Communication types modify the anxiety risk associated with social media addiction: a prospective diary method study

Chenziheng Allen Weng[12], Jahshara Bulgin[2], Savannah Diaz[3], Jiafang Zhang[1], Le (Caroline) Li[4], Runzi Tan[1], Mari Armstrong-Hough[*2]

[1] Department of Biostatistics, New York University School of Global Public Health, New York NY 10003, USA
[2] Department of Epidemiology, New York University School of Global Public Health, New York NY 10003, USA
[3] Ideas42, 80 Broad St. Floor 30, New York, NY 10004, USA
[4] NYU Langone Health, New York NY 10016, USA

*Corresponding Author:

Mari Armstrong-Hough, MPH, PhD
School of Global Public Health
New York University
708 Broadway, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10003
mah842@nyu.edu

Summary

Background Social media has risen beyond a communicational advance to represent a way of being. While problematic social media use and addiction have been increasingly associated with mental disorder risks among younger people, whether these risks are modified by specific online activities and communication types remains largely unexamined. This study aimed to test four characteristic communication types – consumption, broadcasting, offline connections, and parasocial interaction – on how they moderate the link between social media addiction (SMA) and anxiety.

Methods A diary-based study was conducted to capture the daily experience of SMA, communication types, and mental well-being in two weeks. The participants were current undergraduate students at New York University. In total, 1009 daily records were completed by 79 participants. Prospective analyses were conducted to evaluate fluctuations in daily anxiety. Generalized estimation equations (GEE) were used to account for repeated measures.

Findings Overall SMA scores and three addiction components were associated with higher anxiety levels. Interaction analysis revealed that levels of parasocial interaction and consumption moderated the association between SMA and anxiety outcomes. For young adults with higher levels of consumption or parasocial interaction, 1-standard-deviation increase in social conflict was associated with an 11%-13% increase of a standard deviation in anxiety levels in the coming day. And these links did not exist for young adults with low and moderate amounts of consumption scores.

Interpretation High levels of passive consumption and unilateral interactions are strongly intertwined with early-stage anxiety symptoms such as social conflict. More research is needed to explore the potential of health guidelines and interventions to reduce perceived anxiety by promoting regulations on unchecked social media browsing and facilitating two-sided online interactions.

Abbreviation: social media addiction; anxiety; communication types; experience sampling method

Abstract word count: 270

1 Introduction

The last two decades have seen widespread adoption of social media and a steady increase in time spent on social media among the general population. [1] In 2005, barely 5% of American adults used at least one social media platform. By February 2021, 72% of the public reported they used some type of social media, with more than half of Instagram or Snapchat users aged 18-29 saying they use the site several times a day. [2] In response, there has been increasing interest in the impacts of social media use on mental health and social psychology, such as the etiology of social isolation and loneliness[3], coping styles for stress[4], impaired attention span[5], and behavioral addictions[6,7].

Social media addiction (SMA) is a behavioral addiction that has been found to negatively impact mental health outcomes and relationships of those afflicted. Evidence from longitudinal studies and meta-analyses have associated SMA with anxiety and depression. [8,9] A nationally representative U.S. panel study from 2014 to 2016 observed a 9% increase in odds of depression symptoms for young adults with problematic social media use. [7] A large-scale health behavior survey from 29 countries found school-aged adolescents with intense social media addiction reported lower well-being on all mental, educational, and social well-being domains than nonproblematic adolescents. [10] It is therefore imperative to identify sustainable strategies for preventing SMA-related mental disorders and inform public health interventions in young adults and adolescents. [11]

Although SMA itself has been well researched, previous work has been limited by an undifferentiated concept of social media activities that did not attend to differences between individuals in how or why they use social media. For example, a group of people primarily using the sites for making friends and chatting may experience different risk levels compared to another group using most of the time browsing content. [12,13] There is limited scientific understandings of how specific types of communication on social media may modify the relationship between SMA and mental health outcomes. Few studies have investigated whether the effects of SMA are consistent across different types of social media communication. [14,15] Many recent studies have shown that certain aspects of the type of social media communication engaged in have important behavioral implications. This can provide both deeper understandings of SMA and link this emerging public health issue with a broader context of deeply ingrained human characteristics.[12,16]

