Connectedness and habitual use of social media predict the neural response to social exclusion in adolescents

Rui Pei1, Joseph B. Bayer2, Chris Cascio3, Matt B. O’Donnell1, Emily Falk1, Dar Meshi4

1 Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania

2 School of Communication, The Ohio State University

3 School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Wisconsin-Madison

4 Department of Advertising and Public Relations, Michigan State University

# 

# 1. Introduction

Social media is now an essential part of our society. Facebook, the world’s most popular social media platform, currently has 2.7 billion monthly active users worldwide [(Statistica, 2020)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/PKcj). Social media provides individuals a cost-effective tool for the acquirement, building, and maintenance of social connections [(Bargh & McKenna, 2004; Ellison et al., 2007; Haythornthwaite, 2005)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/Y1cS+0Gb0+7u4U). More broadly, social media can enhance individuals’ social networks [(Kalpidou et al., 2011)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/bnVT), promote stronger social ties [(Kim et al., 2016)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/pqbS), help organize group activities [(Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/ywc9), mitigate loneliness [(Teppers et al., 2014)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/0dlz), and offset geo-temporal differences [(Chai & Kim, 2012)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/F2xH). On the other hand, evidence also suggested that social media use can lead to negative affect [(Faelens et al., 2021)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/p8Vqb), loneliness [(Hunt et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/A1eAH), and diminished wellbeing [(Verduyn et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/tCeR). As researchers try to reconcile this conflicting evidence that social media could both benefit and harm individual’s wellbeing, there’s increasing research effort into trying to characterize different types of social media use, as well as the psychological and neural processes that might be involved in these processes.

## 1.1 Social exclusion

A growing line of research has investigated the role of social media in individuals’ responses to social exclusion [(Chiou et al., 2015; Knausenberger et al., 2015; Maner et al., 2007)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/6jVXH+NuDdz+giDty). Aa common occurrence both offline and online [(Lutz & Schneider, 2020; Sommer et al., 2020; Vorderer & Schneider, 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/MLIE+fFOu+8YGS), social exclusion functions as a salient social signal [(Leary, 1990)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/TmPw8) and constitutes a highly distressing experience that can lead to negative emotions and mental health problems, such as depression and anxiety [(Nolan et al., 2003; Prinstein & Aikins, 2004; Rigby, 2003)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/2Mpu+xiku+X9CX). At the psychological level, social exclusion can cause negative emotions such as loneliness, jealousy, depression, and anxiety [(Roy F. Baumeister & Tice, 1990; Leary, 1990; Stillman et al., 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/MQob+TmPw8+Vjta), and threaten one’s fundamental psychological needs such as self-esteem, need for belonging, control, and sense of meaningful existence [(Williams & Nida, 2011)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/fpvt). At the neural level, social exclusion was found to elicit neural activity in regions associated with emotional regulation (e.g. orbitofrontal cortex) and mentalizing (i.e. thinking of others’ mental states) [(Vijayakumar et al. 2017; Cacioppo et al. 2013)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed+lL1tP). After social exclusion, individuals tend to seek social contact [(Maner et al., 2007; Xu et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/NuDdz+nxoFa), and are more motivated to perform in a cognitive task to help establish a connection with others [(Jamieson et al., 2010)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/ogQ7G).

### 1.1.1 Social media and social exclusion

Given that social exclusion threatens our fundamental needs for connection and belongingness, and that social media can be an effective tool for establishing contacts, prior work has investigated the role of social media in situations of social exclusion or rejection. This line of work provided consistent evidence that social media may alleviate or buffer the negative impact of social exclusion. Research in this area has most commonly employed the Cyberball paradigm [(Williams & Jarvis, 2006)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/SLxIO), where participants are excluded from a virtual ball tossing game by two other players. Participants are often led to believe that the two other players are two individuals from other sites, when in fact they are computers with pre-programmed actions.

In one early study [(Gross, 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/4y84), participants first completed the Cyberball game, and were then randomized to either play a solitary game or chat with a stranger through online instant messaging. Results of this study showed that participants in the instant messaging condition reported higher self-esteem and relational value than those who played a solitary game, providing initial evidence that online interaction could alleviate the negative effects of social exclusion. Later studies have explicitly tested the role of social media (as opposed to “general online interaction”) in buffering social pain, and showed consistent evidence that the subliminal prime of social media [(Chiou et al., 2015; Knausenberger et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/giDty+6jVXH), and the exposure to one’s Facebook page [(Knowles et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/aL8uz) can mitigate the negative consequences of exclusion. For instance, Knausenberger and colleagues exposed included or excluded participants to either the Facebook icon or a control icon (Flash Player icon) at the margin of the screen. The results of this study showed that excluded participants in the control condition showed more interest in future social contact than participants in the Facebook icon condition, suggesting that Facebook may restore the relational need after social exclusion. Notably, this effect was observed when most of the participants did not report noticing any icon during the study, suggesting that the conscious processing of the Facebook icon was not necessary for the social need restoration after exclusion. These experimental studies provide initial evidence that social media may help alleviate the pain of social exclusion in laboratory settings, yet it is unclear whether individual differences in how people use and interact on social media can act as a protective factor and buffer the emotional distress of social exclusion.

### 1.1.2 Neural correlates of social exclusion

Recent meta-analyses [(Cacioppo et al., 2013; Vijayakumar et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed+lL1tP) on the neural correlates of social exclusion have identified key brain regions involved in responding to social exclusion, including the orbitofrontal cortex, a region thought to be involved in emotion regulation, anterior cingulate cortex, which is involved in conflict monitoring, and the precuneus which is widely implicated in processes such as social cognition [(Dufour et al., 2013)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/Wj93d) and emotional salience [(Maddock et al., 2003)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/WQ4wH). Developmentally, adolescents go through a significant amount of brain maturation that is accompanied by physical, neural, social and emotional changes. With regards to neural correlates of social exclusion, meta-analysis suggested that adolescents’ response to social exclusion may involve divergent neural systems compared to adults [(Vijayakumar et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed). In adolescent samples (ages 7 to 18), social exclusion was found to elicit neural activity in the left orbitofrontal cortex and the ventral striatum (VS). The VS is central to reward processing [(Bartra et al., 2013)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/7vLiF) and reinforcement learning [(Costa et al., 2016)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/k9KS9), and may also play a key role in regulation during adolescence [(Pei et al., 2020)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/Df1yy).

