

## Supplementary Materials

### Ancillary Analyses:

1. Regarding the closeness fluctuations model, what we used as a proxy to fluctuations, the standard deviation (SD) of closeness, is not independent of the number of observations if the sample standard deviation is used. For example, if a target has a closeness mean of 4, based on two ratings of 1 and 7, the data yields a sample standard deviation of 4.25. If the same individual received 4 ratings, alternating between 1 and 7, the target's sample SD decreases to 3.46. And with 10 ratings, alternating between 1 and 7, the target's sample SD decreases to 3.16, even though the mean rating and amount of fluctuation remained consistent in all cases. To show that our results regarding the main predictors were independent of this issue, additional analyses of all models mentioned in the original text were done including the total number of observations reported by each participant as a covariate (this variable has been grand-mean centered). As shown in Table 1, all results showed the same pattern and significance as the original results.

Table 1.

*Fixed Effects Coefficients for Closeness Fluctuations Model with Number of Observations.*

Model	Predictor	df	Coefficient (SE)	t value	p value	Partial Correlation		
						df	r	95% CI
1		7264				7266		
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$		0.37 (0.02)	15.90	< .001			
	Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$		0.04 (0.02)	2.07	.04		.024	.001, .047
	Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$		0.04 (0.02)	1.50	.13		.018	-.005, .041
	Number of observations, $\gamma_{03}^*$		0.0007 (0.0008)	0.82	.41		.010	-.013, .033
2		7261				7265		
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$		0.50 (0.03)	17.03	< .001			

Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$	0.01 (0.02)	0.44	.66	.005	-.018, .028
Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$	0.05 (0.02)	2.38	.02	.028	.005, .051
Target's closeness mean, $\theta_{10}$	-0.67 (0.06)	-10.42	< .001	-.12	-.144, -.099
Number of observations, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.0001 (0.001)	0.16	.87	.002	-.021, .025

3

7263

7265

Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	0.36 (0.02)	15.75	< .001		
Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$	0.05 (0.02)	2.51	.01	.030	.007, .053
Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$	0.04 (0.02)	1.54	.12	.018	-.005, .041
Anxiety*Avoidance, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.04 (0.02)	2.07	.04	.024	.001, .047
Number of observations, $\gamma_{04}^*$	0.0007 (0.0008)	0.97	.33	.011	-.012, .034

4

7260

7264

Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	0.49 (0.03)	16.88	< .001		
Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$	0.01 (0.02)	0.61	.54	.007	-.016, .030
Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$	0.05 (0.02)	2.41	.02	.028	.005, .051
Anxiety*Avoidance, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.02 (0.02)	0.83	.40	.010	-.013, .033
Target's closeness mean, $\theta_{10}$	-0.67 (0.06)	-10.45	< .001	-.12	-.14, -.099
Number of observations, $\gamma_{04}^*$	0.0002 (0.001)	0.20	.85	.002	-.021, .025

---

\* Fixed slope

2. For the closeness means model, we ran additional analyses with two covariates: (a) SES, since it significantly correlated with closeness and closeness SD, and (b) the total number of targets that each participant reported during ten weeks (range: 10-77) to indicate the participant's number of social connections, since this tends to be negatively related to closeness (Roberts, Dunbar, Pollet, & Kuppens, 2009). Results showed the associations of attachment style did not meaningfully change (see Table 2). SES was positively correlated with closeness,  $\gamma_{003} = 0.21$ ,  $t(7972) = 3.08$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $r_p(7984) = .034$  [.013, .056], such that the greater one's SES, the higher was the person's mean closeness. The total number of targets was negatively correlated with closeness,  $\gamma_{004} = -0.03$ ,  $t(7972) = -4.02$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $r_p(7984) = -.045$  [-.067, -.023], such that the more targets the participant reported, the lower was the person's mean closeness. All predictors were grand-mean centered.

Table 2.