Previous studies have examined specific communication types, including targeted composed communication, broadcast communication, exploring and viewing content, active socializing,

and “one-click” likes and sharing. [12,16,17] These communication types appear to be correlated with mental well-being, mediated by a few classic psychosocial mechanisms. [16] For example, Burke and Kraut (2016) reported that receiving targeted, composed communication from strong-tie friends was associated with improvements in psychological well-being, while viewing broadcasted messages and receiving one-click feedback were not. [16] In a survey of high school students, Frison and Eggermont (2016) found that the incidence of depressed mood was higher among those who used Facebook passively, defined as viewing others’ profiles and posts. [18] Moreover, they also found that perceived online social support mediated the effect of passive Facebook use. This body of work establishes the importance of communication type for contextualizing social media exposures and related health implications, yet no research has examined how the health effects of SMA may vary by communication type.

In this study, we build on the work of Burke and Kraut (2016) [16] and Shakya et al.(2017) [19].

These authors classified communication types as four dimensions consisting of opposite ideas: a. *Consumption* is defined as the proportion of time spent viewing content (+), compared to the proportion spent composing content (–); b. *Broadness* is defined as, among messages sent and received, what proportion was broadcasted to a broad audience (+), compared to the proportion was targeted at a particular person (–); c. *Offline connections* is defined as, among connections fostered on social media sites, what proportion of relationships existed online-only (+, e.g., net friends, celebrities), compared to the proportion existing offline as well (–, e.g., classmates, family members); d. *Parasocial interactions* is defined as, among connections they made on social media sites, what proportion was primarily mutual (+), while what proportion was primarily one-way (–).

Given the deficiency of empirical research in incorporating the concept of communication types in measuring social media use, more rigorous research is needed to discern exposures regarding communication types and further contextualize SMA. In the present study, we assessed the interactive effects of four communication types and SMA on mental well-being among young adults using data from an original diary-based study. The data captured undergraduate student participants’ daily behavioral profiles and anxiety outcomes in a repetitive, prospective, and ecological manner. [20] This allows us to optimize the effective recall of daily measures of interest and directly model the lagged anxiety outcome and changes while controlling an individual’s previous level of anxiety and unmeasured within-subject factors. The hypothesis that will be tested is that communication types moderate the effects of SMA on the anxiety outcome.

2 Method

2.1 Study Design

A diary-based study was designed to collect prospective data from current undergraduate students at New York University. The experiment was fashioned to capture repeated-measured constructs based on the framework of Experience Sampling Method. In the study, individual participants' daily social media use activities, communication types and other behavioral factors, and anxiety levels were captured day by day and perceived as a trajectory of their experiences across a 14-day period. The operational focus of the study design centered on (1) minimizing recall bias and forming a repeated signal for recording daily-level measures steadily; (2) having the survey instrument and length of study balance effective variances for modeling, expenditures, and response fatigue.

To avoid ambiguity and compromised validity from the eclectic idea of social media, we used social networking sites (SNS) throughout the study as a specific type of social media applications particularly focusing on connecting and allowing user-created individual profiles. [21] Examples of SNS applications/platforms given to participants at recruitments and at the pre-calibration at daily diary records (see Procedures) include Facebook, Snapchat, WeChat, Instagram, Twitter, TikTok, Weibo, LinkedIn, Reddit, and Tumblr.

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the New York University Institutional Review Board (IRB-FY2020-4578).

2.1.1 Study size

Through a review of previous diary studies that had similar study population and targeted at social media exposures and mental well-being, we found that the optimal range of study size and timepoints falls around 75-120 subjects with 5-21 time points[22].

A standard statistical power analysis under Repeated Measures ANOVA for within-group factors was conducted. With effect size at 0.06, number of measurements at 14, and power set at 0.80, the sample size is 90.