## 1.2 Types of social media use

The positive and negative effects of social media are on a large part dependent upon the type of social media use rather than general variables such as “amount of time” or “number of friends” [(Best et al., 2014)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/8MUng). One dimension that captures people’s experience on social media is the feeling of social connectedness [(Bailey et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/DFcqg). Drawing from the belongingness theory [(R. F. Baumeister & Leary, 1995)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/3DUPw), which posits that people are motivated to acquire social membership to obtain optimal functioning, social connectedness refers to the feelings of affiliation associated with belonging to a social network [(Lee et al., 2001)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/P3mep). Existing evidence supports that users of social media such as Facebook can derive social connectedness through its usage [(Grieve et al., 2013; Grieve & Kemp, 2015; Lin & Utz, 2015; Sinclair & Grieve, 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/zXMV5+RurVK+Ndfvl+RV9J0). Social connectedness can be measured objectively through the quantity, frequency, and quality of social contacts, it can also be measured through the perceived feeling of meaningful connection with others at an interpersonal level [(Lee et al., 2001)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/P3mep).

In addition to connectedness on Social media, research has examined the habitual and automated social media use. In the current paper, we follow prior accounts and define the habitual use of social media as the automaticity in consumption and use of the social media platform that develops as individuals repeatedly and routinely access, interact, and utilize activity [(LaRose, 2010; Orbell & Verplanken, 2010; Vishwanath, 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/YfFg+ttIZ+jBcz). This definition is in line with the current thinking that habitual use of social media stems from repeated media consumption in stable circumstances [(LaRose, 2010; Verplanken & Wood, 2006)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/YfFg+k2NN). These repeated behaviors can over time become action-scripts that are applied with minimal conscious reflection about its antecedents, consequences, or even its enactment [(LaRose & Eastin, 2004)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/PetA), which may facilitate users to meet their personal and social goals in a low-cost manner [(Seo & Ray, 2019)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/LDJHp).

## 1.3 Current study

The present study extends prior research on social media and social exclusion and investigates the link between individual differences in Facebook usage (connected on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook) and the psychological and neural responses to social exclusion. Individuals who report feeling connected on Facebook or use Facebook more habitually may have better perceived embeddedness in their social groups, which may buffer the effects of social exclusion. 66 participants reported their Facebook use, and completed the Cyberball game while undergoing functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Participants reported their levels of psychological distress after the Cyberball. Specifically, we investigated if connectedness on Facebook use and the habitual use of Facebook was each associated with neural activation during the Cyberball game. Second, we tested the link between individual differences in Facebook use (both connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook) and self-reported psychological distress after Cyberball social exclusion.

# 2. Methods

## 2.1 Participants

Eligible participants reported using Facebook, and our sample consisted of 60 adolescent males between 16 and 17 years old (Mean age = 16.87, SD age = 0.38) , after excluding 6 participants due to missing age variable. Participants were recruited from high schools in [location blinded for peer review], and surrounding communities. This sample combined two data collection periods which were part of a larger series of studies exploring adolescent driving behavior: sample 1 (N = 22; M age = 16.85, SD age = 0.47) data were collected between July and October of 2011 (citations blinded for peer review); and sample 2 (N = 38, M age = 16.88, SD age = 0.32) data were collected between July 2012 and January 2013 (citations blinded for peer review). The two samples did not differ significantly on age (t (32.58) = -0.20, p = 0.84). All regression models below included a covariate for sample wave to account for potential unmeasured differences between the samples. Participants provided written assents and their legal guardian provided written consents in accordance with the Institutional Review Board of [institution blinded for peer review] and were compensated for their participation.

## 2.2 Cyberball game

To measure participants’ neural responses to social exclusion, participants completed the Cyberball game in an fMRI scanner. Cyberball has been validated in a number of behavioral and neuroimaging studies as a reliable way of simulating the experience of social exclusion – this task was found to elicit social distress and mentalizing among participants [(Masten et al., 2012; Williams & Jarvis, 2006)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/SLxIO+x1zVw). Upon arrival at the fMRI session, participants were introduced to two gender-matched peer confederates. Participants were told that in the MRI scanner, they would be playing some games on their own, as well as in a group with the other two peer “participants” (confederates). Participants were then completed the pre-scan questionnaires as well as the fMRI tasks, and the confederates were not involved in study procedures. During the fMRI session, participants next completed a series of tasks, including a game called Cyberball. In this game, participants interacted with two virtual players and tossed a ball at each other. A fair game of Cyberball (approximately 3 minutes in length; Meannumber of throws = 83.68 , SDnumber of throws = 14.20) was always played first, in which the participant and two virtual players received the ball equally often. After a brief pause, this was followed by an unfair game (approximately 3 minutes in length; Meannumber of throws = 60.22, SDnumber of throws = 5.05), in which the participant was left out of ball throws, simulating exclusion. The order of the two rounds was held constant to simulate the same psychological experience across participants.

## 2.3. Self-report measures

Prior to the Cyberball game in the fMRI scanner, participants’ connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook were measured through an online questionnaire. Following the Cyberball game, participants reported the extent that they were threatened during the game. Each of these assessments is described below.

