

Analog First, Digital When Ready

A Paced Media Introduction for a Generation Alpha Neurodivergent Child



Researcher	Kshipra Joshi · Independent User Researcher
Duration	10 years · Birth through mid-primary school (includes COVID-19 years)
Subject	Female, Generation Alpha · Neurodivergent, sensory processing sensitivities
Setting	Home environment, urban Bengaluru, India

The Decision That Didn't Feel Like a Decision

She was somewhere between bath and bed, that narrow transition window for a neurodivergent child, is less a time of day and more a neurological gauntlet. The crying had started at the change in activity. We had learned by then that this was not defiance; it was dysregulation. Her nervous system registered the shift as a threat. And I had a phone in my hand.

I didn't use it. I reached for a book instead.

I don't know, honestly, whether that was principled or just a habit by then. We had already decided months earlier, before she could hold a book on her own that books and vinyl would come first. Not instead of screens. Before them. The reasoning felt intuitive at the time. The research which I would spend years reading more carefully, confirmed it.

This case study is the account of what we did, why it worked, where it didn't and what I still don't fully know. It spans ten years. The subject is my daughter.

What Digital-First Costs a Neurodivergent Child

Generation Alpha is the first cohort born entirely into the smartphone era. The media they inherit isn't neutral infrastructure, it's an attention economy optimised for engagement at the expense of regulation. Algorithmic feeds, autoplay, notification loops, gamified reward structures: these are architectures designed by engineers to exploit precisely the executive function gaps that neurodivergent children are still building.

For a child with a sensitised nervous system and atypical attention regulation, early and unmediated exposure to these systems doesn't just cause distraction. It actively competes with the development of the inhibitory control, working memory and emotional regulation that the child most needs support building. The risk isn't screen addiction in the colloquial sense. The risk is that the regulatory architecture gets shaped by dopaminergic media before it has a chance to be built.

This concern is not speculative. A 2024 cohort study published in JAMA Pediatrics found that greater early-life digital media exposure was associated with atypical sensory processing in toddlers across sensitivity, sensation-seeking and sensation-avoiding domains with the strength of the association differing by the child's age at exposure (*Heffler et al., 2024*). Timing in other words, is not incidental to the outcome. It may be the variable that matters most.

This was the problem we were trying to avoid. The household had no television not as an ideological gesture, but because background broadcast media (its abrupt transitions, advertising interruptions and narrative non-closure) is among the most dysregulating

ambient environments a domestic space can contain. The question was what to put in its place and in what order.

The Approach: Analog First, Not Analog Only

The working principle was simple to state and required ten years of discipline to execute: build the child's regulatory and cognitive infrastructure first, then introduce each layer of digital media once that infrastructure was in place.

Analog media such as books, vinyl, cassette and CD players came before screens not because screens are inherently harmful but because analog media has properties that digital media lacks.

Physical cause-and-effect.

Defined endpoints.

Non-escalating stimulation.

No algorithm.

These properties are precisely what a developing nervous system needs as its first encounter with the idea of media.

They are also, as Jean Piaget's framework would predict, what a child in the concrete-manipulative stage of cognitive development needs: tangible, legible objects that build schemas through physical encounter before asking for abstract engagement.

Reading This Case Study: A Four-Part Theoretical Lens

This account draws on four distinct bodies of theory, each doing different explanatory work.

Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model is the primary framework. It treats a child's development as the product of nested environmental systems: microsystem (immediate relationships), mesosystem (connections between those relationships), exosystem (settings the child doesn't directly participate in but which affect her anyway), macrosystem (cultural context) and chronosystem (the dimension of time and historical event). Every phase of this study can be located within that structure, and the COVID-19 disruption in Phase IV is analysed explicitly as a chronosystem event.

Piaget and Vygotsky provide the individual-development lens nested within Bronfenbrenner's model and Piaget for the stage-based cognitive architecture the child was building at each phase, Vygotsky for the socially scaffolded process (*the Zone of Proximal*

Development, the Gradual Release of Responsibility) by which she moved through those stages with adult support.

Media ecology and digital-childhood research supply the media-specific lens treating media not as neutral content but as an environment with its own logic and constraints. Sonia Livingstone's body of work, particularly her Parental Mediation Theory (*Livingstone et al., 2017*), is the primary source here: it distinguishes enabling (or active) mediation: co-use, discussion, structured access which research associates with greater opportunity alongside managed risk from restrictive mediation limiting access outright, which reduces risk but also opportunity. That distinction is used throughout this study's phase narrative and the Discussion section, and is the closest single framework to what this household was actually practising: not restriction but a deliberate, evolving form of enabling mediation.