2.2 Procedures

Data were collected from March 2021 to May 2021. The study population is current full-time NYU undergraduate students (9 credits or above per semester) who were required to be between 18-26 years old and currently residing in the United States. Participants were excluded if they reported not being a regular user of major SNS applications.

After contacting and acquiring permissions from the gatekeepers of each school, recruitment emails were distributed to undergraduates in four primary NYU undergraduate schools through the institutional email system. The research team sent out three rounds of recruitment emails until reaching the predetermined sample size of 90.

Completion of the study involved three phases: an orientation session through a prerecorded tutorial video and web page, a self-administrated baseline questionnaire, and 14 consecutive days of diary records. Design, distribution, and data collection were all operated fully online on Qualtrics XM. During the study period, participants received an email from their assigned investigators each day at 8 pm that direct to the computer-assisted survey. Participants were asked to finish the diary records within 3 hours. Reminder signals were sent to unfinished participants through Email. Each participant was allowed up to three chances to make up a missing diary record before 12:00 pm on the following day.

At the beginning of the daily survey, a module of calibration questions was asked to help participants warm up and process the recall of their social media usage systematically. These questions consisted of (1) a selection of all SNS applications they had used since the last check-in, where ten most popular SNS platforms were listed and a free text entry was provided for other platforms; (2) a number entry of an estimation of the total number of times and the total time spent in checking the SNSs, broken down into evening, morning, and afternoon. The main daily-level questionnaire was then administrated block by block. All questions in the main questionnaire did not allow skipping or blank responses.

Participants received a $25 US dollars compensation for completing the full daily procedure for each person. And $10 who finished halfway through.

2.3 Measures

2.3.1 Time-independent measures: baseline characteristics

Demographic variables included gender, age and race/ethnicity and were all from self-reported entries at the baseline survey. Four control variables considered as potential source of mental distress were asked at baseline, including COVID-19 adjustment disorder; having previously diagnosed depression disorder (0/1); having previously been diagnosed with an anxiety disorder (0/1); and recently experiencing a major exam or major life event (0/1, examples given were marriage, breakup, losing a job, or the death of a loved one).

COVID-related adjustment disorder was measured by an adapted International Adjustment Disorder Questionnaire (IADQ).[13] Participants were first asked to select one of the most significant stressors since March of 2020–the beginning of the pandemic here in the US– from a

list of ten options: [“Disrupted the ability to work or learn at the desired level”, “Overwhelmed by information”, “Death of a loved one”, “Moving”, “Reduced/suspended social life”, “Financial difficulties”, “Family conflict”, “Serious illness”, “Unemployment”, “Illness/care of a loved one”]. The selected stress was then carried forward to the original IADQ main scale which had six items for evaluating their failure to adapt (e.g., “I find it difficult to relax and feel calm since [Overwhelmed by information]”) and functional impairment (e.g., “Does [Overwhelmed by information] Affected your relationships or social life?”). Participants rated these items from *No* (=0) to *Extreme* (=3) on a Likert scale.

2.3.2 Time-dependent measures: Daily-level entries

Anxiety is the outcome of interest and is measured by the Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale, which is known as GAD-7[16]. The scale consists of seven questions with a 0-3 measured Likert scale. The total score is the sum of each question. A score >= 10 will be considered as having anxiety symptoms, in which a score of 10-14 will be considered as moderate symptoms and a score >= 15 will be considered as severe symptoms.

SNS communication type consists of four types of activities made from contrary ideas. (a) Consumption: creating content versus consuming content; (b) Broadness: information or messages sent or received were targeted, private versus broadcasted, public; (c) Offline connections: connections or interactions made on SNS existing only online or existing offline also; (d) Parasocial interactions: connections or interactions made on SNS were one-way or mutual. Each dimension is rated on a bipolar scale scored 1 to 10 by participants as to their subjective evaluation on the relative proportion of time they invest in certain communication types.

