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Abstract
While college completion is predictive of individual career happiness and economic achievement, many factors, such as excessive alcohol usage, jeopardize college success. In this paper, we propose a method for analyzing large-scale, longitudinal social media timelines to provide fine-grained visibility into how the behaviors and trajectories of alcohol-mentioning students differ from their peers. Using propensity score stratification to reduce bias from confounding factors, we analyze the Twitter data of 63k college students over 5 years to study the effect of early alcohol usage on topics linked to college success. We find multi-year effects, including lower mentions of study habits, increased mentions of potentially risky behaviors, and decreases in mentions of positive emotions. We conclude with a discussion of social media data’s role in the study of the risky behaviors of college students and other individual behaviors with long-term effects.

Introduction
College is an important transition period in the life of young adults (Arnett 2000; Lu 1994). Success in college can predict individual career success, career happiness, and economic achievement (Griliches and Mason 1972), and is of broader societal importance as well, as high rates of post-secondary degree holders are believed to drive income levels and other measures of macro-economic growth (Krueger and Lindahl 2000). Yet, approximately one in three college students leaves without earning a degree (Shapiro et al. 2015). Many factors, including adjustment challenges, family responsibilities, financial pressures, and individual behaviors can jeopardize college success (Pantages and Creedon 1978; DeBerard, Spielmans, and Julka 2004; Tinto 1987).

One factor negatively associated with college success is excessive alcohol consumption. On average, college students drink more than their same age non-college peers (Schulenberg et al. 2001). This is a persistent public health issue, including high rates of binge drinking and wide-ranging consequences such as hangovers, lowered academic performance, DUI arrests, risky sexual behavior, sexual and other assaults, and alcohol-related injuries and deaths (Johnston et al. 2011; Nelson et al. 2009; Hingson, Zha, and Weitzman 2009; Hingson 2010; Wechsler et al. 1995; Musgrave-Marquart, Bromley, and Dalley 1997).

Given this wide range of effects of college drinking, research methods to address the issue will benefit from incorporating as many aspects of the lives of college students as possible. This paper utilizes a large-scale, longitudinal social media data set to provide a view into a broader group of college students which can supplement large sample longitudinal self-report research, such as the Monitoring the Future study (Johnston et al. 2011). Given the high frequency of posting, we find that social media streams provide a granular and in situ reporting of students’ topical interests, behavioral patterns and activities, including risky behaviors such as alcohol use, and the contexts and consequences of these activities which are difficult to capture at scale through existing methods.

We thus generated a multiyear dataset of the social media timelines of 63,387 students entering college in 2010, capturing their timelines from August 2010 through May 2015. We focus on the effect of drinking early in college, using propensity score analyses to identify increased likelihood of mentions of scholastic and social outcomes, such as study habits, social relationships, and even criminal activity of those who mention drinking during their first semester versus those that do not.

The primary contribution of this paper is a longitudinal analysis of long term effects of drinking early in college that utilizes propensity scoring stratification to minimize confounding factors. Multiyear outcomes are associated with early alcohol exposure, including fewer mentions of study habit and social relationships, and sustained increases in mentions of alcohol and other risky behaviors including criminal activity. This analysis fills a gap in the literature on alcohol use in college by showing that social media-based measures of alcohol use early in college can be used to assess the future likelihood of negative outcomes later in college.

Background and Related Work
Challenges in the College Period
College is the first time that many young adults live outside the home and a time when “emerging adults” are developing new social, cognitive, and awareness skills (Arnett 2000). While many college students successfully manage this tran-
tion, graduating and emerging into adulthood, there are also many students who experience significant challenges. Studies going back decades find stubbornly high attrition rates, reporting that up to 40% of students leave without a degree (Porter 1989; Pantages and Creedon 1978).

Many factors are associated with or predict academic performance and college attrition, including academic and social integration variables (Terenzini and Pascarella 1978; McKenzie and Schweitzer 2001). However, while prior academic experience and success are significant predictors, they do not account for the most success variance (McKenzie and Schweitzer 2001; Wolfe and Johnson 1995). Instead, many studies have found that psychological measures are strongly associated with college success. Lecompte et al. find that expectation of academic success has a positive association with actual academic success and low attrition (Lecompte, Kaufman, and Rousseau 1983). Gerdes and Mallinckrodt find that emotional and social adjustment better predicts attrition than prior academics (Gerdes and Mallinckrodt 1994).

Studying factors related to academic success and challenges in college can help drive interventions to better support students in need, including early intervention programs in high schools, appropriate counseling services, financial aid, academic services, and programs that aid student socialization and community integration (Clark and Halpern 1993; Valentine et al. 2009). Methodologically these studies use surveys primarily, which are often limited to single institutions, rely on participant recall, and are subject to response biases. Ideally, social media-based research can complement existing methods, deepen understanding of real experiences given its in situ nature, and provide a timeliness that can be leveraged for intervention.

Research methods to study college student behaviors, stressors, and related outcomes, have to date been largely limited to self-report surveys and interviews, and in-person or deliberate recruiting research. While such methods have many benefits, including the ability to gather rich, open-ended detail, they also have significant limitations, including having relatively small sample sizes from single-institution studies, limiting generalizability of findings.