A short Discussion section near the end of this document compares the study's outcomes against current published research on children's digital media use, rather than treating the case study's own frameworks as the only lens available.

At a Glance: Six Phases, One Developmental Arc

Phase	Age	Media Introduced	Developmental Signal	Primary Framework
I	Birth - 2	Books, Vinyl records	Seeks caregiver co-regulation; responds to tactile/auditory input	<i>Bronfenbrenner Microsystem, Attachment (Bowlby), Piaget Sensorimotor</i>
II	2 - 4	Expanded library (thicker volumes)	Sustains seated attention; books used to bridge transitions	<i>Executive Function, ZPD, Preoperational constructivism</i>
III	4 - 5	Cassette & CD players	Prior vinyl schema consolidated; compelled by mechanical cause-and-effect	<i>GRR, Montessori real objects, Piagetian equilibration</i>
IV	5 - 6	Desktop (COVID classes), iPad / Khan Academy	Screen exposure necessity-driven; bounded, task-purposeful	<i>Bronfenbrenner Chronosystem, Mastery Learning, Concrete operational transition</i>
V	6 - 7	iPod Shuffle with headphones	First personally operated device; self-selects auditory regulation	<i>Autonomous regulation, Gradual Release of Responsibility</i>

Phase	Age	Media Introduced	Developmental Signal	Primary Framework
VI	7+	iPod with Cover Flow, Digital camera	Classifies visual world; photography as metacognitive practice	<i>Prospective memory, Media authorship, Concrete Operational</i>

The Phases

Phase I · Birth to Age Two: The Analog Foundation

We started with books before she could read. This is worth stating plainly, because the common assumption is that books are for children who are ready for language. They aren't or not only. For an infant, a book is a tactile object with weight, texture and pages that turn. Being read to is, in attachment terms, a co-regulatory act: the caregiver's regulated nervous system and rhythmic voice provide the neurological template that the infant's developing regulatory architecture attempts to match. The cognitive content of the book is secondary to what is happening at the nervous system level.

Vinyl records were the other anchor. The acoustic warmth of analogue audio absent the dynamic compression artefacts of digital streaming and produced a specific quality of sound that we noticed she responded to from very early. Her preferences emerged quickly: rock, folk-rock, music with rhythmic regularity and tonal warmth. These sessions were never just about sound. They were the earliest, smallest unit of what Urie Bronfenbrenner would call her microsystem, the immediate, face-to-face environment of caregiver and child, repeated daily in which development actually happens.

KEY CONSTRUCT — THE MICROSYSTEM (BRONFENBRENNER, 1979)

Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model treats the child's immediate, repeated environment that is caregiver, home, and daily routine as the primary engine of development, not a backdrop to it. Reading together and listening to vinyl were microsystem activities: small, repeated, relationally embedded. Attachment research (Bowlby, 1969) suggests this kind of consistent, co-present caregiving is what allows a child to build the internal security from which independent exploration of books, later of devices becomes possible.

Phase II · Ages Two to Four: Books as Regulatory Infrastructure

By two, the book library was deliberate rather than accidental. We expanded it with an increasing proportion of visually rich, image-heavy volumes not because she was reading

but because we had noticed something: more complex visual books held her regulated attention longer than simple ones did.

This wasn't magic. What we were observing though we didn't have the language for it yet was sensory loading. Dense visual-tactile engagement maintains an alert but regulated arousal state more effectively than brief or simple inputs. Patricia Wilbarger's sensory diet framework, developed for occupational therapy with neurodivergent children, describes exactly this: a curated daily pattern of sensory experiences that sustains optimal regulation across the day.

Books have become our most reliable transition tool. The moments between meals, between play and sleep and between activities the high-dysregulation threshold points for a child whose nervous system experiences state changes as abrupt could almost always be bridged with a book.

Place a book at the boundary and the nervous system has somewhere to land.

What I didn't fully account for at the time was how much executive function was quietly being built in those reading hours. Sustained voluntary attention. Resistance to the impulse to move on before a page was finished. Holding narrative context across a spread. These capacities don't develop by being explained, they develop by being practiced, repeatedly, in a low-stakes environment that rewards their use. Books were that environment.

