

Social Media Use and Friendship Closeness in Adolescents' Daily Lives: An Experience Sampling Study

J. Loes Pouwels¹, Patti M. Valkenburg¹, Ine Beyens¹, Irene I. van Driel¹, and Loes Keijsers²

¹ Amsterdam School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam

² Department of Psychology, Education & Child Studies, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Erasmus University of Rotterdam

The formation and maintenance of friendship closeness is an important developmental task in adolescence. To obtain insight in real-time processes that may underly the development of friendship closeness in middle adolescence, this preregistered experience sampling study [ESM] investigated the effects of social media use on friendship closeness. The study was conducted among 387 adolescents (54% girls; $M_{\text{age}} = 14.11$ years; 96% Dutch) from different educational tracks (44% lower prevocational secondary education, 31% intermediate general secondary education, 26% academic preparatory education). Adolescents reported six times per day for 3 weeks on their Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat use in the previous hour and their momentary experiences of friendship closeness (126 assessments; 34,930 observations). Multilevel analyses revealed positive between-person associations of friendship closeness with general WhatsApp use and Instagram use with close friends. In contrast, at the within-person level, we found small negative overall associations of general WhatsApp use and Instagram use (with and without close friends) with friendship closeness. However, there was large heterogeneity in the person-specific effect sizes of the within-person associations of social media use with friendship closeness. For example, person-specific effect sizes of the association of Instagram use with close friends with friendship closeness ranged from $\beta = -.745$ to $\beta = .697$. These results underline the importance of acknowledging person-specific effects in developmental and media effect theories.

Keywords: adolescence, ambulatory assessment, friendship quality, social network site use (SNS use), individual differences

Supplemental materials: <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001148.supp>

The formation and maintenance of close friendships is an important developmental task in adolescence (Berndt, 2002). Close friendships are characterized by supportiveness, accessibility, and responsiveness, and fulfill adolescents' need for intimacy (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Sullivan, 1953). Until one to two decades ago, friendships were predominantly maintained through face-to-face interactions, but nowadays, virtually all adolescents use social media daily to connect with their friends (Rideout & Robb, 2018; van Driel et al., 2019). As friendship closeness in adolescence contributes to a successful psychosocial development later in life, previous studies have started to examine whether

the development of friendship closeness could be promoted through social media use (Nesi et al., 2018; Yau & Reich, 2018). By now, several empirical studies (e.g., Antheunis et al., 2014; Rousseau et al., 2019) and at least four reviews (Nesi et al., 2018; Uhls et al., 2017; Valkenburg & Peter, 2011; Yau & Reich, 2018) have examined the association between social media use and friendship closeness among adolescents. Overall, this work suggests that different types of social media use are related to higher levels of friendship closeness (e.g., intensity of Hyves use, Antheunis et al., 2014; Facebook relationship maintenance behavior, Rousseau et al., 2019; duration of instant

Editor's Note. Jennifer E. Lansford served as the action editor for this article.—EFD

J. Loes Pouwels  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9586-392X>
Patti M. Valkenburg  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0477-8429>
Ine Beyens  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7023-867X>
Irene I. van Driel  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7810-9677>
Loes Keijsers  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8580-6000>

The preregistration of the hypotheses, design, sampling method, and analysis plan (<https://osf.io/7vszj>) and the analysis scripts (<https://osf.io/v3u42/>) used for this article are available online on the Open Science Framework. The anonymous data set has been published on Figshare (Pouwels et al., 2020).

This preregistered study was funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) Spinoza Prize and NWO Gravitation Grant 024.001.003 (Consortium on Individual Development) awarded to Patti M. Valkenburg. Additional funding was received from NWO VIDI Grant 452.17.011 awarded to Loes Keijsers. We thank Tim Verbeij and Teun Siebers for their contributions to the data collection portion of this study.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to J. Loes Pouwels, Amsterdam School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam, P.O. Box 15791, 1001NG Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Email: j.l.pouwels@uva.nl

messaging, Valkenburg & Peter, 2007; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a).

Although researchers seem to agree that social media use can benefit friendship closeness, three pressing questions that arise from the literature are yet to be answered. The first question pertains to real-time processes that may underly the development of friendship closeness (Granic, 2005). Previous longitudinal studies have shown that adolescents' social media use is related to friendship closeness across relatively long time intervals of 6 months (Rousseau et al., 2019; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a). However, as adolescents use social media throughout the day to share their current thoughts and feelings with close friends (Rideout & Robb, 2018), social media use may also be related to friendship closeness across smaller time intervals of weeks, days, or even hours (Kahlow et al., 2020). According to dynamic system theories of adolescent development, these short-term, momentary fluctuations in friendship closeness may shape longer-term developmental change in well-being and social relationships (Granic, 2005; Hinde, 1997). Therefore, it is important to understand to what extent these momentary fluctuations are induced by adolescents' social media use. As such, the first aim of this study was to investigate in-the-moment co-fluctuations of social media use and friendship closeness in adolescents' daily lives.

A second unanswered question is whether it is interaction with close friends that drives the effect of social media use on friendship closeness. Most studies have investigated how the frequency or intensity of social media use predicts friendship closeness (Antheunis et al., 2014; Lee, 2009; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007, 2009a) without discerning whether this social media use concerned interactions with friends. As interactions with friends are the building blocks of friendship closeness (Hartup, 1996), adolescents may experience higher levels of momentary friendship closeness after using social media with close friends than after using social media without close friends (Yau & Reich, 2018). Hence, the second aim of this study was to test this hypothesis by examining how friendship closeness is related to occasions when social media is used to interact with close friends versus occasions when social media is used without close friends. Social media use without close friends included all occasions on which adolescents had used social media to interact with nonclose friends, such as peers, parents, and strangers, as well as all occasions on which they had used social media without interacting with anyone.

A third and final unanswered question is whether different social media platforms yield different effects on friendship closeness. Most previous research has focused on the effects of one social media platform on friendship closeness (e.g., MSN, Hyves, or Facebook; Antheunis et al., 2014; Lee, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2019; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007, 2009a). However, today's adolescents use multiple social media platforms in functionally complementary ways (van Driel et al., 2019; Waterloo et al., 2017) and use some platforms more frequently to communicate with their friends than others. Therefore, the third aim of this study was to investigate the differential effects of the three most popular social media among Dutch adolescents (i.e., Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat; van Driel et al., 2019) on friendship closeness.

To get insight in the association of Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat use with adolescents' momentary friendship closeness, we conducted a preregistered experience sampling method (ESM) study. This study was conducted among 387 middle adolescents

whom we surveyed 6 times a day for 3 weeks. To be able to compare the findings of our study with the findings of previous research (Antheunis et al., 2014; Rousseau et al., 2019), we first investigated the associations of general social media use with friendship closeness, before we examined the associations of social media use with versus without close friends and friendship closeness. We focused on middle adolescence (13 years to 15 years), as this is the period in which friends become more supportive and important, adolescents start to spend more time with friends, and start to value physical and emotional intimacy in these friendships (De Goede et al., 2009; Sullivan, 1953). Middle adolescents may therefore be particularly attracted to social media, because social media provide them the opportunity to stay in touch with their friends near constantly and stimulate the exchange of intimate information (Nesi et al., 2018; Uhls et al., 2017), which are both key driving forces of adolescents' friendship formation and maintenance (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985).

Momentary Social Media Use and Momentary Friendship Closeness

Most previous research has focused on the effects of (mostly) older social media platforms on friendship closeness (e.g., MSN, Hyves, or Facebook; Antheunis et al., 2014; Lee, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2019; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007, 2009a). Many of the affordances of these older social media platforms are comparable to more recent ones (boyd, 2014), and, as a result, these studies may at least partly inform us about how today's adolescents' social media use may be related to their friendship closeness. For example, MSN is comparable to WhatsApp and parts of Snapchat, as all of these platforms are mostly used for more private and direct forms of interaction, whereas both Facebook and Hyves are comparable to Instagram, as all of these platforms are mainly used for public forms of communication such as posts, likes, and comments (Valkenburg & Piotrowski, 2017).

