Deviations from the preregistration

In the first preregistration document, we said that we would examine how different CMC modes (i.e., talking on the phone/video-chatting vs. texting/chatting/emailing vs. interactions on social networking sites) were related to momentary well-being. In the addendum, we said that we had not obtained any significant results in S1 and had therefore decided not to make any predictions for S2. We still ran the analyses in S2 to see if the null effects replicated, and again did not obtain any significant results. Therefore, the analysis comparing the effects of different forms of CMC was listed as a supplementary analysis in the third preregistration document and is now included in the supplementary materials.

In the first preregistration document, we said that we would create the following dummy variable to reflect students' SES: 0 = *at least one parent completed some college*, 1 = *less than some college*. When writing the manuscript, we decided to reverse the coding of the SES dummy variable (i.e., 0 = *less than some college*; 1 = *at least one parent completed some college*). This change was implemented to ease interpretation and does not affect any of the results. Because the change was included in the third preregistration document, it is not listed as a deviation from the preregistration in the manuscript.

In the first preregistration document, we said that we would control for sex, ethnicity, and SES at Level 2 in all models. In the addendum, we said that we had noticed considerable missing data on the demographic variables in S1 which reduced our sample size and statistical power. Because the three demographic control variables (sex, ethnicity, SES) did not have any significant effects in the main analyses, we decided to drop the control variables from the main models. In the third preregistration document, we said that we would add the demographic control variables in the supplementary analyses. Therefore, they are now part of the supplementary materials.

In the first preregistration document, we said that all effects measured at Level 1 would be allowed to vary randomly between participants. In the addendum, we said that we would drop the random slopes and use random-intercepts-only models due to convergence issues. Because the reviewers requested random slopes, we added the random slopes back in in the third preregistration document. We also decided to use the Bayesian estimator to handle complex random effect structures.

In the first preregistration document, we said that in our final models, we would remove all nonsignificant higher-order interactions to provide the most parsimonious description of the data. However, when writing up the manuscript, we decided to provide full model parameters, as requested by the reviewer.

In the first two preregistration documents, we said that would explore the effects of mixed categories (i.e., interactions that involved a mixture of close peers, family members, and weak ties, and interactions that involved a mixture of talking on the phone/video-chatting, texting/chatting/emailing, and interactions on social networking sites). However, as we did not have any hypotheses regarding interactions with multiple interaction partners or interactions using specific combinations of CMC modes, the mixed categories would not be included in the main analyses. Reviewer 1 suggested to run supplementary analyses including interactions with multiple partners. Therefore, in the third preregistration document, we said that we would include interactions with partners from multiple categories in the supplementary analyses. These analyses are now part of the supplementary materials.

Lastly, in the third preregistration document, we said that in S3 we would apply the same data cleaning procedures as in S1 and S2. However, during the analyses, we noticed that this decision was misguided because the timing of the surveys was different (in S1 and S2 the questions referred to the past 15 minutes and the average lag between surveys was > 3 hours, in S3 the questions referred to the last hour and the average time lag between surveys was about 2.5 hours). Therefore, we developed new data cleaning criteria for S3, which are described in the manuscript.