*Fixed Effects Coefficients for Closeness Mean Level and Trend Model with Additional Covariates.*

Predictor	df	Coefficient (SE)	t value	p value	Partial Correlation		
					df	r	95% CI
	7972				7984		
Intercept, $\gamma_{000}$		5.93 (0.06)	102.23	< .001			
Avoidance, $\gamma_{001}$		-0.15 (0.07)	-2.27	.02		-.025	-.047, -.003
Anxiety, $\gamma_{002}$		0.10 (0.08)	1.31	.19		.015	-.007, .037
Time, $\pi_{100}^*$		0.02 (0.003)	6.82	< .001		.076	.054, .098
Time <sup>2</sup> , $\pi_{200}^*$		-0.002 (0.001)	-2.60	.01		-.029	-.051, -.007
SES, $\gamma_{003}$		0.21 (0.07)	3.08	.002		.034	.013, .056

Total number	-0.03 (0.01)	-4.02	< .001	-0.045	-0.067, -0.023
of targets,					
$\chi^2_{004}$ *					

---

\* Fixed slope

3. For the closeness fluctuations model, we ran additional analyses including covariates such as SES, the total number of targets that each participant reported, and the number of times each target was mentioned ( $M = 7.31$ ,  $SD = 2.67$ , range: 2-10). Results showed in the first model, the association of avoidance changed from significant to marginal. In the third model, the significance of the interaction term of avoidance and anxiety also decreased. No other associations of the original predictors changed meaningfully (see Table 3). SES negatively associated with closeness fluctuations in all of the models, such that the higher one's SES, the more stable the person's closeness was. The total number of targets reported did not show any significant association with fluctuations in all of the models. The number of times the target was mentioned positively associated with closeness fluctuations in all of the models, such that the more frequently the target was mentioned, the more the closeness ratings fluctuated. All predictors were grand-mean centered.



Table 3.

*Fixed Effects Coefficients for Closeness Fluctuations Model with Additional Covariates.*

Model	Predictor	df	Coefficient (SE)	t value	p value	Partial Correlation		
						df	r	95% CI
1		7262				7264		
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$		0.36 (0.02)	17.36	< .001			
	Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$		0.04 (0.02)	1.74	.08	.020		-.003, .043
	Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$		0.04 (0.02)	1.67	.10	.020		-.003, .043
	SES, $\gamma_{03}^*$		-0.10 (0.02)	-4.41	< .001	-.052		-.075, -.029
	Total number of targets, $\gamma_{04}^*$		0.001 (0.002)	0.43	.67	.005		-.018, .028
	Number of times target was mentioned, $\beta_{10}^*$		-0.02 (0.002)	-8.13	< .001	-.095		-.118, -.072
2		7259				7263		
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$		0.50 (0.03)	16.91	< .001			
	Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$		0.005 (0.02)	0.23	.82	.003		-.020, .026
	Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$		0.05 (0.02)	1.99	.05	.023		.0003, .046

	Target's closeness mean, $\beta_{10}$	-0.71 (0.07)	-10.82	< .001		-.13	-.15, -.10
	SES, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.01 (0.02)	0.28	.78		.003	-.020, .026
	Total number of targets, $\gamma_{04}^*$	0.005 (0.002)	2.10	.04		.025	.002, .048
	Number of times target was mentioned, $\beta_{20}^*$	0.02 (0.002)	9.91	< .001		.12	.093, .14
3		7261				7263	
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	0.36 (0.02)	17.02	< .001			
	Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$	0.04 (0.02)	1.98	.05		.023	.0003, .046
	Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$	0.04 (0.02)	1.67	.10		.020	-.003, .043
	Anxiety*Avoidance, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.02 (0.02)	1.27	.20		.015	-.008, .038
	SES, $\gamma_{04}^*$	-0.10 (0.02)	-4.16	< .001		-.049	-.072, -.026
	Total number of targets, $\gamma_{05}^*$	0.001 (0.002)	0.44	.66		.005	-.018, .028
	Number of times target was	-0.02 (0.002)	-8.10	< .001		-.095	-.12, -.072

