed their demographic information. For the subset (<5%) of adolescents for whom multiple adults shared the same household identifier and provided different responses to the demographic questions, we matched their responses to adults from the same data collection batch, from the same “primary_respondent” identifier, and who indicated they were the parents/guardians of children aged 13-17. For the subset of adolescents with multiple eligible matched adults, the most recent adult response was used.

To see if certain groups of adolescents had higher prevalence of experiencing harms, we fit a series of separate logistic regression models using the `survey.glm` R package. The dependent variables were whether a given adolescent had experienced each specific harm online, where “online” was defined as if they indicated that this online harm occurred on any of the 20 online platforms. Predictors included gender (male, female, non-binary), categorical age, race (Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino), and ethnicity (White, Asian, American Indian/Native American, African American/Black, Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander, Multiracial), household education, household income, whether the adolescents’ smartphone used parental controls (yes, no, not sure), and the number of platforms they regularly used on a daily basis. Models were not run separately by platform given sample size constraints.

Household education was assessed “indicating the highest level of education attained by the respondent”: “What is the highest level of school that you have completed or the highest degree you have received?” (1 = Less than 1st grade, 2 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th grade, 3 = 5th or 6th grade, 4 = 7th or 8th grade, 5 = 9th grade, 6 = 10th grade, 7 = 11th grade, 8 = 12th grade - no diploma, 9 = High school graduate - high school diploma or the equivalent (for example GED), 10 = Some college but no degree, 11 = Associate degree in college - Occupational/vocational program, 12 = Associate degree in college - Academic program, 13 = Bachelor’s degree (For example: BA, AB, BS), 14 = Master’s degree (For example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA), 15 = Professional School Degree (For example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD), 16 = Doctorate degree (For example: PhD, EdD). Household income assessed as “indicating the total combined income of all members of the respondent’s household (living in their household) during the past 12 months” using the following item: “Which category represents the total combined income of all members of your family (living in your home) during the past 12 months? Please count income from everyone in the household who is age 15 or older, even if the income is theirs, and is not used by others in the household. This includes money from jobs, net income from business, farm or rent, pensions, dividends, interest, Social Security payments and any other monetary

© 2026 Lee AY et al. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 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.

income. If you aren't sure, your best guess will do" (1 = less than \$5,000, 2 = \$5,000–7,499, 3 = \$7,499–9,999, 4 = \$10,000–12,499, 5 = \$12,500–14,999, 6 = \$15,000–19,999, 7 = \$20,000–24,999, 8 = \$25,000–29,999, 9 = \$30,000–34,999, 10 = \$35,000–39,999, 11 = \$40,000–49,999, 12 = \$50,000–59,999, 13 = \$60,000–74,999, 14 = \$75,000–99,999, 15 = \$100,000–149,999, 16 = \$150,000 or more).

eMethods 3. Survey development

This section describes the procedures used to develop the survey instrument, including how harm domains were identified and how individual items were sourced and adapted.

Selection of harm domains. We selected the domains of harms to be assessed based on the Integrated Harm Framework (IHF) developed by the Stanford Center for Digital Health & Social Media Lab, (2025), which convened experts across public health, education, mental health, industry, and policy to build a shared taxonomy of youth-specific online harms. This framework built on and synthesized four resources from across civil society, academia, and policy (the World Economic Forum's Typology of Online Harms, 2023), the National Academies' Social Media and Adolescent Health report, (2024), the Stanford Social Media Lab's Adolescents and Well-being Report, (2024), and the Minnesota Attorney General's Report on Emerging Technology and Its Effects on Youth Well-Being, (2024) to 22 types of specific harms that were rated for inclusion in youth-focused risk assessment. These 22 harms spanned four conceptual categories: threats to safety and/or criminal activity (e.g., adult-minor solicitation and sextortion; child sexual abuse material; illegal transactions), health and wellbeing (e.g., content promoting self-harm, suicide, or eating disorders; displacement of sleep and other beneficial activities; psychological impacts such as depression and anxiety), other content-driven harms (e.g., exposure to violent or pornographic content; misogyny, racism, and hate speech; misinformation), and other harms (e.g, privacy violations, financial harms, fraud). The harm domains assessed in the present survey were selected from this framework, prioritizing domains with both high workshop-rated importance and established prior measurement approaches suitable for adaptation to a survey format.