### 2.3.1 Facebook measures

Measures we used for connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook were included in Table 1. Connectedness on Facebook was measured through two questions (“I feel connected to my friends when I use Facebook.” and “I feel connected to my family members when I use Facebook”), and an average of participants’ responses to these two items were calculated as the connectedness on Facebook score. Participants’ habitual use of Facebook was assessed through a revised version of the Self-Report Habit Index in line with past technology research (SRHI; Verplanken & Orbell, 2003; see Bayer & Campbell, 2012). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. We performed reliability analyses on the obtained data and Cronbach’s alpha demonstrated good internal consistency (α = .90). Average scores were calculated as an overall index of habitual use of Facebook. Both connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook were normally distributed in our sample.

### 2.3.2 Need threat scale

Following the Cyberball game, we assessed the extent to which participants’ fundamental needs (belongingness, self-esteem, meaningful existence, control) were threatened during the game using the Need Threat Scale [(Zadro et al., 2004)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/p24H). Participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert scale how much their fundamental needs were threatened for 12 need items, with each fundamental need represented by 3 items. Consistent with prior literature [(Gerber et al., 2017; Jamieson et al., 2010)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/ogQ7G+0fq8), we used an average response to the 12 items as an overall need threat score. The need threat score was normally distributed in our sample.

## 2.4 FMRI Data Acquisition and Analyses

Our imaging data from the two samples were acquired using two scanners: data from all sample 1 participants and part of sample 2 were acquired in one scanner and the remaining sample 2 participants were acquired in a different scanner. All scans were performed on the same platform (3 Tesla GE Signa MRI) and with the same scanning parameters. Additionally, all regression models in the current analysis included a covariate for scanner ID to account for potential differences between the scanners.

Functional images were recorded using a reverse spiral sequence (TR = 2000 ms, TE = 30 ms, flip angle = 90°, 43 axial slices, FOV = 220 mm, slice thickness = 3mm; voxel size = 3.44 x 3.44 x 3.0 mm). We also acquired in-plane T1-weighted images (43 slices; slice thickness = 3 mm; voxel size = .86 x .86 x 3.0mm) and high-resolution T1-weighted images (SPGR; 124 slices; slice thickness = 1.02 x 1.02 x 1.2 mm) for use in co-registration and normalization.

Functional data were pre-processed and analyzed using Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM8, Wellcome Department of Cognitive Neurology, Institute of Neurology, London, UK). To allow for the stabilization of the blood oxygen-level dependent (BOLD) signal, the first four volumes (eight seconds) of each run were discarded prior to analysis. Functional images were despiked using the 3dDespike program as implemented in the AFNI toolbox [(Cox, 1996)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/W0Yo). Next, data were corrected for differences in the time of slice acquisition using interpolation; the first slice served as the reference slice. Data were then spatially realigned to the first functional image. We then co-registered the functional and structural images using a two-stage procedure. First, in-plane T1 images were registered to the mean functional image. Next, high-resolution T1 images were registered to the in-plane 16 image. After co-registration, high-resolution structural images were skull-stripped using the VBM8 toolbox for SPM8 (http://dbm.neuro.uni-jena.de/vbm), and then normalized to the skull-stripped MNI template provided by FSL. Finally, functional images were smoothed using a Gaussian kernel (8 mm FWHM).

The two rounds of the Cyberball game were modeled as blocks: an inclusion block and an exclusion block. The current analysis focused on neural activation during the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast. The six rigid-body translation and rotation parameters derived from spatial realignment were included as nuisance regressors. Data were high-pass filtered with a cutoff of 128s.

## 2.5 Brain Regions of Interest (ROIs)

Analyses were conducted using two sets of *a-priori,* theory-driven regions of interest (ROIs) previously implicated in either social pain or mentalizing. First, we defined our social pain ROIs based on a prior meta-analysis of Cyberball social exclusion studies in pre-adolescents and adolescents (age range 7 - 18 years; Figure 1c; Vijayakumar et al. 2017). The social pain ROIs included two clusters: one in the ventral striatum (VS) and one in the left lateral orbitofrontal cortex (lOFC). Although prior literature has often thought that neural correlates of social rejection may overlap with those of physical pain, including the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) and insula [(Eisenberger, 2012)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/P6gr), more recent meta-analysis of fMRI studies provided minimal evidence for dACC, and instead suggested the role of orbitofrontal cortex [(Cacioppo et al., 2013; Vijayakumar et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed+lL1tP). Additionally, recent meta-analysis that compared neural correlates of social exclusion in adolescent and young adult samples showed differential patterns of neural engagement between these two populations (Vijayakumar et al., 2017). As the current study is focused on adolescent participants, the social pain network in our study was defined using the meta-analysis of Cyberball studies in adolescent samples (Figure 1a).

Second, given the focus of past work on mentalizing and social cognition in relation to social media use [(Achterberg et al., 2016; Baek et al., 2017; Sherman et al., 2016)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/OPhX+2M6N+md8M), we defined our mentalizing brain regions of interest (ROI) based on a prior meta-analysis of studies using a false belief task [(Dufour et al., 2013)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/Wj93d); obtained at https://saxelab.mit.edu/use-our-theory-mind-group-maps; Figure 2a). The ROIs include dorsal medial prefrontal cortex (DMPFC), middle medial prefrontal cortex (MMPFC), ventromedial prefrontal cortex (VMPFC), precuneus, left temporal parietal junction (LTPJ), right temporal parietal junction (RTPJ), and right anterior superior temporal sulcus (RSTS). These ROIs were combined into a single mentalizing network. Mean neural activation in both the social pain and the mentalizing network, and their individual ROIs, was obtained for the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast using the MarsBar toolbox for SPM [(Brett et al., 2002)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/XUDh).

## 2.6 Linking Facebook use with self-report and neural measures

Ordinary least square (OLS) models were constructed to investigate the relationship between Facebook use, self-reported measures, and neural responses to social exclusion.

First, we constructed four OLS models to separately estimate the associations between Facebook measures and neural responses to social exclusion in both social pain and mentalizing networks. These models included age, sample wave, and scanner ID (since data were collected in two different scanners) as covariates.

