THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL MEDIA USE ON MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH
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Objective Self-Awareness
(Wicklund & Duval, 1972)

Subjective Awareness

Objective Awareness
What are the Effects of Objective Self-Awareness

• Increased volunteerism, generosity (Duval et al., 1979; Beaman et al., 1979)

• Decrease in positive affect, self-esteem (Fejfar & Hoyle, 2000; Ickes et al., 1973)
People tend to over-interpret information in CMC (Epley & Kruger, 2008; Hancock & Dunham, 2001)
HYPOTHESES

H1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mirror</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mirror</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Cover story: we want to “examine people’s attitudes about themselves after exploring different Internet sites.”

• Conditions:
  Control: survey in empty room
  Mirror: survey in front of a mirror
  Facebook: 3 minutes on Facebook + survey
    • “do not leave your profile (e.g. Wall posts, Photos, Info, Boxes)”

• 63 participants (73% female)
Hyperpersonal Effects

Contrast analysis
\[ t(60) = 2.86, p < .01 \]

Changes to profile
\[ \sim \text{self-esteem} \]
\[ (rpb = .44, p < .05) \]
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Socially isolated people have...
- more accidents.
- a greater risk of disease.
- a greater risk of developing psychiatric disorders.
- shorter lives.  

Social support is associated with bio-markers of health, including:
- cardiovascular functioning.
- neuroendocrine functioning.
- immune system functioning.  

House et al., Science ’88
Uchino et al., JPSP ’96
IS SOCIAL MEDIA ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED OR DECREASED SOCIAL SUPPORT?

- Originally thought to be bad for social support
- Recent work finds positive associations with support
  - +Mobile phone and internet = +network size
  - +Facebook/IM = +social capital/support/friendship quality

RQ1. Are there differences in perceived supportiveness across modes of communication?
anything that is social, even if only half of the interaction was going on when the alarm rang (e.g. writing a text, reading an email)…there does not have to be an immediate, instantaneous exchange of information…"
Paid $90

Recruitment: Flyers
- Drexel, Penn & Community College
- Public Housing & WIC offices
- In West/North Philadelphia

Demographics
- 80 total
- 43 W, 37 M
- Median Age: 23yrs, range: 18-38yrs
- 19 no college, 12 some college, 49 four+ years college
- 30 Black, 31 White, 15 Asian, 3 Latino, 1 Middle Eastern
% Use of Media by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No College</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>≥ 4yr Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Accounting for:
Gender
Age
Race
Education
Supportiveness By Channel with Demographic Variables

\[ F = 2.61, \ p = .04, \ \eta^2 = .01 \]

Accounting for:
- Gender
- Age
- Race
- Education

Supportiveness By Channel with Demographic Variables

- **FtF**: \( b = -0.25, \ p = .003 \)
- **Cellphone**: \( b = 0.39, \ p < .001 \)
- **Text**: \( b = 0.15, \ p = .01 \)
- **Facebook**: \( b = .39, \ p < .001 \)
- **Email**: \( b = .15, \ p = .01 \)

SUPPORTIVE, RANGE 1-5
Supportiveness By Channel with Demographics and Relationship

$F=4.65, \ p=.001, \ \eta^2=.004$

Accounting for:
- Individual
- Gender
- Age
- Race
- Education
- Relationship

Supportive, Range 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Supportiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FtF</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellphone</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportiveness By Channel with Demographics and Relationship

\[ F = 4.65, \quad p = .001, \quad \eta^2 = .004 \]

Accounting for:
- Individual
- Gender
- Age
- Race
- Education
- Relationship

Supportive, Range 1-5

- FtF: \( b = .16, \quad p = .003 \)
- Cellphone: \( b = -.18, \quad p = .001 \)
- Text: \( b = -.22, \quad p = .003 \)
- Facebook: \( b = -.18, \quad p = .001 \)
- Email: \( b = -.22, \quad p = .003 \)
Policies should encourage access to cellphones and texting.

Social support interventions should target cellphones.
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