Item selection. To move from these harm domains to specific items, we referenced past work that has assessed these harms in academic research, industry reports, and non-profit/civil society reports. Survey questions were largely drawn from existing surveys used by industry, academia, and policymakers, including Meta's BEEF survey and USC's Neely Indices. The Bad Experiences and Encounters Framework (BEEF) was an internal survey administered to Instagram users in July 2021 that asked if they experienced online harms in the last week (e.g., "Have you ever felt worse about yourself because of other people's posts on Instagram?" Yes, during the last 7 days / Yes, but more than 7 days ago / No). This was released through whistleblower testimony as part of exhibits in *Tennessee v. Meta* (2023) (accessed through Sippel et al., 2026). We adapted BEEF items to allow attribution across a broader set of platforms rather than Instagram alone, and extended the original 7-day recall window to 4 weeks, matching the recall window used by the Neely Indices, described below.

The USC Neely Indices are part of a nationally representative, longitudinal panel survey of US adults administered through the Understanding America Study, launched in 2023 by the USC Marshall Neely Center for Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in partnership with the Psychology of Technology Institute (Fast et al., 2023). The Neely Indices' four core items asked participants if in the last four weeks, they have "personally witnessed or experienced something that affected you negatively on [service]?", "witnessed or experienced content that you would consider bad for the world on [service]", "experienced a meaningful connection with others on [service]" and "learned something that was useful or that helped you understand something

© 2026 Lee AY et al. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 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.

important on [service]”. These questions were asked for a broad range of online platforms including YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, FaceTime, TikTok, Twitter/X, Reddit, Nextdoor, LinkedIn, Pinterest, Snapchat, WhatsApp, Discord, Email, Text Messaging, with the exact set varying over different survey waves. Demographic items about children’s identities and household were retained from the UASTeen panel’s data, which were aligned with the original UAS panel questions (see Alattar et al., 2018).

Per-app comparisons. We adapted the above harm-focused items, adding an “online or in person” framing to extend the comparison beyond a single platform context, and following the Neely Indices’ cross-platform model to structure our own per-platform harm approach. This approach has been used in past work. In the US, Thorn’s Youth Monitoring Reports use a similar per-app attribution model but on a narrower set of negative experiences and with a non-probability sample. Pew uses per-app attribution on a probability sample for a narrower set of negative experiences and applications (3: Instagram, TikTok, and Snapchat); for sleep disruption, they report similar findings (TikTok having the highest rate). Outside of the US, Ofcom’s Online Experiences Tracker and Children’s Online Safety Tracker and Australia eSafety’s Keeping Kids Safe Online surveys use a similar overall structure but provide limited public reporting on per-application harm prevalence, defined as the rate of a negative experience as a proportion of an application’s total users.

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

Fast N, Schroeder J, Iyer R, Motyl M. Unveiling the Neely Ethics & Technology Indices. Designing Tomorrow (Psychology of Technology Institute). Published June 22, 2023. Accessed August 7, 2026. <https://psychoftech.substack.com/p/unveiling-the-neely-ethics-and-technology>

Sippel B, Greb N, Park E, Rausch Z, Haidt J. Meta’s Internal Research: What the Company 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 7, 2026. <https://metasinternalresearch.org/>

eMethods 4. Pilot testing and cognitive interviews.

The following steps were taken to pilot test the survey before fielding. We conducted a series of cognitive tests to assess the comprehensibility and face validity of the survey items, and the clarity and ease of completing the full instrument.