*Model 1: Neural activity in social pain ROIs ~ connectedness on Facebook + age + sample wave + scanner ID,*

*Model 2: Neural activity in mentalizing ROIs ~ connectedness on Facebook + age + sample wave + scanner ID,*

*Model 3: Neural activity in social pain ROIs ~ habitual use of Facebook + age + sample wave + scanner ID,*

*Model 4: Neural activity in mentalizing ROIs ~ habitual use of Facebook + age + sample wave + scanner ID*

Second, to complement our neuroimaging analyses, we constructed two OLS models to estimate the associations between individual differences our measures of interest and self-reported need threat after the Cyberball game. These models included age and sample wave as covariates.

*Model 5: need threat ~ connectedness on Facebook + age + sample wave,*

*Model 6: need threat ~ habitual use of Facebook + age + sample wave,*

# 3. Results

## 3.1 Connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook

We examined participants’ feelings of connectedness to others on Facebook and their habitual use of Facebook. With regard to connectedness on Facebook, participants reported an overall average of 2.57 (on a 5-point scale, where “3” indicated “Neither agree nor disagree”; SD = 0.79). With regard to habitual use of Facebook, participants reported an overall average of 3.33 (on a 7-point scale, where “3” indicated “Slightly disagree”; SD = 1.28). The relationship between these two measures, when controlling for age and sample wave, was not significant (beta = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.23], p = 0.43), indicating that the habitual use of Facebook does not necessarily indicate feeling connected to family and friends on Facebook.

## 3.2 Connectedness on Facebook and neural responses to social exclusion

We investigated whether participants’ self-reported connectedness on Facebook was linked to neural responses to social exclusion in the social pain and mentalizing networks in the Cyberball game. Our analysis revealed no significant association between connectedness on Facebook and overall neural activity in the social pain network in the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast (B = -0.16, 95% CI = [-0.38, 0.06], p = 0.15; Figure 1b). We next examined each region in the social pain network separately and found that connectedness on Facebook was significantly associated with neural activity in the VS during social exclusion (B = -0.23, 95% CI = [-0.46, -0.01], p = 0.04; Figure 1d), but not LOFC (B = -0.09, 95% CI = [-0.35, 0.17], p = 0.51; Figure 1c). These findings indicate that individuals who feel more connected to family and friends on Facebook have lower levels of VS response to social exclusion.

With regards to the mentalizing network, analyses indicated no significant association between connectedness on Facebook and overall neural activity in the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast (B = -0.12, 95% CI = [-0.32, 0.09], p = 0.26; Figure 2b). We next examined each region in the mentalizing network separately and found no significant relationships with connectedness on Facebook during social exclusion (Table 2; Figure 2c-2i).

## 3.3 Habitual use of Facebook and neural responses to social exclusion

We also investigated whether participants’ habitual use of Facebook was linked to the neural response to social exclusion in the social pain and mentalizing networks. Our analyses of the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast indicated no significant association between habitual use of Facebook and neural activity in the overall social pain network (B = 0.01, 95% CI = [-0.12, 0.14], p = 0.88; Figure 3b). Further, habitual use of Facebook was not significantly associated with neural activity in each region (VS and LOFC) within the social pain network during social exclusion (Table 3; Figure 3c-3d).

With regards to the mentalizing network, we observed a significant positive association between habitual use of Facebook and neural activity in the exclusion vs. inclusion contrast (B = 0.12, 95% CI = [0.004, 0.24], p = 0.04; Figure 4b). We next examined each region in the mentalizing network separately and found that habitual use of Facebook was significantly associated with activity in the DMPFC, MMPFC, and bilateral TPJ (DMPFC: B = 0.19, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.34], p = 0.02, Figure 4c; MMPFC: B = 0.23, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.42], p = 0.02, Figure 4f; LTPJ: B = 0.13, 95% CI = [0.02, 0.24], p = 0.02, Figure 4e; RTPJ: B = 0.16, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.27], p = 0.004, Figure 4h; Table 4). These findings indicate that individuals who report more habitual use of Facebook show greater neural activity in the mentalizing network when being socially excluded.

## 3.4 Facebook measures and need threat after social exclusion

To complement our fMRI findings, we conducted two OLS models to separately examine the link between Facebook measures (connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook) and participants’ self-reported need threat after Cyberball social exclusion. We observed a marginal negative association between connectedness on Facebook and need threat after social exclusion (beta = -0.27, 95% CI [-0.56, 0.02], p = 0.07; Figure 5a), and a significant negative association between habitual use of Facebook and need threat (beta = -0.21, 95% CI [-0.39, -0.03], p = 0.03; Figure 5b). This analysis reveals that habitual use of Facebook predicts significantly less psychological distress after social exclusion, and that connectedness on Facebook is marginally associated with less distress after social exclusion.

# 4. Discussion

In this study, we investigated the link between individual differences in Facebook usage (connectedness on Facebook and habitual use of Facebook) and participants’ psychological and neural responses to social exclusion. This study revealed three primary findings. First, participants who reported feeling connected on Facebook showed lower levels of neural activity in the ventral striatum, a brain region previously shown to respond to social exclusion in adolescents during Cyberball social exclusion [(Vijayakumar et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed). Second, participants who reported habitual use of Facebook showed higher levels of neural activity in the mentalizing network during social exclusion. Third, participants who reported habitual use of Facebook experienced lower levels of psychological distress after social exclusion. Taken together, these results showcase that individuals who report more habitual use of Facebook or who report feeling connected on Facebook may have better perceived embeddedness in their social groups, which may buffer the effects of social exclusion through distinct neural mechanisms.