Previous research on social media use and friendship closeness has often been informed by the *stimulation hypothesis*. This hypothesis proposes that due to the reduction of social cues in social media interactions, adolescents may become less concerned about how others perceive them (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a). Accordingly, they may feel more comfortable to self-disclose intimate information via social media with their close friends than via offline conversations, which, in turn, stimulates the closeness of these friendships (Trepte et al., 2018; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a; Yau & Reich, 2018). The stimulation hypothesis received support in different types of studies: Cross-sectional studies showed that adolescents who spent more time on social media than their peers experienced higher levels of friendship closeness (e.g., intensity of Hyves use, Antheunis et al., 2014; frequency of using email/chat room/instant messaging, Lee, 2009; time spent on chatting/instant messaging, Valkenburg & Peter, 2007). In addition, longitudinal studies found that adolescents who spent more time on messaging (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a) and who displayed higher rates of Facebook relationship maintenance behavior (e.g., commenting on a friend's post, Rousseau et al., 2019) than their peers showed higher levels of friendship closeness six months later.

These previous studies have typically used trait-like measures of friendship closeness, such as the Peer Attachment Inventory (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) or the Network of Relationships

Inventory (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). Such trait measures tap into relatively stable global perceptions of friendship closeness based on adolescents' general perception of their friendship across multiple weeks or months. Research among college students has shown that in addition to trait-like levels of friendship closeness, persons may also experience state-like levels of friendship closeness that are context-dependent and fluctuate throughout the day (Bayer et al., 2016; Kahlow et al., 2020), suggesting that social media use may also trigger momentary changes in feelings of friendship closeness within a person.

Different theories, including the transformation framework (Nesi et al., 2018), explain that social media use may be related to momentary fluctuations in friendship closeness due to the accessibility affordance of social media (e.g., boyd, 2011; Moreno & Uhls, 2019). Adolescents have countless possibilities to communicate and stay in touch with their close friends via social media, regardless of whether they are at home, at school, or in the sports club. In fact, many social media platforms explicitly prompt their users to share their current thoughts, feelings, and experiences with their friends and, by doing so, invite immediate support or positive feedback from these friends (Bayer et al., 2016; Waterloo et al., 2017). Never before have adolescents had the opportunity to share so many in-the-moment experiences with their close friends. And never before have they had the opportunity to receive so much immediate positive feedback and emotional support from these friends when sharing their experiences (Bayer et al., 2016; Kahlow et al., 2020; Yau & Reich, 2018).

Positive feedback and emotional support from peers are among the most important building blocks of friendship closeness (Rousseau et al., 2019). As adolescents' social media use predominantly leads to positive feedback from peers (Koutamanis et al., 2015; van Driel et al., 2019) and negative friendship interactions are scarce (De Goede et al., 2009), it is likely that for most adolescents (but not for all), social media interactions with their friends enhance momentary feelings of friendship closeness (Ellison et al., 2014; Rousseau et al., 2019). This assumption received support from a study by Kahlow et al. (2020), which found that young adults who sent more text or voice messages via Snapchat than their peers on one day, experienced higher levels of relational closeness the next day. Moreover, descriptive survey studies have shown that most adolescents believe that social media use enriches existing friendships, because it enables them to easily keep up with their friends on a daily basis (Pew Research Center, 2018; Rideout & Robb, 2018) and helps them to understand their friends' feelings and daily lives (Lenhart, 2015). Thus, based on the idea that adolescents predominantly use social media to interact with their friends (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009a; van Driel et al., 2019), it is plausible that social media use stimulates friendship closeness in daily life.

In the present study, we aimed to examine whether the positive *between*-person association between social media use and friendship closeness that has been found in previous studies also exists at a shorter time span and operates similarly at the *within*-person momentary level. That is, if we are interested in knowing whether social media use actually *stimulates* closeness to existing friends, we need to disentangle social media-induced fluctuations in friendship closeness within single adolescents from social media-induced differences in friendship closeness *between* adolescents (Beyens et al., 2020; Prinstein et al., 2020). We assessed adoles-

cents' levels of social media use and friendship closeness across 126 momentary assessments. By averaging these momentary assessments, we were able to obtain a general measure of friendship closeness and social media use across a 3-week period. We hypothesized that adolescents who used social media more frequently across the 3 weeks would also experience higher average levels of friendship closeness than adolescents who used social media less frequently (i.e., Hypothesis 1a [H1a]: positive between-person level association). In addition we expected that adolescents would experience higher levels of friendship closeness after using social media in the previous hour as compared to when they had not used social media (i.e., Hypothesis 1b [H1b]: positive within-person level association).

Social Media Use With Close Friends

In the early days of the Internet, online social interactions were limited to small groups of early adopters, who mainly interacted with strangers online, but since the introduction of the newer generation social media like Instagram, Snapchat, and WhatsApp, adolescents use social media predominantly to maintain existing relationships (Rideout & Robb, 2018; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009b; van Driel et al., 2019). It is no surprise, then, that many previous social media effect studies on friendship closeness have conceptualized time spent with social media or online relationship maintenance behavior as a proxy for time spent with close friends via social media. Even though the stimulation hypothesis proposes that interactions with close friends drive the effect of social media use on friendship closeness, this assumption has not been tested directly.

Research on messaging suggests that online communication is only positively related to friendship closeness when it is used for communication with peers whom adolescents know in real life, but not when it is used for communication with strangers (Valkenburg & Peter, 2007; Wang et al., 2011). Some other studies found that especially social types of communication, such as Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors or one-on-one communication, are positively related to friendship closeness and tie strength (Burke & Kraut, 2014; Rousseau et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2014). However, these social communication activities did not exclusively pertain to close friends, but also to parents, peers, acquaintances, and even strangers they met online. In line with the social displacement hypothesis (Kraut et al., 1998), one may expect that especially on occasions when social media is used without close friends, it may displace the time adolescents spend on face-to-face interactions with their close friends and reduce friendship closeness. Although this idea is not unequivocally supported (see, e.g., Dienlin et al., 2017; Hall et al., 2019), there are some recent studies among (young) adults suggesting that digital media use may be at the expense of face-to-face contact with close friends (e.g., Facebook use, Allcott et al., 2020; Smartphone use, Verduyn et al., 2021; Information Communications Technology use, Vilhelmson et al., 2018). Moreover, 40% of the adolescents confirm this idea, because they believe that social media take away time that they could otherwise have spent with their close friends in real life (Rideout & Robb, 2018).

Based on the assumption that friendship closeness may be enhanced via social media use through online interaction with close friends, we hypothesized that adolescents who had been

more frequently in touch with close friends via social media across the 3 weeks would experience higher average levels of friendship closeness than adolescents who had been less frequently in touch with close friends (i.e., Hypothesis 2a [H2a]: positive between-person level association). In addition, based on the social displacement hypothesis, we expected that adolescents would experience higher levels of friendship closeness after using social media *with* their close friends in the previous hour as compared to using social media *without* close friends (i.e., Hypothesis 2b [H2b]: positive within-person level association, H2b).

Different Platforms, Differential Effects

Adolescents use different social media in functionally complementary ways, and each of these platforms may therefore be related to friendship closeness in a unique way (Phua et al., 2017; Waterloo et al., 2017). Instagram is mainly used for positive self-presentation to a large audience, which is a type of social media use that may be unrelated to friendship closeness (Burke & Kraut, 2014; McEwan et al., 2018; Waterloo et al., 2017). In contrast, WhatsApp and Snapchat are mainly used to privately communicate with close others such as friends (Vaterlaus et al., 2016; Waterloo et al., 2017). Due to the private nature of WhatsApp and Snapchat, adolescents also share more ludic content and intimate information with their friends via these platforms than via Instagram (Boczkowski et al., 2018; Moreno & Uhls, 2019; van Driel et al., 2019; Vaterlaus et al., 2016; Waterloo et al., 2017). As humor and intimate self-disclosure play an important role in friendship maintenance (Martin & Ford, 2018; Trepte et al., 2018), we hypothesized that WhatsApp and Snapchat use would be more strongly positively associated with friendship closeness than Instagram use, both at the between-person (H3a) and within-person level (H3b).