Phase III · Ages Four to Five: Cassettes, CDs and the Pedagogy of Real Objects

The cassette and CD players entered the household not through a formal decision but through the child's observation. She watched us load and unload media. She found the mechanics compelling from the click of the cassette slot, the tray sliding open, the visible relationship between the disc and the sound that followed.

We let her watch longer before we let her touch. This was not withholding, it was the Montessori principle in practice: children derive profound satisfaction from watching competent adults engage with real tools before attempting the tool themselves.

When she was ready to operate the CD player independently, she already had a complete mental model of how it worked.

The mastery that followed felt different from taught mastery. It felt earned.

These devices offered something that a touchscreen fundamentally cannot: legible physicality. You can see the disc spinning. You can hear the mechanism engage. The relationship between your action and the outcome is transparent. In Piaget's terms, the cassette player provoked a productive equilibration, that is her existing vinyl schema (disc produces sound) was extended by a new physical mechanism and the accommodation required was manageable precisely because the prior schema was already consolidated.

This is also where Livingstone's media framework becomes useful, even before screens enter the picture. Watching us operate the cassette player before touching it herself was functionally, active mediation in its earliest form of structured, co-present, adult-guided exposure to a media object, rather than either unrestricted access or outright prohibition. The same underlying strategy she would later study in parents managing children's internet use (*Livingstone et al., 2017*) was already the operating logic of this household, years before the internet was involved.

KEY CONSTRUCT — PIAGETIAN EQUILIBRATION

Each new medium challenged the child's existing schema in a productive way. The cassette challenged the vinyl schema. The CD challenged the cassette schema. At each step, prior understanding became the scaffold for new understanding. This is schema-building as media literacy each medium became a legible object of knowledge before the next was introduced.

Phase IV · Ages Five to Six: COVID, Screens and an Inadvertent Stress Test

This is the phase I worried about most and the one that taught me the most.

The COVID-19 lockdown arrived precisely at the inflection point when peer socialisation was becoming the primary developmental task. The kindergarten-to-first-grade transition requires children to develop comfort with sustained independent learning, separation from caregivers and cooperative engagement with age peers. The lockdown removed all three contexts simultaneously for this child at the worst developmental moment to lose them.

In Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model, this is a textbook Chronosystem event: a large-scale, non-normative historical disruption that reaches down and reorganises every other layer of a child's environment at once. It changed her *microsystem* (school moved into the home), her *mesosystem* (the connective tissue between home and school collapsed into a single room) and her *exosystem* (my own work-from-home schedule now dictated her supervision).

Researchers applying Bronfenbrenner's model to pandemic-era childhood have made the same observation: COVID-19 did not just add screens to children's lives, it collapsed the boundaries between systems that had previously been separate (*Egan & Pope, 2022*).

We introduced screens because we had no alternative. Classes moved online. That was the necessity. What we controlled was how: screen exposure was task-bounded, parent-mediated and purposeful.

There was no ambient screen time. Sessions had defined start and end points. We stayed in the room.

In Sonia Livingstone's terms, this was a deliberate choice of enabling mediation over restrictive mediation. We could not restrict access because school required the screen. What we could choose was co-presence, structure and discussion: staying in the room, setting boundaries around the session rather than the device and treating the screen as a supervised activity rather than an unsupervised one.

Livingstone's research associates this style of mediation with access to opportunity alongside managed rather than eliminated risk (*Livingstone et al., 2017*) which is a reasonably precise description of what Phase IV actually was.

My worry entering this phase was that four years of careful scaffolding would be undone. That the absence of a screen would turn out to have been the variable that mattered and that the moment a screen appeared, the regulatory architecture would not hold.

It held. But not in the way I expected.

What I hadn't fully understood was that the boundedness mattered more than the analog/digital distinction. Screen time that had a task structure such as beginning, problem, feedback and end did not trigger the same dysregulation as open-ended or entertainment screen time would have.

Khan Academy, specifically, turned out to be a near-perfect fit: mastery-based, self-paced, no time pressure, no comparative performance. The child encountered a challenge, attempted a solution, received feedback and revised.

Benjamin Bloom described this as mastery learning in 1968. Piaget described its cognitive architecture earlier: assimilation, accommodation and equilibration. Khan Academy runs the cycle on repeat at the child's own pace, without social penalty for repetition.