Social media addiction was assessed by a set of 12 items adapted from the Bergen Facebook Addiction Scale (BFAS). [23] Each item represented one of four components of addiction: salience, mood modification, social conflict, and withdrawal; each addiction component has three questions. Participants responded on a Likert scale with anchors from Rarely (0) to All the time (3). While original items specified “Facebook,” we substituted “social networking sites” to encompass more general SMA. The resulting composite scale ranged from 0 to 36 and served as main independent variable in our model.

2.4 Statistical analysis

Generalized equation modeling regressions was used to estimate the how SMA dimensions and communication types predict changes in anxiety. All regression models included a lagged dependent variable and participant as a random effect. By including the lagged anxiety measure,

the analyses controlled for individual participants' anxiety level at the previous day and the unmeasured factors contributing to the anxiety fluctuations.

All continuous independent variables were standardized so that coefficients present the percent change in the anxiety outcome by each unit of 1-standard-deviation increase in the independent variables.

Missing data was extremely limited in the current study as we set responses to daily measures all as required in the data collection. Statistical environment R was used for the analyses. G*Power 3.1[24] was used for the statistical power analysis and study size determination.

3 Results

3.1 Sample Characteristics

The baseline sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. Among 94 participants who finished the baseline survey, 79 participants finished at least 3 daily records and were kept as the study sample, from whom 1009 daily records were collected. On average, participants completed 12 daily records (mean = 12.8; median = 14).

The median age of the sample is 20 years old, ranging from 18 to 26 years old. Most of the sample were females (91%). Over two-thirds (67%) of the participants reported at least moderate levels of COVID-19 adjustment disorder and about one-fourth of participants (27%) reported symptoms consistent with severe COVID-19 adjustment disorder. 24% and 30% of participants reported previously diagnosed depression disorder and anxiety disorder, respectively.

3.2 Distribution of social media communication types and bivariate analysis of daily-level measures

The distributions of the four communication type dimensions are shown in Figure 1; the full summary statistics of daily-level measures and their correlations with anxiety outcome were shown in Supplementary Table 1. The consumption dimension had the most concentrated distribution with most of the records reporting high level of consumption. However, within-subject variances were relatively bigger (ICC = 0.40). The broadness dimension also featured a concentration on the broadcasted end but values from the same individual participant were relatively similar (ICC = 0.58). The offline connection and parasocial interaction had an averaged distribution across the spectrum and similar ICC values.

In terms of daily SNS behavioral profiles, young adults who reported moderate and above anxiety scored significantly higher in all four SMA factors ($P < 0.001$), especially on the salience dimension where people reported on average 2.73 higher on the anxiety scale compared to the non-cases counterparts. Young adults of higher anxiety level also suffered from more emotional distress at three specific dimensions ($P < 0.001$). Contrarily, SNS communication types did not differentiate young adults' anxiety level in the bivariate analysis ($P > 0.05$).

3.3 Multivariable regression

Table 2 presents the population-averaged effect from GEE models, in which daily anxiety score was regressed on the SMA dimensions, communication types, and possible combinations of their interactions. All models were controlled for the lagged anxiety score and baseline characteristics.

Lagged anxiety score is found to be negatively associated with the anxiety level on the next day in all models. Results of Model A indicate that without accounting for communication, the salience effect of SMA is associated with significantly increased anxiety level (b = .16, p =0.01). The effect of withdrawal is also positively associated with anxiety score (b = .10, p =0.07). The mood modification is associated with decreased anxiety level (b = -.09, p =0.05). The effect of social conflict is not statistically significant (p > 0.1). Model B investigated the effects of communication types. The results show that none of the communication types by themselves were associated with anxiety level. The full model (Model C) models on both SMA dimensions and communication types, and include the interaction terms of all possible pairwise combinations (4×4) of these subdimensions. The main effects of SMA dimensions and communication types remain similar to the results in the first two crude models. There are four significant interaction effects that stand out: parasocial interaction negatively moderated the effect of mood modification; consumption and parasocial interaction positively moderated the effect of social conflict; broadness negatively moderated the effect of withdrawal. These four significant interaction effects were carried forward to the parsimonious model. The results of the parsimonious model (Model D) are close to the model but further examined the previously identified four interactions in the full model: parasocial interaction negatively moderated the effect of mood modification (b = -.03, p =0.01); consumption and parasocial interaction positively moderated the effect of social conflict (b = 02, p =0.02; and b = 03, p =0.02, respectively). And the interaction of broadness and withdrawal was not significantly significant (p > 0.1).