Our findings extend research in three main ways: First, our results showed that participants who reported feeling connected on Facebook showed less neural activity in the ventral striatum, part of the social pain network previously shown to respond to social exclusion in adolescents [(Vijayakumar et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed). This finding complements with our self-report data, which showed a marginal negative association between connectedness on Facebook and psychological distress after social exclusion. Our results are also consistent with prior findings demonstrating that adolescents who spent more time with friends showed lower levels of activation in the social pain network during social exclusion [(Masten et al., 2012)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/x1zVw). On the other hand, individuals in more hostile social environments demonstrated higher levels of neural activation in the social pain network [(Schriber et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/eO2P1), suggesting that hostile social environments may increase the cost of potentially being ostracised by the sociaal group, therefore increasing the stress of social exclusion. Together, these findings indicate that individuals who feel connected to family and friends, or spend more time with friends, may feel more accepted by their social support group, which in turn reduces the degree to which social stressors (such as exclusion) are perceived as threatening.

Second, the results indicated that participants who reported habitual use of Facebook showed higher levels of neural activity in the mentalizing network during social exclusion. The use of fMRI can provide additional information about the neuropsychological mechanisms that may underlie the decreased distress of the habitual Facebook users. The mentalizing network, comprised of the precuneus, temporo-parietal junction (TPJ) and the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), is implicated in theory of mind tasks requiring the capacity to understand the other's thoughts and beliefs [(Amodio & Frith, 2006; Frith & Frith, 2012; Saxe & Powell, 2006)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/UiCC1+JdGV8+pPgPG). Prior neuroimaging studies on the cyberball game has found significant activation in regions in the mentalizing network, such as the precuneus (Vijayakumar et al., 2017), MPFC [(Vijayakumar et al., 2017; Wagels et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/xF0ed+7B0Gm). And activity in the mentalizing network during social exclusion has been thought to adaptively regulate social behavior by processing social cues with new information regarding the current situation [(Van Overwalle & Baetens, 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/Vy57X). In the context of Cyberball social exclusion, recruitment of the mentalizing network may reflect participants’ efforts to inference the intentions of other players for the social exclusion [(Karremans et al., 2011)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/m6fn6). In addition, higher neural activation in the mentalizing network was associated with higher levels of social conformity, suggesting that the mentalizing network may track social cues and regulate social behavior [(Falk et al., 2014)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/bwZNE). The current study reported that individuals who report more automated, habitual use of Facebook showed higher neural activation in the mentalizing network during Cyberball social exclusion, suggesting that habitual Facebook users may be better at tracking social cues and inferring intentions of the other players, which may contribute to buffered psychological distress after social exclusion.

Finally, we demonstrated that individuals who report more habitual use of Facebook experienced lower levels of psychological distress after social exclusion in the Cyberball game. This finding is consistent with prior work highlighting the potential role of social media in alleviating psychological distress following social exclusion or rejection [(Chiou et al., 2015; Knausenberger et al., 2015; Knowles et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/giDty+6jVXH+aL8uz). Prior literature that investigated the role of social media in people’s response to social exclusion often implemented an experimental paradigm in which participants are exposed to a Facebook icon [(Knausenberger et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/6jVXH) or a Facebook page [(Knowles et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/aL8uz). Although these studies provide causal evidence of the role of social media in alleviating distress from social exclusion, they do not provide information on whether natural use of social media can exacerbate or alleviate psychological distress from social exclusion. The current study adds to the prior literature and highlights more habitual use of Facebook may provide individuals with a low-cost way of building social connections and receiving social support, thereby leading to less psychological distress after social exclusion.

Social exclusion is painful, distressing, and threatens our fundamental needs of belongingness and connection with others [(Williams, 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/CB1tQ). As social media is increasingly used to facilitate social interaction [(Baym et al., 2004)](https://paperpile.com/c/LBVidN/YB3NI), it may also alter the way humans experience and respond to social exclusions. Results from the current study highlight links between adolescents’ Facebook usage and their psychological and neural responses to social exclusion. Specifically, participants who reported more automated and habitual use of Facebook showed lower levels of psychological distress following social exclusion. Findings using neuroimaging data suggest that habitual Facebook users demonstrated higher levels of neural activation in the mentalizing network during social exclusion. On the other hand, participants who reported feeling connected to family and friends on Facebook showed marginally lower levels of psychological distress following social exclusion. In addition, connectedness on Facebook was associated with lower levels of social pain activation during social distress. Together, these results highlight the potential role of social media in protecting against the psychological distress from social exclusion. As social media provides convenient means of social connection and support, its usage may potentially shift how we react to social exclusion at both psychological and neural levels, thereby alleviating the perceived distress of social exclusion.

# Figures




Figure 1. Regions of interests in the social pain network (a), and Ordinary Least Square model results linking connectedness on Facebook and participants’ neural activation in the social pain network (b) as well as its subregions (c-d) during social exclusion in the Cyberball game.




Figure 2. Regions of interests in the mentalizing network (a), and Ordinary Least Square model results linking connectedness on Facebook and participants’ neural activation in the mentalizing network (b) as well as its subregions (c-i) during social exclusion in the Cyberball game.





Figure 3. Regions of interests in the social pain network (a), and Ordinary Least Square model results linking habitual use of Facebook and participants’ neural activation in the social pain network (b) as well as its subregions (c-d) during social exclusion in the Cyberball game.

Figure 4. Regions of interests in the mentalizing network (a), and Ordinary Least Square model results linking habitual use of Facebook and participants’ neural activation in the mentalizing network (b) as well as its subregions (c-i) during social exclusion in the Cyberball game.




Figure 5. Ordinary Least Square model results linking Facebook measures (a: connectedness on Facebook; b: habitual use of Facebook) and participants’ self-report rating of psychological distress after Cyberball social exclusion.