Method

Sample Characteristics

This preregistered study (<https://osf.io/7vszj>) was part of a larger project on adolescents' social media use and psychosocial functioning. The present study used data from the first ESM wave of this project. The sample consisted of 387 students (54% girls) with a mean age of 14.11 years ($SD = .69$). Students were enrolled in different educational tracks: 44% were in lower prevocational secondary education, 31% in intermediate general secondary education, and 26% in academic preparatory education. Of all participants, 96% was born in The Netherlands and self-identified as Dutch, 2% was born in another European country, and 2% in a country outside Europe. The sample was a fairly accurate representation of this specific area in the Netherlands in terms of education level and ethnic background (Statistics Netherlands, 2020).

Procedure

Sample Recruitment and Selection

The research project titled "Longitudinal Research on Adolescents' Social Media Use and Well-Being" (2019-YME-11162) has

been approved by the Ethics Review Board of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences of the University of Amsterdam. A priori power analyses for our main project (power .80; within-person effect size of .07, $\alpha = .05$; see <https://osf.io/ar4vm/>) indicated that a sample size of 300 participants with 42 assessments would be needed. We took potential attrition and the consent rates of two earlier studies into account (i.e., 46% in Dietvorst et al., 2018 & 42% in Beyens et al., 2020). We invited 745 students from a large school in the Netherlands (i.e., all students in Grade 8 and 9) to participate in our study. Of these students, 400 received active parental consent to participate in the first ESM wave of the project and 388 provided informed consent themselves. One participant withdrew from this study before the start of the first ESM wave, which resulted in a final sample of 387 participants.

Baseline Session

In November 2019, students participated in a classroom baseline session in which the researchers informed them about all stages of the study and assured them that their answers would be anonymized and treated in a confidential way. During this instruction session, students completed a baseline survey in which we asked them to indicate their number of close friends and to provide a definition of close friendships. They were also asked to install the Ethica Data app on their own phone that was used to complete the ESM surveys. At the end of the baseline session, students completed an initial survey on their social media use via the Ethica app. In this initial Ethica survey, we asked them to indicate which social media platforms they used more than once a week, on which we based the subsequent personalized ESM questionnaires. Three researchers were present to answer adolescents' questions and to help them with the installation of the app.

ESM Surveys

The ESM study took part in the 3 weeks following upon the baseline session, in December 2019. Through the Ethica app, adolescents were prompted six times per day to fill out a survey of approximately 2 min (23 items). Adolescents received one additional closed question at the beginning of each day and an additional open question at the end of each day. Adolescents only received questions about their usage of Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat if they indicated on the initial Ethica survey that they used these platforms more than once a week. Adolescents who used any of these platforms less frequently, received questions about their usage of other social media platforms (i.e., YouTube or gaming) or other activities. In total, adolescents received 126 surveys.

Sampling Scheme

Following recent guidelines for designing ESM studies among adolescents (van Roekel et al., 2019) and based on Beyens et al. (2020), a semirandom sampling scheme was chosen. This avoided structural patterns in friendship closeness, while taking into account that adolescents were only allowed to use their phone during break time when they were at school. At weekdays, adolescents received one notification before school time, two notifications during the school breaks, and three notifications after school time. At weekend days, they received one notification in the morning, three notifications in the afternoon, and two notifications in the

evening. The response time windows were adjusted to the time of the day to take travel time to school and individual differences in evening rituals into account. Adolescents had to respond within a time window of 60 min for the first morning surveys, 120 min for the last evening surveys, and 30 min for all other surveys. Adolescents received automatic reminders within 5 min to 10 min after each ESM notification. The exact notification scheme can be found on OSF (<https://osf.io/tbdjq/>).

Monitoring Plan and Incentives

During the study, we sent direct messages to the adolescents to check whether we could help with any technical issues and to motivate them to fill out as many questionnaires as possible. Adolescents received a financial compensation of €0.30 for each completed questionnaire. In addition, each day, we raffled off four times €25 among all adolescents who completed all six surveys the previous day.

Compliance

We sent a total number of 48,762 surveys. However, due to some unforeseen technical issues, 862 surveys (1.77%) were not received by the students. Accordingly, adolescents received 47,900 surveys, of which 34,930 (73%) were completed, resulting in a good compliance rate in comparison with other ESM studies among adolescents (van Roekel et al., 2019). On average, adolescents completed 90.26 out of 126 surveys ($SD = 23.84$).

Measures

Friendship Closeness

In line with previous research (Bayer et al., 2016; Lee, 2009), we measured friendship closeness with a single item: “How close to your close friends do you feel right now?” Adolescents responded on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*completely*), with 4 (*a little*) as midpoint. We specifically focused on close friends to ensure that adolescents did not consider all their social media connections as friends. Adolescents in this sample defined close friends as peers with whom they spend time and have fun, who provide support and whom they can trust and count on, with whom they feel at ease to disclose intimate personal information, and with whom they can be their authentic self. These characteristics are in line with the definition of friendship by Armsden and Greenberg (1987) and align with the social provisions that characterize friendship (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). On average, adolescents had 8.76 close friends ($SD = 6.19$).

Social Media Use

We measured the most popular activities adolescents engaged in on Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat. These activities were selected based on a recent national survey by van Driel et al. (2019). We asked adolescents to indicate how much time they had spent in the previous hour using Instagram (three items: viewing posts/stories of others; reading direct messages; sending direct messages), WhatsApp (two items: reading direct messages; sending direct messages), and Snapchat (five items: viewing stories of others; viewing snaps; sending snaps; reading direct messages; sending direct messages). Adolescents

responded on a scale with answer categories ranging from 0 to 60 min with 1-min intervals. We did not measure active public use of Instagram and Snapchat (e.g., posting a picture or story), because a recent survey study showed that these activities do not occur frequently enough to be assessed multiple times per day (van Driel et al., 2019).

Social Media Use With Close Friends

Social media use with close friends was measured with one question that asked whether adolescents had been in touch with their close friends in the previous hour. The multiple answer options were *yes* (via Instagram, WhatsApp, Snapchat, face-to-face, or in another way) or *no*. Before the start of the study, we conducted interviews with 34 adolescents to become familiar with their jargon and their uses of different social media platforms. From these interviews we learned that adolescents use the Dutch translation of “being in touch” to refer to directed, targeted communication.

Indices

Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat Use

Based on the social media use measure and social media use with close friends measure, we created a dummy per platform for each assessment (e.g., 0 = no Instagram use; 1 = Instagram use). If adolescents reported that they had been in touch with close friends via a certain platform according to the “social media use with close friends” measure (e.g., because they may have used the video chat function) but did not report using this social media platform according to the “social media use” measure, we coded their response on the social media use variable as 1 (instead of 0). We also computed the person mean of each dummy variable, which reflects the proportion of occasions during which participants used a particular platform (e.g., a person mean of .70 indicates that an adolescent used Instagram at 70% of all occasions). Within-person correlations between the specific social media activities belonging to one platform ranged from $r = .56$ to $.84$. Between-person correlations between the specific social media activities belonging to one platform ranged from $r = .86$ to 1.00 . These strong correlations confirm that the social media activity items can be grouped together to compute one dummy variable per platform.

Social Media Use With and Without Close Friends

Per assessment we created dummy variables for social media use with close friends (0 = no Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with close friends; 1 = Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with close friends). We also created the person mean of each dummy variable (e.g., a person mean of .70 indicates that an adolescent used Instagram with close friends at 70% of all occasions). A similar procedure was used to create a dummy variable for Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use without close friends (0 = no Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use without close friends; 1 = Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use without close friends) and the person means of these dummy variables. These dummy-coded variables allowed for the comparison of occasions when adolescents used media with and without close friends, as well as occasions when they did not use any social media at all.

Statistical Analyses

Unless indicated otherwise, we exactly followed our preregistered analysis plan (<https://osf.io/7vszj>) and examined associations of Instagram, Snapchat, and WhatsApp use with friendship closeness by means of multilevel modeling in Mplus 8.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). We ran two-level models in which the repeated momentary ESM assessments (level 1) were nested within adolescents (level 2). To avoid multicollinearity (see Supplement 1), the three platforms were analyzed in three separate sets of analyses. We estimated four models per platform. In all models, we person-mean centered all categorical and continuous within-person variables (Level 1) to control for between-person effects (Wang & Maxwell, 2015). Between-person variables were grand-mean centered (Level 2).