Overall, Model fit improved significantly in the two models that accounted for the interactions between SMA dimensions and communication types.

3.4 Stratified analysis of relative effects of SMA based on communication type

The results of a stratified analysis further examine the effects of SMA based on the levels of social media communication types, see Figure 2 for a graphical presentation. For the three pairs of significant interactions identified in the multivariable analysis, the models were rerun on the tertiles of their corresponding communication types.

For the study sample with least amount of consuming activities, the effect of social conflict on anxiety score was close to zero and was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). But for the group with highest level of consumption, a 1-standard-deviation increase in social conflict was associated with 13% increased anxiety level in the next day (95% CI = 5%-20%). For the interaction between parasocial interaction and mood modification, the effects were not statistically significant in stratified samples ($p > 0.05$). For the study sample with least amount of one-sided social media interaction, the effect of social conflict on anxiety score was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). But for the group with highest level of consumption, a 1-standard-deviation increase in social conflict was associated with 11% increased anxiety level in the next day (95% CI = 4%-17%).

4 Discussion [Not complete]

Despite its relatable health impact and rising significance as a major communication tool, previous studies have suffered from the intricacies of the putative relationship between social media use and mental health problems among young people. More importantly, considering its instrumental nature and daily-living usage, the focus of this study lies in identifying effective behavioral antidotes that inform of active adaptation in the manner of using social media. To this end, this study pivoted on addictive uses of social media as a most crucial and well-established negative factor to mental well-being, and scaled four specific communication types that can be commonly defined, observed, and classified by activities on social networking sites. Based on this classification, we systematically examined the moderation of these communication types on the four integrant factors of ASMU (i.e., a 4×4 pairs of interactions).

Key results. We found that while exposure to ASMU consistently predicted higher anxiety levels over the 14-day period, the anxiety outcome is most prominent for young adults in the study sample with behavioral markers in two communication types: For those who primarily used social media for consuming content, every 1-standard-deviation increase in social conflict (i.e., interpersonal problems ensue because of social media usage) score was associated with 13% of a standard deviation increment in the anxiety score (95% CI: 5% - 20%). However, for young adults with low or moderate levels of consumption, exposure to social conflict was not

associated with the anxiety change. Similarly, an increase in one-sided parasocial interactions was also found to intensify the effect of social conflict, whereas the most interesting finding lies in that parasocial interaction moderated the detrimental effect of mood modification (i.e., using social media to improve moods) in that for young adults who most intensely engaged in one-sided interaction, exposure to mood modification was not associated with increased anxiety score. Finally, the moderating effects of communication types are only significant in above-mentioned pairs and are masked in composite SMA score.

Limitations. The strengths of the study built on the assumption of an ecological momentary assessment framework coupled with prospective design. Ecological validity and lowering of retrospective bias were prioritized to complement the measures of subjective, fluctuating anxious moods, and transient, event-based social media exposures. The study sample was guided and aware of receiving highly-structured brief surveys in a smartphone/tablet compatible interface to sample their experience daily – a response interval considered to balance meaning fluctuation and convenience. Previous studies support the efficiency, variation, and retest reliability of such daily diary-based design for social media exposures with relatively short follow-up time scope. There are a few limitations of this study. First, the sample is subject to gender imbalance and clearly not a random sample of young adults using social media sites in New York City. They were more likely to be female and more responsive to online experimental conditions. Second, the fact that the study population was current college students from an “elite” university and the study was administrated during the first wave of COVID-19 outbreak in the US probably implicate an above-normal mental stress level.