Cognitive testing. Two rounds of cognitive testing were completed. First, each of three trained research assistants (aged 18-25) from the [Anonymized] Institution completed the survey themselves to establish a baseline completion time (Average completion time: 14 minutes); identify programming errors; and provide high-level feedback on item wording. Next, these research assistants conducted in-person interviews using a structured think-aloud protocol where they assessed how adolescent respondents aged 13-17 ($n = 3$) would think through the process of responding to each item; perceive the survey item stems, response options, instructions, and skip logic; and feel when completing the survey. These adolescents were recruited through word of mouth. Research assistants noted any points of confusion or hesitation. This feedback was used to refine and revise the survey wording and presentation. Overall, respondents were reported to understand the survey items well.

Pilot survey. Next, the survey was piloted online with respondents aged 18–25 recruited through Prolific (N = 506 valid responses). Respondents were asked to complete the full survey and to identify any items that were unclear, confusing, or difficult to answer. In total, the mean duration of the survey took 22.8 minutes to complete (median = 19.5 minutes, SD = 15.8 minutes). In general, most respondents felt the survey was clear and that they encountered no problems. Comments included that the questions were “simple and easy” and that they encountered “no problems.” Feedback on specific items again informed revisions to the instrument prior to fielding with the adolescent UAS sample.

eMethods 5. Note on sample size

The weighted analytic sample size reported in earlier drafts of this manuscript (N=482) differed from the corrected weighted sample size (N=472) by 10, which was caused by the inclusion of 10 18-year-old adolescents. We chose to exclude these participants given that the weights developed by UASTeen are weighted for the 13–17-year-old American population. All prevalence estimates reported in the main text and this Supplement reflect the corrected N=472 sample unless otherwise noted.

eTable 1. Characteristics of adolescent respondents in the full sample and by platform used in the past four weeks (unweighted).

		Full sample	Among adolescent users of each platform in the past four weeks										
			Snapchat	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online Gaming	Text Msg.	Facetime	Email
N (weighted)		505	241	390	286	98	302	179	131	204	389	240	315
	Mean age (SE)	15 (0.1)	15.3 (0.1)	15 (0.1)	15.2 (0.1)	15.5 (0.1)	15.4 (0.1)	15 (0.1)	15.2 (0.1)	14.9 (0.1)	15 (0.1)	15.1 (0.1)	15.2 (0.1)
Gender % (SE)													
	Female	51.5 (2.2)	54.8 (3.2)	49 (2.5)	55.2 (2.9)	55.1 (5)	54.6 (2.9)	82.1 (2.9)	26.7 (3.9)	36.3 (3.4)	56.3 (2.5)	58.3 (3.2)	54 (2.8)
	Male	45.3 (2.2)	42.7 (3.2)	47.9 (2.5)	41.3 (2.9)	42.9 (5)	42.1 (2.8)	14 (2.6)	64.9 (4.2)	58.8 (3.4)	39.6 (2.5)	39.2 (3.2)	42.2 (2.8)
	Other/non-binary	3.2 (0.8)	2.5 (1)	3.1 (0.9)	3.5 (1.1)	-	3.3 (1)	3.9 (1.5)	8.4 (2.4)	4.9 (1.5)	4.1 (1)	2.5 (1)	3.8 (1.1)
Race / Ethnicity % (SE)													
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2.2 (0.7)	-	1.5 (0.6)	3.5 (1.1)	-	3.6 (1.1)	-	-	-	2.3 (0.8)	-	-