For each platform, in Model 1 (the intercept only model), we determined the relative amount of within-person and between-person variance (i.e., intraclass correlation). In Model 2 (the reference model), we added two fixed covariates to the model, weekday versus weekend day (Level 1) and notification number of the day (Level 1), to detrend the data. This is helpful to interpret within-person associations as correlated fluctuations beyond other changes in social media use and friendship closeness (Wang & Maxwell, 2015). In Model 3 (fixed effects model), we determined the within-person and between-person associations of social media use with friendship closeness, by adding the fixed within-person effect of Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use (Level 1) and the between-person effect of adolescents' average level of Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use across the 3 weeks (Level 2).

Finally, in Model 4, we determined the within-person and between-person associations of Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with and without close friends with friendship closeness. For the ease of interpretation, we used an alternative specification of the preregistered model. Specifically, we estimated the within-person fixed effects of Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with close friends and without close friends with two Level 1 dummy variables (Dummy 1: 0 = no Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with close friends; 1 = Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use with close friends; Dummy 2: 0 = no Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use without close friends, 1 = Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat use without close friends; Level 1). At the between-person level, we estimated the associations of adolescents' average level of Instagram/WhatsApp/Snapchat with close friends and without close friends across the 3 weeks (Level 2). As this alternative specification of Model 4 resulted in an identical overall model fit as the preregistered Model 4 in which we aimed to include the general social media use variables instead of the social media use without close friends variables, Model 3 remained nested in Model 4 (see Supplement 14 for the results of the original preregistered models).

Nested models were compared by the likelihood ratio test, the Akaike information criterion (AIC), and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Hox et al., 2018). We preregistered that model comparison would show an improvement in model fit if the AIC and BIC values were at least three points lower than the reference model or if the likelihood ratio test was significant ($p < .05$; Raftery, 1995). We interpreted the fixed effects if at least one of these inference criteria suggested a better fit. When p values were smaller than .05, we considered the fixed effects as significant and interpreted the effect sizes. To determine differences between

platforms (Hypotheses 3a [H3a] and 3b [H3b]), standardized effects were compared.

As an assumption check, we examined whether residuals were normally distributed according to the procedure of Hox et al. (2018). Histograms and QQ-plots revealed that all residuals were fairly normally distributed (see Supplement 2 in the online supplemental material). As the assumptions were met, we tested our models in Mplus 8.4 by using the maximum likelihood estimation method. The multilevel analyses allowed us to include all available assessments on which all items were reported.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

In total, 345 adolescents (89%) used Instagram at least once a week, 375 (97%) used WhatsApp, and 285 (73%) used Snapchat at least once a week. Descriptive statistics in Table 1 show that adolescents used Snapchat at 61% of the assessments, followed by Instagram (56%), and WhatsApp (53%). In about half of all occasions during which adolescents used Snapchat or Instagram, they had been in touch with their friends via these platforms. WhatsApp was used less frequently for being in touch with close friends; only during 23% of all occasions when adolescents had used WhatsApp. Of all participants, 23% had never been in touch with their friends via WhatsApp, as opposed to 4% via Snapchat and 1% via Instagram. Thus, although WhatsApp was used by the largest group of participants, they used WhatsApp relatively less frequently with close friends than Instagram and Snapchat.

As Table 1 shows, within-person and between-person correlations had an opposing sign. At the between-person level we found positive correlations between friendship closeness and Instagram use with close friends and WhatsApp use. Adolescents who had used Instagram with close friends and WhatsApp more frequently than their peers throughout the 3 weeks experienced higher levels of friendship closeness across the 3 weeks than their peers. At the within-person level, however, friendship closeness was significantly negatively correlated with Instagram use, Instagram use with close friends, and WhatsApp use. Hence, adolescents felt less close to their friends after they had used Instagram or WhatsApp in the previous hour. As these associations reflect zero-order within-person correlations, we conducted multilevel analyses to test our hypotheses.

Associations of Friendship Closeness With Social Media Use

A full overview of each model can be found in Supplements 3 through 6 in the online supplemental material. A summary of the main findings is presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents a statistical overview of the main findings of Model 3 and 4.

Intercept-Only Model

The intercept-only model (Model 1) without predictors revealed an intraclass correlation (ICC) of .41. Hence, whereas 41% of the variance in friendship closeness was due to stable differences between adolescents, 59% was due to within-person overtime fluctuations in adolescents' individual scores around their own

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Within-Person and Between-Person Correlations of Social Media Use With Friendship Closeness

Variable	n	No. of occasions	Descriptive statistics		Correlations friendship closeness	
			M ^a	SD	Within-person	Between-person
Friendship closeness	387	34,930	4.48	1.30		
Social media use						
Instagram	345	31,658	.56	.25	-.03***	.10
WhatsApp	375	34,068	.53	.25	-.02**	.12*
Snapchat	285	26,479	.61	.27	-.01	.04
Social media use with close friends						
Instagram	345	31,658	.29	.22	-.03***	.19***
WhatsApp	375	34,068	.12	.20	-.01	.07
Snapchat	285	26,479	.31	.27	.00	.10
Social media use without close friends						
Instagram	345	31,658	.28	.20	-.01	-.09
WhatsApp	375	34,068	.41	.22	-.01*	.07
Snapchat	285	26,479	.30	.20	.00	-.07

^a Means reflect the average of person mean scores. For social media use, person mean scores reflect the proportion of occasions during which participants used a particular platform (e.g., adolescents used Instagram during 56% of the occasions).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

means. This ICC confirms that our sampling scheme of six assessments a day yielded sufficient within-person variance in friendship closeness for conducting multilevel analyses.

Reference Model

Next, we estimated our reference model (Model 2) to check for potential time trends in the data. Adolescents experienced higher levels of friendship closeness on weekdays than in the weekend ($\beta = .184$ to $.195$, $p < .001$) and they experienced higher levels of friendship closeness at the beginning than at the end of the day ($\beta = -.059$ to $-.072$, $p < .001$). As both predictors were significant, Model 2 served as reference model to which the social media use models were compared.

Table 2
Summary of the Main Outcomes of the Multilevel Analyses

Variable	Friendship closeness	
	Within-person β	Between-person β
Social media use		
Instagram	-.058***	.082
WhatsApp	-.027*	.104*
Snapchat	-.001	.035
Social media use with close friends		
Instagram	-.069***	.171**
WhatsApp	-.037	.082
Snapchat	.009	.090
Social media use without close friends		
Instagram	-.047**	-.055
WhatsApp	-.025	.095
Snapchat	-.009	-.073

Note. β = standardized effects using STDY standardization in Mplus for the categorical within-person variables and STDYX standardization in Mplus for the continuous between-person variables. Significance was based on two-sided p values of the unstandardized effects.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Social Media Use Models

Instagram Use

Model 3 revealed no between-person association (H1a): Adolescents' average level of Instagram use across the 3 weeks was unrelated to their mean level of friendship closeness across the same period. In contrast, a very small significant negative within-person effect of Instagram use on momentary experiences of friendship closeness was revealed ($\beta = -.058$, $p < .001$; H1b). That is, adolescents felt less close to their friends after they had used Instagram in the previous hour.

In Model 4, we determined the relative effects of Instagram use with and without close friends (H2). At the within-person level, this model showed that the very small negative effect of Instagram use on momentary friendship closeness pertained to both Instagram use with close friends ($\beta = -.069$, $p < .001$; H2b) and Instagram use without close friends ($\beta = -.047$, $p = .002$; H2b). Adolescents felt less close to their friends after using Instagram in the past hour than when they did not use Instagram, regardless of whether they used Instagram with or without close friends. At the between-person level, we found an association with an opposite sign for Instagram use with close friends ($\beta = .171$, $p = .002$; H2a), which indicated that adolescents who had been in touch more frequently with their close friends via Instagram across the 3 weeks felt, on average, closer to their friends than adolescents who had been in touch less frequently with close friends via Instagram. The average level of Instagram use without close friends was unrelated to mean levels of friendship closeness.