Third, lack of any objective metrics of social media use behaviors may have created difficulties for participants to anchor in their responses, even though a block of warm-up questions were included at the beginning of the daily survey to review and estimate the frequency of opening and time spent on their primary social media sites. That said, we tried including these self-report raw usage data in our models and we have arrived at the same results, suggesting the relative stability of self-report behavioral exposures regardless of frequency and length of usage. Fourth, it may help to reduce residual confounding to include several variables regarding online communication types like participants’ social network size and tie strength of communication. We also noticed that some recent studies proposed some computational methods to quantify several communication types investigated in this study, like consumption and broadness. While these limitations may affect the generalizability of our findings, we do not believe that they would invalidate the findings of deleterious effects of SMA and the moderation of communication types.

Interpretation. The pivotal impact of parasocial interaction on SMA may stem from the simple fact that parasocial interaction is a kind of social interaction that misses the content and promise of relational feedback and social support. Through a focus on "knowing" a person of interest, those young adults who intensively spend time in this form of activities while using social media pay persisting emotional investment and affective engagement with media figures but lack corresponding relational returns and do little good in maintaining their stock of friendships[25]. This could causally impair the function of social interaction that is instrumental to improvements in mental health, lessening the sense of loneliness, and the build-up of support networks and close ties that were normally observed in relational investment[16]. Furthermore, previous studies found that exposure to media figures can negatively predict body image for adolescents and be associated with negative social comparison among adolescents and adults[26,27]. Given that social media rewarding favorable images and drama-inducing content while the receiver would typically see a biased part of a real or fictional person. Nevertheless, it has been noted that moderate parasocial interactions can foster feelings of coping and community and facilitate identity exploration[27].

Reference

1. We Are Social D, Hootsuite. Daily time spent on social networking by internet users worldwide from 2012 to 2020 (in minutes). Statista. Statista Inc. Accessed September 22, 2021. https://www.statista.com/statistics/433871/daily-social-media-usage-worldwide/
2. Auxier B, Anderson M. Social media use in 2021. *Pew Research Center*. 2021;
3. Teppers E, Luyckx K, Klimstra TA, Goossens L. Loneliness and Facebook motives in adolescence: A longitudinal inquiry into directionality of effect. *Journal of adolescence*. 2014;37(5):691-699.
4. Brand M, Young KS, Laier C, Wölfling K, Potenza MN. Integrating psychological and neurobiological considerations regarding the development and maintenance of specific Internet-use disorders: An Interaction of Person-Affect-Cognition-Execution (I-PACE) model. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2016;71:252-266.
5. Throuvala MA, Griffiths MD, Rennoldson M, Kuss DJ. Motivational processes and dysfunctional mechanisms of social media use among adolescents: A qualitative focus group study. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2019;93:164-175.
6. Moqbel M, Kock N. Unveiling the dark side of social networking sites: Personal and work-related consequences of social networking site addiction. *Information & Management*. 2018;55(1):109-119.
7. Shensa A, Escobar-Viera CG, Sidani JE, Bowman ND, Marshal MP, Primack BA. Problematic social media use and depressive symptoms among US young adults: A nationally-representative study. *Social science & medicine*. 2017;182:150-157.
8. Huang C. A meta-analysis of the problematic social media use and mental health. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 2020:0020764020978434.