mentioned,  $\beta_{10}^*$

4	7258				7262		
	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	0.50 (0.03)	16.73	< .001			
	Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$	0.01 (0.02)	0.38	.70	.004	-.019, .027	
	Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$	0.05 (0.02)	2.01	.04	.024	.001, .047	
	Anxiety*Avoidance, $\gamma_{03}^*$	0.02 (0.02)	0.78	.44	.009	-.014, .032	
	Target's closeness mean, $\beta_{10}$	-0.71 (0.07)	-10.84	< .001	-.13	-.15, -.10	
	SES, $\gamma_{04}^*$	0.01 (0.02)	0.39	.70	.005	-.018, .028	
	Total number of targets, $\gamma_{05}^*$	0.005 (0.002)	2.10	.04	.025	.002, .048	
	Number of times target was mentioned, $\beta_{20}^*$	0.02 (0.002)	9.91	< .001	.12	.093, .14	

---

\* Fixed slope

4. For the multiplexity model, we ran additional analyses including SES as a covariate. The results for avoidance and anxiety did not meaningfully change (see Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4.

*Negative Binomial Regression Analysis for Total Number of Targets Mentioned with SES.*

Predictor	<i>df</i>	Coefficient (SE)	<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> value	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
	108				
Intercept		2.38 (0.23)	10.24	< .001	10.77 (6.84, 16.98)
Avoidance		0.14 (0.04)	1.21	< .001	1.15 (1.07, 1.24)
Anxiety		0.05 (0.04)	3.70	0.23	1.05 (.97, 1.15)
SES		-0.05 (0.04)	-1.10	0.27	0.95 (.87, 1.04)

Table 5.

*Linear Regression Analysis for Log-Transformed Total Number of Targets Mentioned with SES.*

Predictor	df	Coefficient (SE)	t value	p value	Partial Correlation		
					df	r	95% CI
	108				108		
Intercept		2.46 (0.21)	11.58	<.001			
Avoidance		0.10 (0.04)	2.92	.005		.27	.088, .44
Anxiety		0.04 (0.04)	1.10	.27		.11	-.084, .29
SES		-0.06 (0.04)	-1.33	.19		-.13	-.307, .062

5. For the closeness fluctuations model, we ran an additional model which included the interaction term of the total number of targets reported and the number of times the target was mentioned. This was in order to further explain the finding that the more the target was mentioned, the greater were the participant's fluctuations in perceived closeness to the target. One explanation is that the number of social connections, which is known to associate with felt closeness (Roberts, Dunbar, Pollet, & Kuppens, 2009), moderates this association. Indeed, the interaction term was significant,  $\gamma_{11} = 0.001$ ,  $t(7257) = 3.63$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $r_p(7261) = .043$  [.020, .066] (see Table 6). Our results imply that for those who have more social connections, their perceived closeness to important others may not be as stable compared to those with fewer social connections.

Table 6.

*Fixed Effects Coefficients for Additional Closeness Fluctuations Model.*

Predictor	df	Coefficient (SE)	t value	p value	Partial Correlation		
					df	r	95% CI
	7257				7261		
Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$		0.50 (0.03)	17.04	< .001			
Avoidance, $\gamma_{01}^*$		0.01 (0.02)	0.25	.80	.003		-.020, .026
Anxiety, $\gamma_{02}^*$		0.04 (0.02)	1.98	.05	.023		.0002, .046
Target's closeness mean, $\theta_{10}$		-0.71 (0.06)	-10.91	< .001	-.13		-.15, -.10
Avoidance*Anxiety, $\gamma_{03}^*$		0.01 (0.02)	0.74	.46	.009		-.014, .032
SES, $\gamma_{04}^*$		0.01 (0.02)	0.40	.69	.005		-.018, .028



Total number of targets, $\gamma_{05}^*$	0.01 (0.002)	2.56	.01	.030	.007, .053
Number of times target was mentioned, $\theta_{20}^*$	0.02 (0.002)	8.81	< .001	.10	.080, .13
Total number of targets*Number of times target was mentioned, $\gamma_{11}^*$	0.001 (0.002)	3.63	< .001	.043	.020, .066

---

\* Fixed slope

**References:**

Roberts, S. G., Dunbar, R. I., Pollet, T. V., & Kuppens, T. (2009). Exploring variation in active network size: Constraints and ego characteristics. *Social Networks*, *31*, 138-146.