	Asian	5.9 (1.1)	3.7 (1.2)	5.4 (1.1)	3.1 (1)	-	6.3 (1.4)	3.4 (1.3)	6.9 (2.2)	3.9 (1.4)	4.9 (1.1)	5.8 (1.5)	6.7 (1.4)
	Black	14.7 (1.6)	14.1 (2.2)	15.6 (1.8)	19.9 (2.4)	9.2 (2.9)	16.6 (2.1)	13.4 (2.5)	16 (3.2)	16.7 (2.6)	14.7 (1.8)	17.9 (2.5)	12.1 (1.8)
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.6 (0.6)	-	1.5 (0.6)	1.7 (0.8)	-	1.7 (0.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Multiracial	11.5 (1.4)	11.2 (2)	12.1 (1.7)	12.2 (1.9)	11.2 (3.2)	10.9 (1.8)	14.5 (2.6)	13 (2.9)	13.2 (2.4)	12.1 (1.7)	7.5 (1.7)	9.8 (1.7)
	White	63.2 (2.1)	67.2 (3)	63.1 (2.4)	58.7 (2.9)	70.4 (4.6)	60.6 (2.8)	64.8 (3.6)	61.1 (4.3)	63.7 (3.4)	64 (2.4)	63.7 (3.1)	67.9 (2.6)
Hispanic % (SE)													
	% non-hispanic	35.8 (2.1)	32.4 (3)	36.2 (2.4)	40.6 (2.9)	29.6 (4.6)	39.1 (2.8)	33.5 (3.5)	38.9 (4.3)	36.3 (3.4)	35.2 (2.4)	35 (3.1)	30.8 (2.6)
	% hispanic	63.2 (2.1)	67.2 (3)	63.1 (2.4)	58.7 (2.9)	70.4 (4.6)	60.6 (2.8)	64.8 (3.6)	61.1 (4.3)	63.7 (3.4)	64 (2.4)	63.7 (3.1)	67.9 (2.6)
Household income % (SE)													
	Less than \$25k	13.5 (1.5)	11.6 (2.1)	12.1 (1.7)	14.3 (2.1)	13.3 (3.4)	13.2 (2)	10.1 (2.3)	10.7 (2.7)	12.7 (2.3)	12.9 (1.7)	9.6 (1.9)	9.5 (1.7)
	Between \$25k-\$49k	18.8 (1.7)	19.9 (2.6)	17.9 (1.9)	23.8 (2.5)	27.6 (4.5)	21.5 (2.4)	19 (2.9)	19.1 (3.4)	17.2 (2.6)	16.7 (1.9)	17.5 (2.5)	18.1 (2.2)
	Between \$50k-\$74k	6.9 (1.1)	6.6 (1.6)	7.4 (1.3)	8.4 (1.6)	9.2 (2.9)	7 (1.5)	5.6 (1.7)	6.1 (2.1)	6.4 (1.7)	6.7 (1.3)	9.2 (1.9)	6 (1.3)
	Between \$75k-\$150k	36.8 (2.1)	39.8 (3.2)	35.9 (2.4)	35.3 (2.8)	32.7 (4.7)	36.1 (2.8)	38 (3.6)	41.2 (4.3)	33.8 (3.3)	38 (2.5)	36.2 (3.1)	34.6 (2.7)
	Greater than \$150k	23.8 (1.9)	21.6 (2.7)	26.4 (2.2)	18.2 (2.3)	16.3 (3.7)	22.2 (2.4)	27.4 (3.3)	22.1 (3.6)	29.4 (3.2)	25.4 (2.2)	27.5 (2.9)	31.4 (2.6)
Parental education% (SE)													