WhatsApp Use

We found that WhatsApp use was positively related to mean levels of friendship closeness at the between-person level ($\beta = .104$, $p = .044$; H1a, Model 3), but very weakly *negatively* related to momentary experiences of friendship closeness at the within-person level ($\beta = -.027$, $p = .030$; H1b, Model 3). This indicates

Table 3
Predicting Friendship Closeness From Social Media Use at the Within-Person and Between-Person Level

Models & variables	Instagram [IN]			WhatsApp [WA]			Snapchat [SN]		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Model 3: Social media use									
Within-person									
IN/WA/SN use versus no use	-.087	.020	<.001	-.041	.019	.030	-.002	.023	.940
Between-person									
Average IN/WA/SN use	.419	.276	.129	.542	.269	.044	.157	.269	.559
Fit indices	$\chi^2(2) = 21.604, p < .001$			$\chi^2(2) = 8.740, p = .006$			$\chi^2(2) = .348, p = .420$		
AIC	117169.827			126932.689			97265.941		
BIC	117228.367			126991.742			97323.229		
Model 4: Social media use with versus without close friends									
Within-person									
IN/WA/SN use with friends versus no use	-.104	.024	<.001	-.069	.034	.090	.014	.028	.616
IN/WA/SN use without friends versus no use	-.072	.023	.002	-.047	.020	.053	-.013	.025	.614
Between-person									
Average IN/WA/SN use with friends	.970	.318	.002	.525	.348	.131	.416	.292	.154
Average IN/WA/SN use without friends	-.345	.355	.332	.555	.319	.082	-.440	.381	.249
Fit indices	$\chi^2(2) = 12.556, p \leq .001$			$\chi^2(2) = .320, p = .426$			$\chi^2(2) = 5.726, p = .029$		
AIC	117161.262			126936.370			97264.214		
BIC	117236.527			127012.295			97337.871		

Note. In all models, we controlled for weekday versus weekend day and with notification number of the day. Social media use predictors were dummy coded (0 = no use of IN/WA/SN, 1 = use of IN/WA/SN). Significant effects are displayed in bold. *t* = average number of assessments per participant; *b* = unstandardized effect; *SE* = standardized effect using STUDY standardization in Mplus for the categorical within-person variables and STDYX standardization in Mplus for the continuous between-person variables.

that adolescents who used WhatsApp more frequently across the 3 weeks felt, on average, closer to their friends than adolescents who used WhatsApp less frequently. However adolescents felt less close after they used WhatsApp in the previous hour, compared to not using it at all.

The model fit did not significantly improve by including WhatsApp use with close friends in the model (H2a and H2b, Model 4). Thus, the positive between-person and negative within-person associations of WhatsApp use with friendship closeness did not depend on whether adolescents used WhatsApp with their friends.

Snapshot Use

The model fit of the Snapchat model was not significantly better than the reference model (Model 3). This indicates that Snapchat use was unrelated to adolescents' average (between-person level, H1a) and momentary (within-person level, H1b) level of friendship closeness.

The fit of the Snapchat use with close friends model (Model 4) was significantly better than the Snapchat use model according to the likelihood ratio test, but not according to the AIC and BIC criteria. We did not find any significant fixed effects. Thus, regardless of whether Snapchat was used with or without close friends, Snapchat use was not associated with adolescents' average (between-person level, H2a) and momentary (within-person level, H2b) level of friendship closeness.

Comparison of Platforms

Looking at differences between platforms, at the between-person level (H3a), we found moderately strong positive significant associations of friendship closeness with Instagram use with close friends ($\beta = .171$) and general WhatsApp use ($\beta = .104$), but not for Snapchat use. In contrast, at the within-person level (H3b), friendship closeness was significantly negatively related to Instagram use ($\beta = -.058$) and WhatsApp use ($\beta = -.027$). Comparison of effect sizes suggests that the associations were the strongest for Instagram, both at the between-person and within-person level.

Sensitivity Analyses

We conducted several preregistered sensitivity analyses that shed light on the robustness of the results against alternative specifications of the sample and research models. Specifically, we examined models in which all three platforms were included together and models in which eight participants with potentially untrustworthy answer patterns were excluded. In addition to the preregistered sensitivity analyses, we also estimated a model in which we omitted occasions with discrepancies between social media use with close friends and general social media use (i.e., occasions on which adolescents used a platform with close friends, even though they indicated that they spent 0 min using that platform). The findings of these models are available in [Supplements 7 through 9](#) in the online supplemental material. The general conclusion is that the findings were most robust for Instagram.

Exploratory Analyses

We conducted three additional sets of exploratory analyses. As preregistered, we first examined whether the within-person


effects of Instagram use without close friends and WhatsApp use remained significant after controlling for the carry-over effect of friendship closeness two hours prior to each assessment. A full overview of the model specifications and main outcomes of these analyses can be found in [Supplements 10 through 13](#) in the online supplemental material. Dynamic structural equation modeling [DSEM] revealed that, again, findings were most robust for Instagram. The effects of Instagram use with and without close friends on friendship closeness remained significant after controlling for the 2-hour lagged effect of friendship closeness ($b = -.088$, 95% confidence interval [CI; $-.133, -.042$], $\beta = -.024$ and $b = -.054$, 95% CI [$-.096, -.010$], $\beta = -.015$, respectively). Thus, Instagram use with and without close friends did not only co-fluctuate with friendship closeness, but also predicted subsequent changes in friendship closeness. For WhatsApp use, we no longer found a significant within-person effect on friendship closeness.

Second, we examined whether there was heterogeneity between adolescents in the within-person effects of social media use on friendship closeness. The fixed effect models pointed at very small average within-person effect sizes. One explanation for such small effects may be that effects were diluted across a heterogeneous sample of adolescents with different susceptibilities to the effects of social media use (Beyens et al., 2020; Valkenburg & Peter, 2013). To model such heterogeneity, we added random effects to our multilevel analyses. Random effect models pointed at significant variance around the slopes and indicated that there was significant heterogeneity between adolescents in the strength and direction of the association of friendship closeness with Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat use (see [Supplements 4 through 6](#) in the online supplemental material). This heterogeneity was confirmed by DSEM analyses with random slopes (see [Supplements 10 through 13](#) in the online supplemental material). [Figure 1](#) presents the range of the person-specific associations of Instagram use (top histogram), Instagram use with close friends (bottom left histogram), and Instagram use without close friends (bottom right histogram). The y -axis represents the number of participants and the x -axis the standardized person-specific effect sizes. As [Figure 1](#) shows, for all three variables we found a large heterogeneity in person-specific within-person associations with friendship closeness. For Instagram use, the standardized person-specific effect sizes ranged from $-.565$ to $.449$, for Instagram use with close friends from $-.745$ to $.697$, and for Instagram use without close friends they ranged from $-.649$ to $.454$.

Third, in addition to the preregistered exploratory analyses, we explored potential gender differences, given that several large-scale studies have demonstrated that media effects may differ between boys and girls (Kelly et al., 2018; Thorisdottir et al., 2019; Twenge et al., 2020). We did not find a main effect of gender on friendship closeness at the between-person level, indicating that boys and girls did not differ in their average level of friendship closeness. The associations between Instagram, WhatsApp or Snapchat use and friendship closeness at the between-person level were not moderated by gender. However, we found a significant cross-level interaction. The within-person association of WhatsApp use with friendship closeness was moderated by gender ($b = .123$, $p = .028$), but the associations of Instagram and Snapchat use with friendship

Figure 1

Distribution of Person-Specific Effect Sizes for the Associations of Instagram Use with Closeness to Friends



Note. Top histogram: Instagram use. Bottom-left histogram: Instagram use with close friends. Bottom-right histogram: Instagram use without close friends. The vertical black lines represent the mean of person-specific effect sizes. See the online article for the color version of this figure.

closeness were not. Simple effect analyses showed that the within-person association of WhatsApp use with friendship closeness was significantly negative among boys ($b = -.098$, $p = .040$), and nonsignificant among girls ($b = .024$, $p = .465$).

Discussion

The development of close friendships is an important task in adolescence. To get insight in real-time processes that may underly the development of friendship closeness (Granic, 2005), we investigated the role of social media use in adolescents' friendship closeness in their daily lives. Using experience sampling data with

34,930 observations of 387 participants, we demonstrated that adolescents who used WhatsApp and Instagram with close friends more often than their peers experienced higher levels of friendship closeness. These positive between-person associations were not replicated at the within-person level. Instead, we found small negative within-person associations between general WhatsApp use and Instagram use and friendship closeness. Thus, overall, the stimulation hypothesis was not supported at the within-person level. However, post hoc analyses indicated sizable individual differences in adolescents' susceptibility to the effects of social media use on friendship closeness.