9. Keles B, McCrae N, Grealish A. A systematic review: the influence of social media on depression, anxiety and psychological distress in adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*. 2020;25(1):79-93.
10. Boer M, Van Den Eijnden RJ, Boniel-Nissim M, et al. Adolescents' intense and problematic social media use and their well-being in 29 countries. *Journal of adolescent health*. 2020;66(6):S89-S99.
11. Tsao S-F, Chen H, Tisseverasinghe T, Yang Y, Li L, Butt ZA. What social media told us in the time of COVID-19: a scoping review. *The Lancet Digital Health*. 2021;
12. Utz S, Breuer J. The relationship between use of social network sites, online social support, and well-being. *Journal of media psychology*. 2017;
13. Burke M, Marlow C, Lento T. Social network activity and social well-being. 2010:1909-1912.
14. Kuss DJ, Griffiths MD. Social networking sites and addiction: Ten lessons learned. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2017;14(3):311.
15. Marino C, Gini G, Vieno A, Spada MM. The associations between problematic Facebook use, psychological distress and well-being among adolescents and young adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2018;226:274-281.
16. Burke M, Kraut RE. The relationship between Facebook use and well-being depends on communication type and tie strength. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*. 2016;21(4):265-281.
17. Manuoğlu E, Uysal A. Motivation for different Facebook activities and well-being: A daily experience sampling study. *Psychology of Popular Media*. 2020;9(4):456.
18. Frison E, Eggermont S. Exploring the relationships between different types of Facebook use, perceived online social support, and adolescents' depressed mood. *Social Science Computer Review*. 2016;34(2):153-171.
19. Shakya HB, Christakis NA. Association of Facebook use with compromised well-being: A longitudinal study. *American journal of epidemiology*. 2017;185(3):203-211.
20. Iida M, Shrout PE, Laurenceau J-P, Bolger N. Using diary methods in psychological research. 2012;
21. Kuss DJ, Griffiths MD. Online social networking and addiction—a review of the psychological literature. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2011;8(9):3528-3552.
22. Ohly S, Sonnentag S, Niessen C, Zapf D. Diary studies in organizational research: An introduction and some practical recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. 2010;9(2):79.
23. Andreassen CS, Griffiths MD, Hetland J, Pallesen S. Development of a work addiction scale. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*. 2012;53(3):265-272.
24. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2007;39:175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146
25. Giles DC. Parasocial Relationships and Affective and Emotional Character Engagement. *The International Encyclopedia of Media Psychology*. 2020:1-5.
26. Gleason TR, Theran SA, Newberg EM. Parasocial interactions and relationships in early adolescence. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2017;8:255.
27. Hoffner CA, Bond BJ. Parasocial relationships, social media, & well-being. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2022:101306.

Table 1. Study sample characteristics (*N* = 79)

Characteristics		Total subjects
Demographics		
Median age (IQR, range)		20 (2, 18-26)
Gender, %	Female	72 (91.1%)
	Male	5 (6.3%)
	Other	2 (2.5%)
Race, %	Non-Hispanic white	21 (26.6%)
	Non-Hispanic black	10 (12.7%)
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	7 (8.9%)
	Asian	26 (32.9%)
	Mixed/other	15 (19.0%)
Control variables		
COVID-19 adjustment disorder, %	No/minor	26 (32.9%)
	Moderate	32 (40.5%)
	Severe	21 (26.6%)
Have previously diagnosed depression disorder, %	No	60 (75.9%)
	Yes	19 (24.1%)
Have previously diagnosed anxiety disorder, %	No	55 (69.6%)
	Yes	24 (30.4%)
Recently had a major exam or major life event[1], %	No	14 (17.7%)
	Yes	65 (82.3%)

[1]A major life event is defined as events that recently occurred and impacted at baseline survey including examples such as marriage, breakup, losing a job, or the death of a loved one. IQR: Interquartile Range.

Figure 1. Distribution of the four social media communication dimensions from daily diary records (*N* = 1009). Axis labels show the visual analog of the rated activities on the dimensions that range from one to ten. ICC was measured in two-way random-effects model, i.e., ICC (2,1). Higher ICC score indicates values from the same individual participant tend to be similar. MAD: Median absolute deviation. ICC: Intraclass correlation.

Table 2. Population-averaged effect of social media addiction and social media communication on prospective daily anxiety score