**College Students and Social Media**

Approximately 80% of young adult internet users (ages 18-29) use social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram, Tumblr), with 27% on Twitter specifically (Duggan and Brenner 2013). As usage of social networking sites among college students has grown, content posted by students has become a significant information source, albeit biased, about students’ fine-grained activities and interactions.

Many studies of social networking site usage among college students have found that social networks play an important role for students in this transition period. Social media provides informational and social support, a source of connection to other students and university community, as well as connection to family and friends (Ellison et al. 2011; Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe 2007). Gray, Vitak, Easton and Ellison study social adjustment to college in freshman year using online social network measures such as number of friends, and find positive relationships between engagement and collaboration with other students through Facebook and measures of social support and adjustment (Gray et al. 2013).

Previous research has shown that measures derived from social media posts can predict alcohol related behavior. Marczinski et al. (Marczinski et al. 2016) assessed alcohol-related Facebook activity, finding it predictive of measures of alcohol use quantity and frequency and risk of alcohol use disorder. Social media posts by others in one’s network has also been shown to predict later alcohol usage, particularly for male students. For example, undergraduate first years’ exposures to alcohol-related content in their first 6 weeks predicted alcohol use six months later (Boyle et al. 2016). Building on this research, we examine downstream effects of alcohol use, measured through social media post activity.

**Longitudinal Studies of Online Data**

Longitudinal studies of online data, including social media data and search query logs, have proven effective in helping understand the behaviors of people in various situations. These studies have been targeted to explore and understand how situations evolve over time, identify predictive factors involved in positive and negative outcomes, and help identify at-risk individuals. For example, using search query logs, Paul et al. (Paul, White, and Horvitz 2015) characterize the information seeking behavior during various phases of prostate cancer. Fourney et al. (Fourney, White, and Horvitz 2015) align search query logs with the natural clock of gestational physiology of pregnant women to characterize their changing information needs. Althoff et al. study 5 years of fitness tracking data to better understand social influence on physical activity (Althoff, Jindal, and Leskovec 2017).

By mining social media, De Choudhury et al. (De Choudhury et al. 2013) find behavioral cues useful to predict the risk of depression before onset. Similarly, by leveraging these naturalistic data, prior work examined how dietary habits vary across locations (Abbar, Mejova, and Weber 2015); the links between diseases, drugs, and side-effects (Myslín et al. 2013; Paul and Dredze 2011); links between actions and outcomes (Kiciman and Richardson 2015); and shifts in suicidal ideation (De Choudhury et al. 2016). Olteanu et al. demonstrate propensity scored analysis of social media timelines to understand outcomes across a broad set of domains (Olteanu, Varol, and Kiciman 2017).

**Methods**

**Identifying Students Entering College**

To identify students entering college, we first use high-recall, low-precision phrase matching to select a set of tweets indicating the author may be starting college. Then, we apply a high-precision text classifier to identify individuals who are very likely to be starting college. Thus, after retrieving a large set of tweets related to college attendance, our high-precision classifier distinguishes between tweets indicating the author is starting college (“Can’t wait to start college next week”) and tweets that do not (“Can’t wait for college football”).

We create our high-recall, low-precision phrase set using an iterative keyword generation procedure of tweet retrieval, evaluation, and keyword expansion. We identify a list of 87...
phrases related to college attendance, and extract 639k tweets that match these keywords during a 5-month period in the fall of 2010 (August-December 2010) in our organization’s archive of the Twitter firehose, restricting our analysis to only Twitter users with English-language profiles. Table 1 shows tweets identified by top phrases.

To build our classifier, we labeled a selection of 1000 tweets from our initial retrieval using Mechanical Turk judges. For each tweet, we asked three judges to indicate whether the author was in or soon to be in college; not in college; or cannot tell. For in-college tweets, we asked whether the author appeared to be in or entering their first year. We remove tweets where a majority of judges disagree on the label and downsample to create a balanced dataset of 634 tweets by first year students and others. Using unigrams, bigrams, and part-of-speech tags as features, we train a logistic regression classifier with 10-fold cross-validation and achieve a classification f-score of 0.78 (AUC=0.85). We set a high acceptance threshold to trade off recall for high precision. Our final classifier achieves a precision of 88% and a recall of 25%.

We retrieved from our Twitter firehose archive all tweets (including retweets) by these users during the almost 5-year period from August 2010 through May 2015. This time period is intended to cover the full 4 to 5 year college tenure of students. This dataset contains 658,905,460 tweets by the 63,387 users over almost 5 years.

We note here that for privacy and ethics considerations, all tweet content used is publicly available, all analyses were conducted anonymously, and all results aggregated. Further, example tweet texts used in this paper for illustration purposes have been paraphrased and subsequently checked via Twitter search to ensure tweet authors are not identifiable.

Characterizing Tweet Content

Identifying Alcohol Usage We identify potential signs of drinking alcohol using a curated list of keywords associated with alcohol. Our keywords are developed by one of the authors, a research expert on alcohol usage and risky behavior, based on commonly used phrases and slang for drinking in addition to the most popular brands of beer and liquor and retail store sales by a market research firm.