WHAT WOBBLED

Not everything was held cleanly. There were evenings in those early lockdown months when the session boundary was hard to enforce. For instance, she had found a format she liked and didn't want to stop. The transition out of the screen was harder than any pre-COVID transition. That was new. It told me something: the risk wasn't the screen itself; it was the absence of a hard endpoint the child had internalised. We had to build that boundary externally before she could manage it herself.

KEY CONSTRUCT — THE CHRONOSYSTEM (BRONFENBRENNER)

The chronosystem is the dimension of time in Bronfenbrenner's model, the historical and biographical moment a child's development happens to fall in. A

pandemic and a childhood transition arriving simultaneously is exactly the kind of interaction the chronosystem describes: the same intervention (screens, introduced) means something different depending on when, developmentally, it lands. The four years of microsystem work done before COVID is arguably what made this particular chronosystem shock survivable.

Phase V · Ages Six to Seven: The iPod Shuffle and Autonomous Regulation

The iPod Shuffle was her first personally owned, personally operated device. No screen. No algorithm. No album art. No social features. It played music that she and we had curated together. The headphones created a personal acoustic space she could enter by choice.

This was the emergence of self-directed regulation and the capacity to actively select her own sensory inputs rather than relying on a caregiver to provide them. She knew what she needed. More importantly, she could now access it without needing us to provide it. The co-regulatory scaffold, built across six years within the microsystem, was beginning its handover to the Gradual Release of Responsibility playing out not in a classroom but in a bedroom, with a music player instead of a worksheet.

The iPod Shuffle was navigable, both physically and cognitively because the underlying schema was consolidated. Music requires a device. The device requires an action. The action produces the music. She had known this since infancy. The abstract simplicity of the Shuffle's interface was paradoxically, legible to her precisely because her mental model of what a music device was had been built on objects with far more visible mechanics.

Phase VI · Ages Seven and Beyond: iPod, Cover Flow and the Camera

The current configuration, an iPod with Cover Flow navigation connected to small speakers and a personal digital camera is the most autonomous layer of media engagement she has reached so far.

Cover Flow is worth noting. It is a haptic, gestural, visual interface: album art arranged spatially, navigated by swipe. The music library becomes physically tangible in a way that a playlist grid does not.

Embodied cognition research suggests that physical and gestural engagement with information supports stronger encoding and more stable attention. Cover Flow, it turns out is closer to flipping through a record collection than it is to scrolling a feed. That distinction is not incidental.

The digital camera is the richest element of this phase. She photographs landscapes, people and food, a tripartite category of interest that is in Piaget's terms, a concrete operational achievement. She is classifying and organising her visual world into stable conceptual types. Choosing what to photograph requires making explicit what is worth remembering, a

metacognitive exercise that develops attentional intentionality in ways that passive image consumption never could.

She is a maker of images. That orientation of authorial rather than receptive is perhaps the most important single outcome of the entire decade.

How Piaget's Stages Map to the Phases

Piaget's constructivism provides the deepest single lens for this sequence. Each phase aligned and not by design initially but by retrospective analysis with the cognitive stage at which the child was actually operating.

Piagetian Stage	Age Range	Cognitive Characteristics	Phase Alignment
Sensorimotor	Birth - 2	Knowledge through sensory-motor action; schemas built via physical manipulation; object permanence develops	<i>Phase I: Books as tactile-visual objects; vinyl as cause-effect physical system and handling the object is the learning</i>
Preoperational	2 - 7	Symbolic thinking emerges; egocentric reasoning; learns through observation and imitation	<i>Phases II - IV: Narrative comprehension in books; observational learning with cassette/CD mechanics; supervised digital tools</i>
Concrete Operational	7 - 11	Logical reasoning about tangible objects; classification; serialisation; decentred thinking	<i>Phases V - VI: Autonomous music library management; deliberate photographic categorisation (landscapes, people, food)</i>
Formal Operational	11+	Abstract, hypothetical and systematic reasoning; capacity for decontextualised thought	<i>Beyond current timeframe and foundation now securely established for future digital environments</i>

What Didn't Go Cleanly

A case study that records only the things that worked is not an honest account.

The following are the moments and dynamics that were harder than the narrative above makes them appear.

THE COVID SCREEN BOUNDARY

As noted in Phase IV: the transition out of screen-based sessions was consistently harder than any pre-COVID transition had been. We had not built the endpoint internalisation before the screen arrived. The external boundary (parent-imposed session close) had to precede the internal one. This took several months to stabilise.