References

[Achterberg, M., Peper, J. S., van Duijvenvoorde, A. C. K., Mandl, R. C. W., & Crone, E. A. (2016). Frontostriatal White Matter Integrity Predicts Development of Delay of Gratification: A Longitudinal Study. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *36*(6), 1954–1961. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/md8M)[10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3459-15.2016](http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3459-15.2016)

[Amodio, D. M., & Frith, C. D. (2006). Meeting of minds: the medial frontal cortex and social cognition. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, *7*(4), 268–277. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/UiCC1)[10.1038/nrn1884](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn1884)

[Baek, E., Sholz, C., O’Donnell, M. B., & Falk, E. B. (2017). Neural correlates of selecting and sharing information. *Psychological Science*.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/OPhX)

[Bailey, M., Cao, R., Kuchler, T., Stroebel, J., & Wong, A. (2018). Social Connectedness: Measurement, Determinants, and Effects. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives: A Journal of the American Economic Association*, *32*(3), 259–280.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/DFcqg) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30362698>

[Bargh, J. A., & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2004). The internet and social life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *55*, 573–590. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/0Gb0)[10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141922](http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141922)

[Bartra, O., McGuire, J. T., & Kable, J. W. (2013). The valuation system: a coordinate-based meta-analysis of BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *NeuroImage*, *76*, 412–427. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/7vLiF)[10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.063](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.063)

[Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/3DUPw) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7777651>

[Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (1990). Point-Counterpoints: Anxiety and Social Exclusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *9*(2), 165–195. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/MQob)[10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.165](http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.165)

[Bayer, J. B., & Campbell, S. W. (2012). Texting while driving on automatic: Considering the frequency-independent side of habit. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *28*(6), 2083–2090. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/aEisk)[10.1016/j.chb.2012.06.012](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.06.012)

[Baym, N. K., Zhang, Y. B., & Lin, M.-C. (2004). Social Interactions Across Media: Interpersonal Communication on the Internet, Telephone and Face-to-Face. *New Media & Society*, *6*(3), 299–318. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/YB3NI)[10.1177/1461444804041438](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461444804041438)

[Best, P., Manktelow, R., & Taylor, B. (2014). Online communication, social media and adolescent wellbeing: A systematic narrative review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *41*, 27–36. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/8MUng)[10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.001](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.001)

[Brett, M., Anton, J.-L., Valabregue, R., & Poline, J.-B. (2002). Region of interest analysis using the MarsBar toolbox for SPM 99. *NeuroImage*, *16*(2), S497.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/XUDh)

[Cacioppo, S., Frum, C., Asp, E., Weiss, R. M., Lewis, J. W., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2013). A quantitative meta-analysis of functional imaging studies of social rejection. *Scientific Reports*, *3*, 2027. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/lL1tP)[10.1038/srep02027](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep02027)

[Chai, S., & Kim, M. (2012). A socio-technical approach to knowledge contribution behavior: An empirical investigation of social networking sites users. *International Journal of Information Management*, *32*(2), 118–126. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/F2xH)[10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2011.07.004](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2011.07.004)

[Chiou, W.-B., Lee, C.-C., & Liao, D.-C. (2015). Facebook effects on social distress: Priming with online social networking thoughts can alter the perceived distress due to social exclusion. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *49*, 230–236. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/giDty)[10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.064](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.064)

[Costa, V. D., Dal Monte, O., Lucas, D. R., Murray, E. A., & Averbeck, B. B. (2016). Amygdala and Ventral Striatum Make Distinct Contributions to Reinforcement Learning. *Neuron*, *92*(2), 505–517. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/k9KS9)[10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.025](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.025)

[Cox, R. W. (1996). AFNI: software for analysis and visualization of functional magnetic resonance neuroimages. *Computers and Biomedical Research, an International Journal*, *29*(3), 162–173. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/W0Yo)[10.1006/cbmr.1996.0014](http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/cbmr.1996.0014)

[Dufour, N., Redcay, E., Young, L., Mavros, P. L., Moran, J. M., Triantafyllou, C., Gabrieli, J. D. E., & Saxe, R. (2013). Similar Brain Activation during False Belief Tasks in a Large Sample of Adults with and without Autism. *PloS One*, *8*(9), e75468. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Wj93d)[10.1371/journal.pone.0075468](http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075468)

[Eisenberger, N. I. (2012). The neural bases of social pain: evidence for shared representations with physical pain. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *74*(2), 126–135. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/P6gr)[10.1097/PSY.0b013e3182464dd1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3182464dd1)

[Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication: JCMC*, *12*(4), 1143–1168.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Y1cS) <https://academic.oup.com/jcmc/article-abstract/12/4/1143/4582961>

[Faelens, L., Hoorelbeke, K., Soenens, B., Van Gaeveren, K., De Marez, L., De Raedt, R., & Koster, E. H. W. (2021). Social media use and well-being: A prospective experience-sampling study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *114*, 106510. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/p8Vqb)[10.1016/j.chb.2020.106510](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106510)

[Falk, E. B., Cascio, C. N., O’Donnell, M. B., Carp, J., Tinney, F. J., Bingham, C. R., Shope, J. T., Ouimet, M. C., Pradhan, A. K., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2014). Neural responses to exclusion predict susceptibility to social influence. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, *54*(5 0), S22–S31. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/bwZNE)[10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.12.035](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.12.035)

[Frith, C. D., & Frith, U. (2012). Mechanisms of social cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*, 287–313. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/pPgPG)[10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100449](http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100449)

[Gerber, J. P., Chang, S.-H., & Reimel, H. (2017). Construct validity of Williams’ ostracism needs threat scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *115*, 50–53. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/0fq8)[10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.008](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.008)

[Grieve, R., Indian, M., Witteveen, K., Anne Tolan, G., & Marrington, J. (2013). Face-to-face or Facebook: Can social connectedness be derived online? *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(3), 604–609. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/RurVK)[10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.017](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.017)

[Grieve, R., & Kemp, N. (2015). Individual differences predicting social connectedness derived from Facebook: Some unexpected findings. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *51*, 239–243. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/zXMV5)[10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.034](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.034)

[Gross, E. F. (2009). Logging on, bouncing back: an experimental investigation of online communication following social exclusion. *Developmental Psychology*, *45*(6), 1787–1793. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/4y84)[10.1037/a0016541](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016541)