Adolescents' Social Media Use and Friendship Closeness in Their Daily Lives

Previous research consistently found positive between-person associations of social media use with friendship closeness (e.g., [Antheunis et al., 2014](#); [Rousseau et al., 2019](#)). These earlier studies examined the between-person association between adolescents' social media use and their general assessment of the closeness of their friendships. In the present study, we examined these between-person associations by aggregating adolescents' real-time, momentary experiences of friendship closeness across 3 weeks, which generally greatly reduces the recall bias in estimating the level of social media use ([Griffioen et al., 2020](#); [Underwood et al., 2018](#)). Despite this difference in approach, we were able to replicate the positive between-person association, but only for WhatsApp use: Adolescents who used WhatsApp more frequently experienced higher average levels of friendship closeness as compared to their peers who used WhatsApp less often. Although the associations for general Instagram and Snapchat use with friendship closeness were also positive, they fell below significance. As a result, our first hypothesis (H1a) was partially supported.

Although at first sight the positive between-person association appears to suggest that the stimulation hypothesis was supported, several scholars have highlighted the importance of disentangling within-person effects of social media from between-person associations, as conclusions about processes within single individuals cannot be drawn from between-person differences ([Coyne et al., 2020](#); [Keijsers & van Roekel, 2019](#); [Prinstein et al., 2020](#)). To investigate whether social media use stimulates friendship closeness in adolescents' daily lives, we examined the within-person associations of Instagram, WhatsApp, and Snapchat use with friendship closeness. Contrary to the stimulation hypothesis and our own hypothesis (H1b), we found either nonsignificant or very small negative within-person associations. Thus, on average, adolescents did *not* experience higher levels of friendship closeness after using social media in the previous hour. This finding is in line with other social media effects studies, which found only very small effects of social media at the within-person level ([Coyne et al., 2020](#); [Orben et al., 2019](#)). However, it should be noted that our additional analyses, as presented in [Figure 1](#), showed a striking heterogeneity in these effects. In fact, although the average within-person effect of Instagram use was very small ($\beta = -.058$), the person-specific within-person effect sizes ranged from $\beta = -.565$ to $\beta = .449$.

Friendship Closeness and Social Media Use With Versus Without Close Friends

We further extended previous research by showing that the effects of Instagram use did depend on whether adolescents used Instagram with or without close friends. As expected in H2a, we found quite strong positive between-person associations of Instagram use with friendship closeness that pertained to social media use with close friends ($\beta = .171$). Moreover, as expected, adolescents' Instagram use without close friends was unrelated to friendship closeness at the between-person level.

In contrast to the between-person associations and H2b, at the within-person level we did find a significant, but small, negative within-person association between Instagram use with and without close friends and friendship closeness. While this may indicate that using Instagram may be linked with feeling less close to one's close friends, it is important to consider that the sizes of the within-person associations were very small and appeared to mask individual differences in effect sizes ([Beyens et al., 2020](#)). That is, we found strong heterogeneity in the within-person effect sizes of Instagram use with and without close friends, ranging from strongly negative ($\beta = -.745$) to strongly positive ($\beta = .697$). Although a more extensive analysis of the person-to-person differences in susceptibility to the effects of social media use on friendship closeness was beyond the scope of this study, our findings do suggest that there is a group of adolescents for whom the stimulation hypothesis holds. However, because there is also a group of adolescents for whom social media use is negatively related to friendship closeness, these effects may cancel each other out, resulting in small average within-person associations between Instagram use with and without close friends and friendship closeness.

We have two potential explanations as to why some adolescents may experience small decreases in friendship closeness because of Instagram use per se or Instagram use with or without close friends. A first explanation may lie in the constant accessibility of social media. Adolescents have created expectations regarding online friendship maintenance that may temporarily decrease friendship closeness if they are not met. For example, adolescents may have created the expectation that their friends will always be available to provide feedback on their social media posts ([Nesi et al., 2018](#)). Accordingly, they may feel stressed or concerned about their friendships if they do not receive immediate or enough (positive) comments or likes from their close friends on these posts ([Beyens et al., 2016](#); [Yau & Reich, 2018](#)), which could lead to momentary decreases in their assessment of friendship closeness. Moreover, as adolescents often use social media to publicly display their friendships to others by posting pictures with close friends, they may sometimes be exposed to social media posts of friends at events they are not invited to, which may enhance feelings of social exclusion ([Nesi et al., 2018](#); [Rideout & Robb, 2018](#)).

A second explanation may be that for some adolescents Instagram use without close friends displaces the time they spend on face-to-face interaction with their close friends ([Kraut et al., 1998](#); [Verduyn et al., 2021](#)). Even when adolescents spend time with their close friends, social media may be at the expense of quality time with close friends, as adolescents and their friends have been found to frustrate each other by using their phones while they are hanging out together ([Rideout & Robb, 2018](#)). Such media multitasking during conversations has been found to be related to lower socioemotional functioning ([van der Schuur et al., 2015](#)), and may account for the small social media-induced decreases in friendship closeness among some adolescents ([Nesi et al., 2018](#)).

Different Platforms Yield Differential Effects

The findings of this study confirmed the idea that adolescents use different social media platforms in complementary ways ([Phua et al., 2017](#); [Vermeulen et al., 2018](#); [Waterloo et al., 2017](#)),

although the pattern of platform differences was the opposite of what we had expected. Whereas we expected that WhatsApp and Snapchat use would be more strongly positively related to friendship closeness than Instagram use (H3a and H3b), the most robust and strongest effects were found for Instagram. This may perhaps be because adolescents' use of social media rapidly changes over time. Although WhatsApp was the most popular platform among adolescents in this study, only in 12% of the occasions it was used to communicate with close friends. A recent Dutch survey study revealed that WhatsApp is used not only to send direct messages to (close) friends, but also to parents and acquaintances (van Driel et al., 2019). Although Snapchat was used more frequently with close friends than WhatsApp, the effects for Snapchat may have been nonsignificant because adolescents may not remember the content of their snap messages and consider them as relatively meaningless, as has been shown in a study among young adults (Bayer et al., 2016).

Contrary to our expectations, Instagram seems to play the largest role in communicating with close friends and, thus, friendship closeness. Today's adolescents often have multiple Instagram accounts (van Driel et al., 2019): Besides a real Instagram account, many adolescents have a fake Instagram account (FINSTA) that is used to connect with close friends. Research among college students showed that a FINSTA is used to provide friends daily updates and to make them laugh (Kang & Wei, 2020). As humor and intimate self-disclosure are strongly related to friendship closeness (Martin & Ford, 2018; Trepte et al., 2018), the use of FINSTAs may explain why we found the strongest effects for Instagram.

Strengths, Limitations, and Implications for Future Research

To the best of our knowledge, this preregistered study is (among) the first to assess whether social media use and friendship closeness are linked in adolescents' daily lives. The study had a high compliance rate (one of the most important markers of the quality of an ESM study; van Roekel et al., 2019), resulting in a total number of 34,930 assessments. Moreover, we used an ecologically valid measure of social media use that minimized recall bias (Larson, 2019), by asking adolescents to report on their social media use in the previous hour. In addition, this study provided further evidence for the more general idea that between-person and within-person processes are distinct processes, which need to be distinguished in (social) media effect studies (Coyne et al., 2020; Orben et al., 2019; Prinstein et al., 2020). Finally, the present study revealed that it is important for future studies to disentangle online interactions with close friends from other online interactions, because at the between-person level, these different types of interactions may have opposite effects on adolescents' friendship closeness.