	High school or less	20.4 (1.8)	20.3 (2.6)	20.5 (2)	24.5 (2.5)	32.7 (4.7)	23.2 (2.4)	16.8 (2.8)	12.2 (2.9)	16.7 (2.6)	19 (2)	22.5 (2.7)	14.3 (2)
	Some college	33.9 (2.1)	38.2 (3.1)	34.1 (2.4)	42.3 (2.9)	36.7 (4.9)	37.4 (2.8)	36.3 (3.6)	36.6 (4.2)	36.3 (3.4)	34.2 (2.4)	34.6 (3.1)	32.4 (2.6)
	Bachelor's or more	45.5 (2.2)	41.1 (3.2)	45.1 (2.5)	33.2 (2.8)	29.6 (4.6)	39.4 (2.8)	46.9 (3.7)	50.4 (4.4)	46.6 (3.5)	46.5 (2.5)	42.9 (3.2)	53 (2.8)
Smartphone ownership % (SE)													
	% own a personal smartphone	90.5 (1.3)	97.1 (1.1)	90.8 (1.5)	95.8 (1.2)	92.9 (2.6)	97 (1)	93.9 (1.8)	93.1 (2.2)	91.2 (2)	91.5 (1.4)	95 (1.4)	91.7 (1.6)
	Mean age first acquired smartphone	11.2 (0.1)	11.1 (0.1)	11.2 (0.1)	11 (0.1)	11.3 (0.3)	11.1 (0.1)	10.8 (0.2)	11 (0.2)	11.3 (0.2)	11.2 (0.1)	11 (0.2)	11.3 (0.1)
Type of smartphone used % (SE)													
	An iPhone	67.3 (2.1)	72.2 (2.9)	66.9 (2.4)	72.7 (2.6)	70.4 (4.6)	74.5 (2.5)	68.7 (3.5)	55 (4.4)	64.7 (3.3)	70.7 (2.3)	87.1 (2.2)	67.9 (2.6)
	An Android device	28.5 (2)	27.8 (2.9)	29.7 (2.3)	25.2 (2.6)	27.6 (4.5)	24.2 (2.5)	29.1 (3.4)	41.2 (4.3)	29.9 (3.2)	25.4 (2.2)	10.8 (2)	28.3 (2.5)
	A different type of smartphone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parents use parental controls to manage smartphone usage % (SE)													
	Yes	32.1 (2.1)	27.4 (2.9)	32.6 (2.4)	23.8 (2.5)	26.5 (4.5)	25.2 (2.5)	33.5 (3.5)	22.1 (3.6)	32.8 (3.3)	34.2 (2.4)	37.5 (3.1)	32.1 (2.6)
	No	57.2 (2.2)	67.6 (3)	58.7 (2.5)	68.2 (2.8)	63.3 (4.9)	68.2 (2.7)	60.9 (3.7)	67.9 (4.1)	54.9 (3.5)	55.3 (2.5)	55.4 (3.2)	58.7 (2.8)
	Not sure	6.9 (1.1)	5 (1.4)	5.6 (1.2)	6.3 (1.4)	8.2 (2.8)	6 (1.4)	3.9 (1.5)	6.1 (2.1)	7.4 (1.8)	6.9 (1.3)	5.4 (1.5)	5.7 (1.3)

Note. Unweighted sample of 13–17-year-olds. The top row shows the unweighted number of respondents in the full sample (first column) and the unweighted number of respondents who reported using each platform in the past 4 weeks (subsequent columns). Apart from age and age at first smartphone acquisition, values represent unweighted percentages; standard errors are shown in parentheses. "Among users of platform" columns are restricted to respondents who reported using the named platform. Percentages within each demographic category (gender, race/ethnicity, Hispanic origin, household income, parental education, smartphone type, and parental controls) may not sum to 100% due to a small number of missing responses.

eTable 2. Percentage of respondents who experienced harms in the past four weeks, overall, offline, online and among users of each platform (unweighted proportions, and standard errors)

	Full sample			Among adolescent users of each platform in the past four weeks (% , SE)										
	Offline or/and online	Offline	Online	Snapchat	YouTube	TikTok	Facebook	Instagram	Pinterest	Discord	Online Gaming	Text Msg	Facetime	Email
N (weighted)	505	505	505	241	390	286	98	302	179	131	204	389	240	315
Have you personally witnessed or experienced something that affected you negatively?	41.1 (2.2)	21.8 (1.8)	26.9 (2)	7.5 (1.7)	5.9 (1.2)	20.6 (2.4)	-	16.9 (2.2)	-	7.6 (2.3)	5.4 (1.6)	5.7 (1.2)	-	-
Have you witnessed or experienced content that you would consider bad for the world?	51.7 (2.2)	15.2 (1.6)	42.8 (2.2)	10 (1.9)	16.2 (1.9)	35.3 (2.8)	14.3 (3.6)	27.2 (2.6)	6.7 (1.9)	7.6 (2.3)	6.4 (1.7)	2.3 (0.8)	-	-
Have you seen nudity or sexual images that	15.3 (1.6)	2.4 (0.7)	13.1 (1.5)	5.4 (1.5)	4.1 (1)	5.2 (1.3)	-	7.9 (1.6)	-	-	-	-	-	-