PEER CONTEXT

By age six, most of her peers had unrestricted screen access. The gap between her media environment and theirs was socially visible. There were moments of friction at play dates and in conversations where the difference registered. We chose to hold the approach but that choice had a social cost for her that shouldn't be minimised in any honest account.

THE LIMITS OF N=1

This is a longitudinal account of a single child in a specific neurological profile with specific parental resources (time, financial, knowledge access) that are not universally available. The outcomes are interpretable through the frameworks I have cited; they are not, by themselves, generalisable. What I can claim is that the approach was coherent, principled and produced observable results in this child. I cannot claim more than that.

Outcomes: What Was Observed

The following are behavioural observations, not conclusions. I am reporting what can be seen and the theoretical lenses through which it is interpretable. I am not claiming causation beyond what the frameworks support.

Outcome Area	What Was Observed	Framework Lens
Nervous system regulation	Independently accesses regulatory supports (music, books) without prompting. No hyperactivation or meltdown upon media removal and the regulatory architecture is internalised, not externally enforced.	<i>Attachment Theory (Bowlby); Bronfenbrenner Microsystem-to-independence transfer</i>

Outcome Area	What Was Observed	Framework Lens
Sustained attention	Progressive tolerance for seated, voluntary attention built across the book-expansion years. Engages purposefully rather than passively with autonomous music management and deliberate photographic practice both demonstrate this.	<i>Executive Function development; ZPD scaffolding (Vygotsky)</i>
Media literacy & agency	Understands media as something she operates, not something that operates upon her. Physical media mastery (vinyl, cassette, CD) created a generative mental model for all media as constructed, controllable objects.	<i>Montessori prepared environment; Piagetian schema transfer</i>
Resistance to instant gratification	The goal was not achieved through restriction. Executive function and cognitive schemas were developed before she encountered architectures designed to exploit their absence.	<i>Piagetian constructivism; Inhibitory control development</i>
Media authorship orientation	Photography practice seeded an early authorial relationship with visual media: she is a maker of images not merely a consumer.	<i>Prospective memory offloading; Metacognitive awareness (Flavell)</i>

Discussion: How This Compares to Current Research

A single case study means very little on its own. It matters more when set against what the broader literature on children's digital media use is currently finding.

On timing and sequence: A 2024 review of digital media context and cognitive development concluded that no causal relationship has yet been established between screen exposure and cognitive impairment in early childhood but that correlations exist and that context of use matters more than raw exposure duration (Adams et al., cited in ScienceDirect, 2024). That is broadly consistent with this study's central claim: it was never simply about withholding screens but about the order and structure in which media was introduced.

On mediation strategy specifically: Sonia Livingstone's research on parental mediation developed originally for internet use but applicable to media introduction generally distinguishes enabling mediation (co-use, structure, discussion) from restrictive mediation (limiting access outright), finding that the former is associated with greater access to opportunity alongside managed rather than eliminated risk (Livingstone et al., 2017).

This case study is in effect, a ten-year enactment of enabling mediation, extended backward from the internet into every prior medium the child encountered. That continuity of the same mediation logic applied consistently from books to broadband is not something the existing literature has tracked at this length.

On bounded versus open-ended use: A September 2025 systematic review of 46 studies found a clear link between higher screen use and negative outcomes in physical activity, sleep, attention and social-emotional functioning but also found that limited or educational screen use, especially with parental involvement, showed neutral or even positive effects in some contexts (Kar et al., 2025). This maps closely onto the Phase IV finding that task-bounded, parent-mediated screen time did not trigger the same dysregulation as open-ended use would have.

On neurodivergent-specific media use: Current commentary from Children and Screens notes that for neurodivergent children with sensory sensitivities, media can reduce the discomfort of environments that are either overwhelming or under-stimulating that is media as a regulatory tool, not only a risk (Harrison, cited 2026). This is a useful corrective against reading this case study as anti-screen. The claim here is narrower: sequence and structure, not exclusion.

Where this case study sits relative to the field: most published research on children's digital media use is cross-sectional or short-longitudinal, studying exposure and outcome at one or two points in time. Few accounts trace a single child's media introduction across a full decade with this level of phase-by-phase detail. That is this study's primary contribution and not a competing causal claim but a long-form, high-resolution account of what sequencing actually looks like in practice, phase by phase, including where it wobbled.