[Haythornthwaite, C. (2005). Social networks and Internet connectivity effects. *Information, Communication & Society*, *8*(2), 125–147. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/7u4U)[10.1080/13691180500146185](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691180500146185)

[Hunt, M. G., Marx, R., Lipson, C., & Young, J. (2018). No More FOMO: Limiting Social Media Decreases Loneliness and Depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *37*(10), 751–768. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/A1eAH)[10.1521/jscp.2018.37.10.751](http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2018.37.10.751)

[Jamieson, J. P., Harkins, S. G., & Williams, K. D. (2010). Need threat can motivate performance after ostracism. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*(5), 690–702. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/ogQ7G)[10.1177/0146167209358882](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167209358882)

[Kalpidou, M., Costin, D., & Morris, J. (2011). The relationship between Facebook and the well-being of undergraduate college students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, *14*(4), 183–189. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/bnVT)[10.1089/cyber.2010.0061](http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2010.0061)

[Karremans, J. C., Heslenfeld, D. J., van Dillen, L. F., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2011). Secure attachment partners attenuate neural responses to social exclusion: an fMRI investigation. *International Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology*, *81*(1), 44–50. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/m6fn6)[10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2011.04.003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2011.04.003)

[Kim, E., Lee, J.-A., Sung, Y., & Choi, S. M. (2016). Predicting Selfie-posting Behavior on Social Networking Sites. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *62*(C), 116–123. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/pqbS)[10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.078](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.078)

[Kirschner, P. A., & Karpinski, A. C. (2010). Facebook® and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *26*(6), 1237–1245. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/ywc9)[10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.024](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.024)

[Knausenberger, J., Hellmann, J. H., & Echterhoff, G. (2015). When virtual contact is all you need: Subtle reminders of Facebook preempt social-contact restoration after exclusion. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*(3), 279–284.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/6jVXH) <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ejsp.2035?casa_token=ZdOGFLMbqiEAAAAA:OxOHIXF9U94hfV-znsb7hirYyKMYVgitWFmcFh75P2Nij6XGVEGfMW0tgErtv2gAiCc59_0Q8VG44l3V>

[Knowles, M. L., Haycock, N., & Shaikh, I. (2015). Does Facebook Magnify or Mitigate Threats to Belonging? *Social Psychology*, *46*(6), 313–324. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/aL8uz)[10.1027/1864-9335/a000246](http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000246)

[LaRose, R. (2010). The Problem of Media Habits. *Communication Theory: CT: A Journal of the International Communication Association*, *20*(2), 194–222. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/YfFg)[10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01360.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01360.x)

[LaRose, R., & Eastin, M. S. (2004). A Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications: Toward a New Model of Media Attendance. In *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* (Vol. 48, Issue 3, pp. 358–377). https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/PetA)[10.1207/s15506878jobem4803\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4803_2)

[Leary, M. R. (1990). Responses to Social Exclusion: Social Anxiety, Jealousy, Loneliness, Depression, and Low Self-Esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *9*(2), 221–229. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/TmPw8)[10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.221](http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.221)

[Lee, R. M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). Social connectedness, dysfunctional interpersonal behaviors, and psychological distress: Testing a mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(3), 310–318. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/P3mep)[10.1037/0022-0167.48.3.310](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.48.3.310)

[Lin, R., & Utz, S. (2015). The emotional responses of browsing Facebook: Happiness, envy, and the role of tie strength. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *52*, 29–38. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Ndfvl)[10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.064](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.064)

[Lutz, S., & Schneider, F. M. (2020). Is receiving Dislikes in social media still better than being ignored? The effects of ostracism and rejection on need threat and coping reponses online. *Media Psychology*, 1–25.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/fFOu) <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15213269.2020.1799409?casa_token=4GHyZXx2JgsAAAAA:xjySEZmkJZtJKTX4AUPEzVFS5pvuL55x_a2NUneDCXDidGVdqk2HByIsnFDBxnRMnhm4NQX6JVeNzA>

[Maddock, R. J., Garrett, A. S., & Buonocore, M. H. (2003). Posterior cingulate cortex activation by emotional words: fMRI evidence from a valence decision task. *Human Brain Mapping*, *18*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/WQ4wH)[10.1002/hbm.10075](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10075)

[Maner, J. K., DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., & Schaller, M. (2007). Does social exclusion motivate interpersonal reconnection? Resolving the“ porcupine problem.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(1), 42.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/NuDdz) <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2006-23056-004>

[Masten, C. L., Telzer, E. H., Fuligni, A. J., Lieberman, M. D., & Eisenberger, N. I. (2012). Time spent with friends in adolescence relates to less neural sensitivity to later peer rejection. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *7*(1), 106–114. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/x1zVw)[10.1093/scan/nsq098](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsq098)

[Nolan, S. A., Flynn, C., & Garber, J. (2003). Prospective relations between rejection and depression in young adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(4), 745–755. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/2Mpu)[10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.745](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.745)

[Orbell, S., & Verplanken, B. (2010). The automatic component of habit in health behavior: habit as cue-contingent automaticity. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, *29*(4), 374–383. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/ttIZ)[10.1037/a0019596](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019596)

[Pei, R., Lauharatanahirun, N., Cascio, C. N., O’Donnell, M. B., Shope, J. T., Simons-Morton, B. G., Vettel, J. M., & Falk, E. B. (2020). Neural processes during adolescent risky decision making are associated with conformity to peer influence. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *44*, 100794. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Df1yy)[10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100794](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100794)

[Prinstein, M. J., & Aikins, J. W. (2004). Cognitive moderators of the longitudinal association between peer rejection and adolescent depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *32*(2), 147–158. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/xiku)[10.1023/b:jacp.0000019767.55592.63](http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/b:jacp.0000019767.55592.63)