you didn't want to see?														
Have you felt worse about yourself or your life because of other peoples' posts, messages, or communications?	23 (1.9)	9.1 (1.3)	19.8 (1.8)	9.5 (1.9)	4.1 (1)	14.3 (2.1)	-	17.2 (2.2)	6.1 (1.8)	-	2.5 (1.1)	5.1 (1.1)	-	-
Has anyone insulted or disrespected you, contacted you in an inappropriate way, damaged your reputation, threatened you, or excluded you or left you out?	28.5 (2)	18.6 (1.7)	15.4 (1.6)	5.8 (1.5)	1.3 (0.6)	4.2 (1.2)	-	6.6 (1.4)	-	8.4 (2.4)	5.4 (1.6)	8 (1.4)	-	-

Have you seen anyone do any of these things to someone else (insult, disrespect, inappropriate contact, damage reputation, threaten, or exclude)?	45.1 (2.2)	26.7 (2)	29.5 (2)	11.6 (2.1)	9.5 (1.5)	21.7 (2.4)	9.2 (2.9)	18.9 (2.3)	2.8 (1.2)	17.6 (3.3)	15.7 (2.6)	7.2 (1.3)	2.9 (1.1)	-
Have you received unwanted sexual advances?	5.8 (1)	2.4 (0.7)	4 (0.9)	3.3 (1.2)	-	1.7 (0.8)	-	2 (0.8)	-	-	-	1.8 (0.7)	-	-
Have you gotten involved in an unwanted conversation?	25.4 (1.9)	13.9 (1.5)	15.6 (1.6)	8.7 (1.8)	-	2.8 (1)	-	7 (1.5)	-	8.4 (2.4)	4.9 (1.5)	9.8 (1.5)	4.2 (1.3)	-
Have you sent nude or sexually explicit images or messages?	3.8 (0.9)	-	3.6 (0.8)	2.5 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8 (0.7)	-	-

Has anyone used your photos in an inappropriate way?	3.6 (0.8)	-	2.8 (0.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1 (0.7)	-	-
Have you seen any violent, bloody, or disturbing images that bothered you?	15.5 (1.6)	2.2 (0.6)	12.3 (1.5)	-	2.3 (0.8)	7.3 (1.5)	-	9.9 (1.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Have you seen someone harm themselves, or threaten to do so?	15.7 (1.6)	7.9 (1.2)	9.9 (1.3)	3.7 (1.2)	1.8 (0.7)	6.6 (1.5)	-	4 (1.1)	-	6.9 (2.2)	2.9 (1.2)	2.1 (0.7)	-	-
Have you seen anyone encourage someone to harm themselves?	13.1 (1.5)	4.4 (0.9)	10.5 (1.4)	3.3 (1.2)	2.6 (0.8)	6.6 (1.5)	-	6 (1.4)	-	6.1 (2.1)	5.9 (1.7)	2.8 (0.8)	-	-
Have you seen anyone discriminating against people because of	47.6 (2.2)	20.6 (1.8)	39 (2.2)	9.1 (1.9)	12.8 (1.7)	36.4 (2.8)	17.3 (3.8)	33.4 (2.7)	6.7 (1.9)	13.7 (3)	13.2 (2.4)	4.9 (1.1)	3.3 (1.2)	-

their gender, religion, race, sexual orientat ion, or another part of their identity ?														
How often do you feel that your use of technol ogy gets in the way of your sleep? (Someti mes + Often)	51.7 (2.2)	-	48.3 (2.2)	18.7 (2.5)	25.6 (2.2)	43 (2.9)	-	29.1 (2.6)	8.4 (2.1)	7.6 (2.3)	17.2 (2.6)	12.3 (1.7)	12.9 (2.2)	-