What I Still Don't Know

The child is now entering mid-primary school. The foundation is in place. But several questions remain genuinely open:

How durable is the regulatory architecture when she encounters, at scale and without mediation, the social-media environments her older peers already inhabit?

The executive function capacity that the analog-first approach built was developed against the relatively mild pulls of a curated media environment. The architectures she will encounter in adolescence are substantially more sophisticated.

Is any of this attributable to temperament rather than intervention?

Her neurological profile is specific. Another neurodivergent child, with different sensory sensitivities and different attachment history, might respond to the same environment very differently. I cannot fully disentangle the approach from the child.

What has camera practice become?

The deliberate, categorising, authorial relationship with visual media that she has developed is one of the outcomes I find most interesting. I don't know yet what she does with it.

These are honest questions. The decade is not complete.

Implications for Practitioners

Practitioner	Application
Occupational Therapists	Structured book-time at transition boundaries is a concrete sensory diet tool. This case demonstrates its effectiveness as a regulatory anchor across years, not just individual sessions.
Early Childhood Educators	Physical, tactile media (books, puzzles, physical instruments) should precede and scaffold screen introduction and be consistent with both Montessori's prepared environment and Piaget's concrete-before-formal sequencing.
School Counsellors & Psychologists	The GRR model and Piagetian stage mapping offer a framework for assessing whether children have been given developmentally appropriate ownership of their media engagement.
Paediatric Practitioners	A protective media environment does not require prohibition of digital devices. It requires deliberate scaffolding, developmentally appropriate sequencing and respect for the child's current cognitive and regulatory stage.

Conclusion

The child at the centre of this study did not benefit from techno-refusal. She was not protected from screens by prohibition. She was prepared for screens by arriving at them with the regulatory capacity and cognitive schemas already in place to engage them as objects she controls rather than environments that control her.

That distinction between restriction and preparation is the central pedagogical argument of this case study.

The analog-first approach is not a counsel of fear.

It is a sequencing strategy, read through Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model, grounded in what developmental psychology, media ecology, occupational therapy and educational pedagogy converge in saying: *build the microsystem infrastructure first, then introduce the architectures it will need to manage* even when, as in Phase IV, history intervenes and that sequence is tested by forces no household can control.

The decade is not finished.
I will keep watching.

Key Theoretical References

Adams, S. et al. (2024).

Context of digital media use in early childhood: Factors associated with cognitive development up to 36 months of age.

ScienceDirect.

Ayres, A. J. (1972).

Sensory Integration and Learning Disorders.

Western Psychological Services.

Bloom, B. S. (1968).

Learning for mastery. Evaluation Comment, 1(2), 1 - 12.

Bowlby, J. (1969).

Attachment and Loss, Vol. 1: Attachment.

Basic Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979).

The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design.

Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006).

The bioecological model of human development. In *Handbook of Child Psychology* (Vol. 1).

Wiley.

Egan, S. M., & Pope, J. (2022).

A bioecological systems approach to understanding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: Implications for the education and care of young children.

In Springer Nature.

Green, L., Haddon, L., Livingstone, S., O'Neill, B., Stevenson, K. J., & Holloway, D. (2024).

Digital Media Use in Early Childhood: Birth to Six.

Bloomsbury Academic.

Heffler, K. F., et al. (2024).

Early-life digital media experiences and development of atypical sensory processing.

JAMA Pediatrics, 178(3), 266 - 273.

Kar, S. S., Dube, R., Goud, B. K. M., et al. (2025).

Impact of screen time on development of children. Children, 12(10), 1297.

Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K., Helsper, E. J., Lupiáñez-Villanueva, F., Veltri, G. A., & Folkvord, F. (2017).

Maximizing opportunities and minimizing risks for children online: The role of digital skills in emerging strategies of parental mediation.

Journal of Communication, 67(1), 82 - 105.

Montessori, M. (1912).

The Montessori Method.

Frederick A. Stokes.

Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983).

The instruction of reading comprehension.

Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8(3), 317 - 344.

Piaget, J. (1952).

The Origins of Intelligence in Children.

International Universities Press.

Piaget, J. (1964).

Development and learning. In R. Ripple & V. Rockcastle (Eds.), *Piaget Rediscovered.*

Cornell University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978).

Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.

Harvard University Press.

Wilbarger, P., & Wilbarger, J. (1991).

Sensory Defensiveness in Children Aged 2 - 12.

Avanti Educational Programs.