Despite its strengths, this study also has several limitations. First, as this study specifically focused on close friendships, findings cannot be directly generalized to other types of friendships or friendships in general. Second, this study incorporated a rather narrow measure of social media use with close friends that did not distinguish between different types of social media use with close friends (e.g., liking a friends' post, direct messaging). Third, this study did not take the valence or quality of online interactions with

friends into account. The present study therefore could not obtain insight into the circumstances under which social media use enhances and decreases friendship closeness. Insight in this question could be obtained by assessing the type, valence, and content of social media interactions with close friends (i.e., humor, self-disclosed intimate information, support, conflicts, cyberbullying, or misunderstanding; Nesi et al., 2018; Yau & Reich, 2018). As most adolescents predominantly have positive experiences with close friends via social media (Koutamanis et al., 2015; van Driel et al., 2019), this question could only be addressed in a targeted sample of adolescents who have both positive and negative experiences with close friends.

Another important open question is how many adolescents experience positive or negative effects of social media use on real-time experiences of friendship closeness. This study already provided a first glimpse of potential heterogeneity in these effects, as our sensitivity analyses pointed at large variance around within-person effects. A recent ESM study on the effects of adolescents' social media use on well-being demonstrated strong person-specific susceptibilities to these effects (Beyens et al., 2020). Beyens et al. showed that 46% of the adolescents felt happier after using social media, while 10% felt less happy. Answering the question of how adolescents' social media use affects their friendship closeness in positive or negative ways would provide indispensable insight into who benefits from social media use in terms of friendship closeness and who does not.

A person-specific approach provides the opportunity to obtain insight into who these adolescents are in terms of trait-level characteristics. This study provided initial insights in potential trait differences in terms of gender, by revealing that a negative within-person association of WhatsApp use with friendship closeness only holds for boys. However, even after including gender as trait-like moderator, there still was a large portion of unexplained variance, suggesting that besides gender, there may be other trait variables that explain heterogeneity. To get a more complete overview of the characteristics of adolescents who benefit from social media use in terms of friendship closeness and who do not, investigation of a combination of different trait variables is warranted. Based on results of previous between-person studies, it may be interesting to investigate the moderating role of trait levels of friendship quality, social anxiety, and social competence (Nesi et al., 2018; Yau & Reich, 2020).

While the current study already provided unique insights in the short-term Instagram-induced changes in momentary levels of friendship closeness, an important avenue for future research is to investigate the long-term effects of Instagram-induced decreases or increases in momentary levels of friendship closeness. The within-person associations that we found in this study were based on just one hour of social media use. Yet, these within-person effects may accumulate over time and result in long-term social-media induced development of friendship closeness. This accumulation, however, does not necessarily follow the logic of a linear system, as short-term and long-term effects may be opposing in magnitude or even sign (e.g., Keijsers & van Roekel, 2019; Lerner & Lerner, 2019; Smith & Thelen, 2003). Perhaps, through socio-emotional nonlinear feedback loops, short-term negative effects of social media use upon experienced friendships may motivate youths to invest more in their friendships, leading to longer term positive effects and positive between-person associations of social

media use and friendship closeness. Future research, for instance using measurement burst designs (Nesselrode, 1991), could provide more insight in the effect of short-term daily mechanisms on longer-term developmental change.

The findings of the present study shed light on the public debate on the effects of social media use. Many people have concerns about the potential negative impact of social media use on adolescents' socioemotional well-being. The present study revealed that virtually all adolescents had been in touch with their friends via social media throughout the day. Whereas spending time on social media was linked with very small negative momentary associations with friendship closeness, we did not find negative associations between the average time spent with social media and average levels friendship closeness. Those adolescents who used Instagram most frequently to interact with close friends even experienced the highest levels of friendship closeness in their daily lives. As our findings pointed at sizable individual differences in adolescents' susceptibility to the effects of social media use on friendship closeness, we found preliminary evidence for the idea that social media use may be harmful for some youths and beneficial for others. Future research is needed to examine for whom, when, and why social media use either stimulates or decreases friendship closeness.

References

- Allcott, H., Braghieri, L., Eichmeyer, S., & Gentzkow, M. (2020). The welfare effects of social media. *The American Economic Review*, *110*(3), 629–676. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20190658>
- Antheunis, M. L., Schouten, A. P., & Kraahmer, E. (2014). The role of Social Networking Sites in early adolescents' social lives. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *36*(3), 348–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431614564060>
- Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *16*(5), 427–454. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02202939>
- Bayer, J. B., Ellison, N. B., Schoenebeck, S. Y., & Falk, E. B. (2016). Sharing the small moments: Ephemeral social interaction on Snapchat. *Information Communication and Society*, *19*(7), 956–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1084349>
- Berndt, T. J. (2002). Friendship quality and social development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *11*(1), 7–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00157>
- Beyens, I., Frison, E., & Eggermont, S. (2016). "I don't want to miss a thing": Adolescents' fear of missing out and its relationship to adolescents' social needs, Facebook use, and Facebook related stress. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *64*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.083>
- Beyens, I., Pouwels, J. L., van Driel, I. I., Keijsers, L., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2020). The effect of social media on well-being differs from adolescent to adolescent. *Scientific Reports*, *10*, 10763. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67727-7>
- Boczkowski, P. J., Matassi, M., & Mitchelstein, E. (2018). How young users deal with multiple platforms: The role of meaning-making in social media repertoires. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *23*(5), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy012>
- boyd, d. (2011). Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics and implications. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *A networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites* (pp. 39–58). Routledge.
- boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Burke, M., & Kraut, R. (2014). Growing closer on Facebook: Changes in tie strength through social network site use. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 4187–4196). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557094>
- Coyne, S. M., Rogers, A. A., Zurcher, J. D., Stockdale, L., & Booth, M. (2020). Does time spent using social media impact mental health? An eight-year longitudinal study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *104*, 106160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.106160>
- De Goede, I. H. A., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2009). Developmental changes and gender differences in adolescents' perceptions of friendships. *Journal of Adolescence*, *32*(5), 1105–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.03.002>
- Dienlin, T., Masur, P. K., & Trepte, S. (2017). Reinforcement or displacement? The reciprocity of FTF, IM, and SNS communication and their effects on loneliness and life satisfaction. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *22*(2), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12183>
- Dietvorst, E., Hiemstra, M., Hillegers, M. H. J., & Keijsers, L. (2018). Adolescent perceptions of parental privacy invasion and adolescent secrecy: An illustration of Simpson's Paradox. *Child Development*, *89*(6), 2081–2090. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13002>
- Ellison, N. B., Vitak, J., Gray, R., & Lampe, C. (2014). Cultivating social resources on social network sites: Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and their role in social capital processes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *19*(4), 855–870. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12078>
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*, *21*(6), 1016–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.21.6.1016>
- Granic, I. (2005). Timing is everything: Developmental psychopathology from a dynamic systems perspective. *Developmental Review*, *25*(3), 386–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2005.10.005>
- Griffioen, N., Rooij, M., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., & Granic, I. (2020). Toward improved methods in social media research. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000005>
- Hall, J. A., Xing, C., Ross, E. M., & Johnson, R. M. (2019). Experimentally manipulating social media abstinence: Results of a four-week diary study. *Media Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2019.1688171>
- Hamaker, E. L., Asparouhov, T., Brose, A., Schmiedek, F., & Muthén, B. (2018). At the frontiers of modeling intensive longitudinal data: Dynamic structural equation models for the affective measurements from the COGITO study. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *53*(6), 820–841. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2018.1446819>
- Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. *Child Development*, *67*(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131681>
- Hinde, R. A. (1997). *Relationships: A dialectic perspective*. Psychology Press.
- Hox, J., Moerbeek, M., & van de Schoot, R. (2018). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Kahlow, J. A., Coker, M. C., & Richards, R. (2020). The multimodal nature of Snapchat in close relationships: Toward a social presence-based theoretical framework. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *111*, 106409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106409>
- Kang, J., & Wei, L. (2020). Let me be at my funniest: Instagram users' motivations for using Finsta (a.k.a., fake Instagram). *The Social Science Journal*, *57*(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2018.12.005>
- Keijsers, L., & van Roekel, E. (2019). Longitudinal methods in adolescent psychology: Where could we go from here? And should we? In L. B. Hendry & M. Kloep (Eds.), *Reframing adolescent research* (pp. 56–77). Routledge.