	Model A			**Model B**			**Model C**			**Model D**		
	SMA only			**Communication types**			**Full model**			**Parsimonious model**		
	β	*SE*	*p*	*β*	*SE*	*p*	*β*	*SE*	*p*	*β*	*SE*	*p*
Intercept	0.03	0.55	0.96	-0.13	0.46	0.79	0.03	0.16	0.84	-0.42	0.51	0.41
Lagged anxiety score	-0.34	0.05	<0.001	-0.45	0.06	<0.001	-0.15	0.02	<0.001	-0.58	0.07	<0.001
SMA dimensions												
Salience	0.16	0.06	0.01				0.05	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.01
Mood modification	-0.09	0.05	0.05				-0.03	0.02	0.08	-0.02	0.01	0.10
Social conflict	0.07	0.05	0.17				0.02	0.02	0.31	0.02	0.02	0.27
Withdrawal	0.10	0.05	0.07				0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.02
Communication types												
Consumption				0.03	0.04	0.42	0.02	0.01	0.18	0.02	0.01	0.19
Broadness				-0.03	0.04	0.48	-0.02	0.01	0.12	-0.02	0.01	0.14
Social connections				0.04	0.06	0.44	0.01	0.02	0.40	0.02	0.02	0.28
Parasocial interaction				-0.02	0.05	0.61	0.004	0.02	0.81	<0.001	0.01	0.98
SMA dimensions × Communication types												
Salience[a]												
Mood modification[a]												
Parasocial interaction							-0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.03	0.01	0.01
Social conflict[a]												
Consumption							0.03	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.02
Parasocial interaction							0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.02
Withdrawal[a]												
Broadness							-0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.009	0.22
QICu/CIC	827.3/30.5			870.4/24.6			148.2/55.2			124.9/40.8		
Residual Std. Dev.	0.93			0.96			0.28			0.28		

All models were adjusted for age, gender, race, COVID-19 adjustment disorder, major life events or major exams, and previously diagnosed anxiety or depression disorder. Regression coefficients (*β*) reflect percent change in the anxiety outcome as a function of a 1-standard-deviation change in the predictors. SMA: social media addiction.

[a]Only significant interaction terms at $p = 0.1$ level in the full model (Model C) were shown. The significant interaction terms in the full model were carried forward to the parsimonious model (Model D).

A Effect of social conflict across tertiles of consumption



Events	283	293	354
Coef.	0.003	-0.03	0.13
(95% CI)	(-0.04, 0.05)	(-0.08, 0.01)	(0.05, 0.20)

B Effect of Mood modification across tertiles of parasocial interaction



Events	271	336	323
Coef.	0.02	-0.03	0.11
(95% CI)	(-0.04, 0.08)	(-0.07, 0.004)	(0.04, 0.17)

C Effect of Social conflict across tertiles of parasocial interaction



Events	283	293	354
Coef.	0.003	-0.03	0.13
(95% CI)	(-0.04, 0.05)	(-0.08, 0.01)	(0.05, 0.20)

Figure 2. Percentage change in anxiety score by the pairs of significant interactions between social media addiction (SMA) dimensions and Communication types. Coefficients indicate percentage changes in the outcome as a function of 1-standard-deviation change in the predictor.

Supplementary Table 1. Distribution, intraclass correlations, and association measures of daily-level social media behavioral variables. Variables are the aggregates from the 14-day follow-up records (*N* = 1009).

Variables	Min	Max	Median (MAD)	ICC[a]	Corr. With Anxiety Score[b]
Social media communication dimensions					
Consumption	1	10	9 (1.5)	0.40	<0.01
Broadness	1	10	8 (3.0)	0.58	-0.01
Social connections	1	10	6 (3.0)	0.54	<0.01
Direction of relationships	1	10	5 (4.4)	0.53	0.02
Social media addiction (SMA)					
Salience	3	12	6 (3.0)	0.65	0.28***
Mood modification	3	12	6 (1.5)	0.65	0.08***
Social conflict	3	12	4 (1.5)	0.71	0.35***
Withdrawal	3	12	4 (1.5)	0.74	0.33***
Sum score	12	48	20 (5.9)	0.75	0.30***
Anxiety score	7	28	12 (5.9)	0.65	/

MAD = median absolute deviation. ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient. Anxiety score was measured by a GAD-7 anxiety scale adapted for daily measures.
[a] ICC was measured in two-way random-effect models, i.e., ICC (2,1). Higher ICC score indicates less variances the variable has for subjects on different days.
[b] Correlation was measured by Kendall's rank correlation tau.