Note. Unweighted sample. All cells report unweighted proportions and SEs.

eTable 3. Logistic regressions examining demographic correlates of reported online harm experiences (Unweighted)

Outcomes: (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) Tech interferes with sleep (sometimes/often)

Predictor	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10	-11	-12	-13	-14	-15
Intercept	-4.26**	-1.55	-4.15*	-4.46**	-0.47	-2.93*	-4.78	0.59	-7.08*	-1.97	-2.52	2.1	-1.59	-2.5*	-1.7
	-1.33	-1.18	-1.76	-1.49	-1.46	-1.21	-3.36	-1.47	-3.46	-3.77	-1.56	-1.99	-1.77	-1.18	-1.12
Gender (ref: Female)															
Male	-0.3	0.14	0.32	1.33***	-0.02	0.35	-1.1	0.13	-0.56	0.15	-0.4	-0.11	0.46	-0.08	-0.4*

	-0.22	-0.2	-0.28	-0.28	-0.28	-0.21	-0.56	-0.28	-0.62	-0.71	-0.29	-0.35	-0.32	-0.2	-0.2
Other/ non- binary	1.44*	1.54*	0.68	-0.46	0.06	1.1	0.2	0	0.81	- 16.21** *	0.66	1.02	-0.32	0.64	0.51
	-0.6	-0.66	-0.7	-0.63	-0.69	-0.61	-1.02	-0.68	-1.3	-0.66	-0.71	-0.62	-1.11	-0.57	-0.55
Hispan ic	-0.13	-0.09	-0.12	-0.39	-0.22	0.21	-0.47	-0.03	0.52	1.16	0.25	-0.21	0.01	0.15	0.27
	-0.27	-0.24	-0.38	-0.33	-0.35	-0.26	-0.73	-0.33	-0.66	-0.64	-0.35	-0.41	-0.4	-0.25	-0.24
Age	0.19*	0.07	0.14	0.23*	-0.13	0.11	0.07	-0.18	0.21	-0.16	0.03	-0.3*	-0.08	0.13	0.1
	-0.09	-0.08	-0.11	-0.1	-0.09	-0.08	-0.19	-0.1	-0.23	-0.21	-0.1	-0.13	-0.11	-0.08	-0.07
Race/Ethnicity (reference: White)															
Americ an Indian/ Alaska Native	-0.66	-1.25	-0.29	0.06	-0.5	-0.13	0.8	0.94	- 16.06** *	- 17.2***	- 14.28** *	0.5	- 14.47** *	-0.42	0.23
	-0.88	-0.88	-1.17	-0.85	-1.01	-0.67	-1.12	-0.76	-0.68	-0.76	-0.5	-1	-0.42	-0.64	-0.58
Asian	0.27	0.06	-0.04	1.33**	0.5	0.71	-0.1	0.09	1.57	- 16.42** *	0.89	-0.01	-0.16	-0.35	0.16
	-0.5	-0.44	-0.57	-0.49	-0.55	-0.44	-1.13	-0.59	-0.99	-0.55	-0.52	-0.66	-0.63	-0.47	-0.44
Black	-0.16	-1.07**	0.5	-1.24*	-0.95	-0.35	0.65	0.56	0.48	0.63	0.76	-0.44	-0.5	-0.1	0.01
	-0.35	-0.35	-0.39	-0.51	-0.56	-0.34	-0.62	-0.38	-0.78	-0.66	-0.4	-0.57	-0.49	-0.3	-0.31
Hawaii an/Pac ific Islande r	-0.98	1.16	0.04	0.32	0.31	-0.54	- 16.14** *	0.64	0.89	- 17.16** *	1.6*	0.32	1	0.29	1.79
	-1.25	-0.79	-1.09	-0.94	-1.01	-0.9	-0.92	-1.05	-1.47	-0.85	-0.8	-1.35	-0.89	-0.91	-1.09
Multira cial	0.5	0.17	-0.57	0.41	0.22	-0.1	-0.77	0.82*	- 15.95** *	-0.17	0.34	0.35	0.22	0.03	0.23
	-0.32	-0.3	-0.55	-0.39	-0.39	-0.33	-0.99	-0.36	-0.46	-1.1	-0.45	-0.44	-0.49	-0.32	-0.3