- Kelly, Y., Zilanawala, A., Booker, C., & Sacker, A. (2018). Social media use and adolescent mental health: Findings from the U. K. Millennium Cohort Study. *EClinicalMedicine*, 6, 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2018.12.005>
- Koutamanis, M., Vossen, H. G. M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2015). Adolescents' comments in social media: Why do adolescents receive negative feedback and who is most at risk? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53, 486–494. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.016>
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53(9), 1017–1031. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017>
- Larson, R. W. (2019). Experiencing sampling research from its beginnings into the future. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 29(3), 551–559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12524>
- Lee, S. J. (2009). Online communication and adolescent social ties: Who benefits more from Internet use? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(3), 509–531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01451.x>
- Lenhart, A. (2015). *Teens, social media and technology overview 2015*. Pew Research Center.
- Lerner, R. M., & Lerner, J. V. (2019). An idiographic approach to adolescent research: Theory, method, and application. In L. B. Hendry & M. Kloep (Eds.), *Reframing adolescent research* (pp. 25–38). Routledge.
- Martin, R. A., & Ford, T. E. (2018). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.
- McEwan, B., Sumner, E., Eden, J., & Fletcher, J. (2018). The effects of Facebook relational maintenance on friendship quality: An investigation of the Facebook relational maintenance measure. *Communication Research Reports*, 35(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2017.1361393>
- McNeish, D., & Hamaker, E. L. (2020). A primer on two-level dynamic structural equation models for intensive longitudinal data in Mplus. *Psychological Methods*, 25(5), 610–635. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000250>
- Moreno, M. A., & Uhls, Y. T. (2019). Applying an affordances approach and a developmental lens to approach adolescent social media use. *Digital Health*, 5, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207619826678>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2017). *Mplus user's guide* (8th ed.).
- Nesi, J., Choukas-Bradley, S., & Prinstein, M. J. (2018). Transformation of adolescent peer relations in the social media context: Part 1—A theoretical framework and application to dyadic peer relationships. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 21(3), 267–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-018-0261-x>
- Nesselroade, J. R. (1991). The warp and the woof of the developmental fabric. In *Visions of aesthetics, the environment & development: The legacy of Joachim F. Wohlwill* (pp. 213–240). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Orben, A., Dienlin, T., & Przybylski, A. K. (2019). Social media's enduring effect on adolescent life satisfaction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(21), 10226–10228. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1902058116>
- Pew Research Center. (2018). *Teens' social media habits and experiences*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/11/28/teens-social-media-habits-and-experiences/>
- Phua, J., Jin, S. V., & Kim, J. (2017). Uses and gratifications of social networking sites for bridging and bonding social capital: A comparison of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72, 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.041>
- Pouwels, J. L., Valkenburg, P. M., Beyens, I., van Driel, I. I., & Keijsers, L. (2020). *Data set belonging to Pouwels et al. (2020). Social media use and friendship closeness in adolescents' daily lives: An experience sampling study* [Data set]. University of Amsterdam/Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.21942/uva.13285685>
- Prinstein, M. J., Nesi, J., & Telzer, E. H. (2020). Commentary: An updated agenda for the study of digital media use and adolescent development—Future directions following Odgers & Jensen (2020). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 61(3), 349–352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13219>
- Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayesian model selection in social research. *Sociological Methodology*, 25, 111–195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271063>
- Rideout, V., & Robb, M. B. (2018). *Social media, social life: Teens reveal their experiences*. Common Sense Media.
- Rousseau, A., Frison, E., & Eggermont, S. (2019). The reciprocal relations between Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and adolescents' closeness to friends. *Journal of Adolescence*, 76, 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.09.001>
- Smith, L. B., & Thelen, E. (2003). Development as a dynamic system. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(8), 343–348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(03\)00156-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00156-6)
- Statistics Netherlands. (2020). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2020* [Key figures districts and neighborhoods 2020, Stat-line]. <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/maatwerk/2020/29/kerncijfers-wijken-en-buurten-2020>
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. Norton.
- Thorisdottir, I. E., Sigurvinsdottir, R., Asgeirsdottir, B. B., Allegrante, J. P., & Sigfusdottir, I. D. (2019). Active and passive social media use and symptoms of anxiety and depressed mood among Icelandic adolescents. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 22(8), 535–542. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2019.0079>
- Trepte, S., Masur, P. K., & Scharnow, M. (2018). Mutual friends' social support and self-disclosure in face-to-face and instant messenger communication. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 158(4), 430–445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1398707>
- Twenge, J. M., Haidt, J., Joiner, T. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2020). 2020/04/01. Underestimating digital media harm. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(4), 346–348. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0839-4>
- Uhls, Y. T., Ellison, N. B., & Subrahmanyam, K. (2017). Benefits and costs of social media in adolescence. *Pediatrics*, 140(Suppl. 2), S67–S70. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-1758E>
- Underwood, M. K., Brown, B. B., & Ehrenreich, S. E. (2018). Social media and peer relations. In W. M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (2nd ed., pp. 533–551). Guilford Press.
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2007). Preadolescents' and adolescents' online communication and their closeness to friends. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(2), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.267>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2009a). The effects of instant messaging on the quality of adolescents' existing friendships: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Communication*, 59(1), 79–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01405.x>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2009b). Social consequences of the Internet for adolescents: A decade of research. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01595.x>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2011). Online communication among adolescents: An integrated model of its attraction, opportunities, and risks. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48(2), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.08.020>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2013). The differential susceptibility to media effects model. *Journal of Communication*, 63(2), 221–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12024>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Piotrowski, J. T. (2017). *Plugged in: How media attract and affect youth*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300218879.001.0001>
- van der Schuur, W., Baumgartner, S. E., Sumter, S. R., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2015). The consequences of media multitasking for youth: A

- review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53, 204–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.035>
- van Driel, I. I., Pouwels, J. L., Beyens, I., Keijsers, L., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2019). *Posting, scrolling, chatting, and Snapping: Youth (14–15) and social media in 2019*. Center for Research on Children, Adolescents, and the Media.
- van Roekel, E., Keijsers, L., & Chung, J. M. (2019). A review of current ambulatory assessment studies in adolescent samples and practical recommendations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 29(3), 560–577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12471>
- Vaterlaus, J. M., Barnett, K., Roche, C., & Young, J. A. (2016). “Snapchat is more personal”: An exploratory study on Snapchat behaviors and young adult interpersonal relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, 594–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.029>
- Verduyn, P., Schulte-Strathaus, J., Kross, E., & Hülshager, U. (2021). When do smartphones displace face-to-face interactions and what to do about it? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106550>
- Vermeulen, A., Vandebosch, H., & Heirman, W. (2018). #Smiling, #venting, or both? Adolescents’ social sharing of emotions on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 84, 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.02.022>
- Vilhelmson, B., Eildér, E., & Thulin, E. (2018). What did we do when the Internet wasn’t around? Variation in free-time activities among three young-adult cohorts from 1990/1991, 2000/2001, and 2010/2011. *New Media & Society*, 20(8), 2898–2916. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817737296>
- Wang, J.-L., Jackson, L. A., Gaskin, J., & Wang, H.-Z. (2014). The effects of Social Networking Site (SNS) use on college students’ friendship and well-being. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 37, 229–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.051>
- Wang, J.-L., Jackson, L. A., & Zhang, D.-J. (2011). The mediator role of self-disclosure and moderator roles of gender and social anxiety in the relationship between Chinese adolescents’ online communication and their real-world social relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(6), 2161–2168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.06.010>
- Wang, L. P., & Maxwell, S. E. (2015). On disaggregating between-person and within-person effects with longitudinal data using multilevel models. *Psychological Methods*, 20(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000030>
- Waterloo, S. F., Baumgartner, S. E., Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2017). Norms of online expressions of emotion: Comparing Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and WhatsApp. *New Media & Society*, 20(5), 1813–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817707349>
- Yau, J. C., & Reich, S. M. (2018). Are the qualities of adolescents’ offline friendships present in digital interactions? *Adolescent Research Review*, 3(3), 339–355. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-017-0059-y>
- Yau, J. C., & Reich, S. M. (2020). Buddies, friends, and followers: The evolution of online friendships. In N. Van Zalk & C. P. Monks (Eds.), *Online peer engagement in adolescence: Positive and negative aspects of online social interaction*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429468360-2>

Received July 7, 2020

Revision received November 17, 2020

Accepted November 24, 2020 ■