[Rigby, K. (2003). Consequences of bullying in schools. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*, *48*(9), 583–590. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/X9CX)[10.1177/070674370304800904](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/070674370304800904)

[Saxe, R., & Powell, L. J. (2006). It’s the thought that counts: specific brain regions for one component of theory of mind. *Psychological Science*, *17*(8), 692–699. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/JdGV8)[10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01768.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01768.x)

[Schriber, R. A., Rogers, C. R., Ferrer, E., Conger, R. D., Robins, R. W., Hastings, P. D., & Guyer, A. E. (2018). Do Hostile School Environments Promote Social Deviance by Shaping Neural Responses to Social Exclusion? *Journal of Research on Adolescence: The Official Journal of the Society for Research on Adolescence*, *28*(1), 103–120. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/eO2P1)[10.1111/jora.12340](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jora.12340)

[Seo, D., & Ray, S. (2019). Habit and addiction in the use of social networking sites: Their nature, antecedents, and consequences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *99*, 109–125. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/LDJHp)[10.1016/j.chb.2019.05.018](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.05.018)

[Sherman, L. E., Payton, A. A., Hernandez, L. M., Greenfield, P. M., & Dapretto, M. (2016). The Power of the Like in Adolescence: Effects of Peer Influence on Neural and Behavioral Responses to Social Media. *Psychological Science*. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/2M6N)[10.1177/0956797616645673](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797616645673)

[Sinclair, T. J., & Grieve, R. (2017). Facebook as a source of social connectedness in older adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *66*, 363–369. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/RV9J0)[10.1016/j.chb.2016.10.003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.10.003)

[Sommer, K. L., Leone, J., & Williams, K. D. (2020). Ostracism and Motivation in Groups. In *Individual Motivation within Groups* (pp. 331–357). https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/8YGS)[10.1016/b978-0-12-849867-5.00010-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-849867-5.00010-0)

[Statistica. (2020). *Facebook: active users worldwide*. Statista.com.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/PKcj) <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

[Stillman, T. F., Baumeister, R. F., Lambert, N. M., Crescioni, A. W., Dewall, C. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2009). Alone and Without Purpose: Life Loses Meaning Following Social Exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(4), 686–694. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Vjta)[10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.007](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.007)

[Teppers, E., Luyckx, K., Klimstra, T. A., & Goossens, L. (2014). Loneliness and Facebook motives in adolescence: a longitudinal inquiry into directionality of effect. *Journal of Adolescence*, *37*(5), 691–699. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/0dlz)[10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.11.003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.11.003)

[Van Overwalle, F., & Baetens, K. (2009). Understanding others’ actions and goals by mirror and mentalizing systems: a meta-analysis. *NeuroImage*, *48*(3), 564–584. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/Vy57X)[10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.06.009](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.06.009)

[Verduyn, P., Ybarra, O., Résibois, M., Jonides, J., & Kross, E. (2017). Do social network sites enhance or undermine subjective well-being? A critical review. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *11*(1), 274–302.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/tCeR) <https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/sipr.12033>

[Verplanken, B., & Orbell, S. (2003). Reflections on past behavior: a self-report index of habit strength 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(6), 1313–1330.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/c2QoA) <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x?casa_token=_bIV6qDAG_EAAAAA:jsderHhHSJWmWG9pK9OG5zkgkxXsft1eqfbVI9q794DRDQJAfxk4j6NOCHKVi9OUUJpiWof0qrDr2Xqa>

[Verplanken, B., & Wood, W. (2006). Interventions to Break and Create Consumer Habits. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *25*(1), 90–103. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/k2NN)[10.1509/jppm.25.1.90](http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jppm.25.1.90)

[Vijayakumar, N., Cheng, T. W., & Pfeifer, J. H. (2017). Neural correlates of social exclusion across ages: A coordinate-based meta-analysis of functional MRI studies. *NeuroImage*, *153*, 359–368. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/xF0ed)[10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.02.050](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.02.050)

[Vishwanath, A. (2015). Habitual Facebook Use and its Impact on Getting Deceived on Social Media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication: JCMC*, *20*(1), 83–98. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/jBcz)[10.1111/jcc4.12100](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12100)

[Vorderer, P., & Schneider, F. M. (2017). Social media and ostracism. *Ostracism, Exclusion, and Rejection*, 240–257.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/MLIE) <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=diglDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA240&dq=Social+media+and+ostracism&ots=47Sdo-MTEG&sig=ShC_9l_NCU5gvP14mV8pJSzFQxc>

[Wagels, L., Bergs, R., Clemens, B., Bauchmüller, M., Gur, R. C., Schneider, F., Habel, U., & Kohn, N. (2017). Contextual exclusion processing: an fMRI study of rejection in a performance-related context. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *11*(3), 874–886. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/7B0Gm)[10.1007/s11682-016-9561-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11682-016-9561-2)

[Williams, K. D. (2009). Chapter 6 Ostracism: A Temporal Need‐Threat Model. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 41, pp. 275–314). Academic Press. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/CB1tQ)[10.1016/S0065-2601(08)00406-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)00406-1)

[Williams, K. D., & Jarvis, B. (2006). Cyberball: a program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods*, *38*(1), 174–180.](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/SLxIO) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16817529>

[Williams, K. D., & Nida, S. A. (2011). Ostracism. In *Current Directions in Psychological Science* (Vol. 20, Issue 2, pp. 71–75). https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/fpvt)[10.1177/0963721411402480](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411402480)

[Xu, E., Huang, X., & Robinson, S. L. (2017). When Self-View Is at Stake: Responses to Ostracism Through the Lens of Self-Verification Theory. *Journal of Management*, *43*(7), 2281–2302. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/nxoFa)[10.1177/0149206314567779](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206314567779)

[Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How low can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(4), 560–567. https://doi.org/](http://paperpile.com/b/LBVidN/p24H)[10.1016/j.jesp.2003.11.006](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.11.006)