Annual household income (reference: >\$150k)															
<\$25k	-0.21	-0.62	-0.31	-0.53	-0.84	-0.52	-0.34	-0.81	-2.53*	-1.61	-0.67	0.17	0.25	-0.01	-0.74
	-0.46	-0.41	-0.57	-0.52	-0.66	-0.44	-1.09	-0.54	-1.24	-1.22	-0.65	-0.74	-0.66	-0.41	-0.38
\$25k–\$49k	-0.06	-0.22	-0.29	-0.88	-0.5	-0.44	-0.25	-0.15	-2.4**	-0.46	-0.13	0.21	0.16	0.24	0.06
	-0.37	-0.34	-0.44	-0.45	-0.44	-0.35	-0.79	-0.45	-0.85	-0.91	-0.43	-0.56	-0.54	-0.33	-0.32
\$50k–\$74k	-0.71	-0.36	-1.02	0.04	-0.64	-0.44	-17.08** *	-0.6	-1.96*	-17.84** *	-0.29	0.52	-0.64	-0.44	-0.08
	-0.5	-0.46	-0.8	-0.5	-0.63	-0.46	-0.84	-0.7	-0.92	-0.76	-0.68	-0.71	-0.89	-0.44	-0.42
\$75k–\$150k	-0.03	-0.15	-0.15	-0.45	-0.08	-0.08	-1.2	-0.01	-1.53*	-1.02	-0.46	0.48	0.14	-0.13	-0.42
	-0.28	-0.26	-0.36	-0.32	-0.35	-0.27	-0.77	-0.37	-0.61	-0.75	-0.37	-0.47	-0.41	-0.26	-0.25
Parental education (reference: Bachelor's or higher)															
High school or less	-0.09	-0.53	-0.49	-0.16	0.03	-0.17	0.08	-0.22	1.42	0.91	0.06	-0.83	-0.09	-0.82**	0.01
	-0.35	-0.33	-0.46	-0.43	-0.47	-0.33	-1.05	-0.43	-0.81	-1.04	-0.45	-0.56	-0.51	-0.31	-0.31
Some college	0.1	-0.27	-0.17	0.21	0.57	-0.11	0.6	0.33	1.43*	0.88	-0.53	0.07	-0.28	-0.35	-0.09
	-0.27	-0.25	-0.35	-0.31	-0.33	-0.26	-0.76	-0.33	-0.7	-0.86	-0.37	-0.41	-0.4	-0.25	-0.24
Number of platforms used daily	0.18*	0.19**	0.07	0.15	0.26**	0.15*	0.33*	0.14	0.28	0.16	0.11	0.12	0.2*	0.22**	0.19**
	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	-0.08	-0.09	-0.07	-0.16	-0.08	-0.17	-0.25	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.07	-0.07
Parental control (reference: No)															
Not sure	-0.6	0.81*	0.51	-0.35	0.23	0.56	0.79	-0.09	0.28	-16.93** *	0.35	-1.71	-0.69	-0.74	0.26
	-0.51	-0.41	-0.51	-0.52	-0.49	-0.39	-0.84	-0.52	-1.17	-0.57	-0.52	-1.09	-0.76	-0.41	-0.39
Yes	0.32	-0.09	0.05	-0.1	-0.12	-0.04	0.02	-0.94**	-0.38	-0.06	-0.05	-1.11*	-0.06	-0.26	-0.13

	-0.24	-0.22	-0.33	-0.29	-0.3	-0.24	-0.69	-0.35	-0.66	-0.79	-0.34	-0.44	-0.37	-0.22	-0.22
N	480	479	480	480	480	480	480	480	479	479	480	480	480	480	478
McFadden R ²	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.14	0.07	0.18	0.15	0.06	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.05