Keywords were further refined through multiple iterations to identify additional terms and phrases commonly used in conjunction with these brands and drinking indicators, and to disambiguate from false positives. Our final keyword list consists of 111 words and phrases about alcohol use. A selection can be found in Table 3. We apply these keywords to all original tweets (not retweets) to identify users mentioning alcohol consumption.

Identifying Topics Relevant to College Success To better understand the relationship between alcohol mentions and outcomes that might be affect college success, we seek to identify effects that are known to be linked to college success: peer group interactions, family responsibilities, study habits, negative academic outcomes, financial pressures and legal/criminal challenges. To bridge between these high-level concepts and the textual representation of social media timelines, we used Empath (Fast, Chen, and Bernstein 2016) to systematically generalize from a sample of seed words in our selected topics to related words in the same lexical category. Using Empath, we generate a short, non-overlapping list of 20-60 related words for each concept (Table 2). In addition, we also analyze the effects of alcohol mentions and Empath’s built-in 195 human-validated topics, including additional risky behaviors, emotional topics, and other indicators of social and work-related topics.

Propensity Score Analysis

Our analysis goal is to understand the effects of experiences (e.g., drinking alcohol) mentioned early in a person’s college career using observational study. Because we are interested in better understanding potential mechanisms and possible interventions, our goal is fundamentally one of causal inference. While we do not believe we can achieve the ideal identification of causal relationships, we can use methods borrowed from the causal inference literature to reduce the bias of naive correlational analyses. Prior research demonstrates the feasibility of this approach. For example, Eckles and Bakshy reduced bias in an observational study by 97% compared to a naive analysis, as measured against a gold-standard randomized field experiment, by conditioning on high-dimensional covariate data (Eckles and Bakshy 2017). Towards this end, we similarly condition on high-dimensional covariate data — the distribution of words used by individuals in the 6 weeks from Aug. 1 through Sep 15, 2010 — with the aim of reducing bias in our estimates of causal effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword Phrase</th>
<th>Positive example</th>
<th>Negative example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>day of college</td>
<td>First day of college is tuesday. I am not ready yet :(</td>
<td>my little sis is leaving for her first day of college @ UMich.. * thos aren't tears *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college tomorrow</td>
<td>Last day on the beach! :( headed to college tomorrow :)</td>
<td>so bummer I even want to go visit my dream college tomorrow might just stay in bed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start college</td>
<td>woah can't believe I start college tomorrow, today is the last official day of vacation.</td>
<td>when you start college are you going to focus on that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to college</td>
<td>@user nervous going to college is gonna be big change for me:D</td>
<td>old guy told me if I plan on going to college, ill need better posture, wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my first college</td>
<td>Had my first college class!! its official I am a college student</td>
<td>at my first college I got in trouble because I didn't go to church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my first semester</td>
<td>Just paid tuition for my first semester of university... my wallet is sad :(</td>
<td>rereading the essays when I did my first semester 3 years ago. my writing sucked LOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Top college-attendance keywords and paraphrased examples of tweets passing or failing our high-precision classifier.
In medical and social sciences literature, the target experience is often called the treatment, and is compared to a control or placebo experience. We will use the term Alcohol group and Control group in this paper.

Table 2: Topics linked to college success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Seed words</th>
<th>Final topic words</th>
<th>Example Tweets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer group interaction</td>
<td>friend, boyfriend, girlfriend</td>
<td>boyfriend, buddy, roommate, bandmate, fiance, +20 more</td>
<td>Yup buddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibilities</td>
<td>mother, father, brother, sister</td>
<td>mother, father, brother, step-dad, grandmother, +21 more</td>
<td>Thanks for my little bro and mom I have a sister #fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study habits</td>
<td>study, library, homework</td>
<td>study, library, math, tutor, textbooks, worksheets, +49 more</td>
<td>anyone that wants to study for history we're in the library but anyways ima off to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial pressures</td>
<td>debt, student loans, loans</td>
<td>wages, afford, utilities, tuition, evicted, fees, +28 more</td>
<td>finally my wages wooo #anon its all about money. Im in debt. dont want more loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/criminal challenges</td>
<td>police, cops, jail, parole</td>
<td>cops, police, restraining, probation, rehab, +15 more</td>
<td>meeting my parole officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: (a) Schematic description of our analysis procedure.; (b) Population CDF of active days of alcohol mentions during Sep. 15-Dec. 15, 2010. 37% of users never mention alcohol during this period, while 19.7% mention alcohol on over 10% of the days they are active on Twitter.
smoothed word likelihood and include the top 50k unigrams in our corpus for covariates, and a fixed vocabulary of the top 10k unigrams for outcome words, not including URLs and user mentions. We do not remove stopwords, stem or normalize the text, and use whitespace and punctuation to identify word-breaks. We combine outcome word likelihoods for all words in a given topic to generate the total topic likelihood.

We implement our high-dimensional propensity score analysis as a logistic regression with 10-fold cross-validation. Our analysis divides users into 100 strata, removes strata with either or both too few Alcohol or too few Control users. In practice, this removes the lowest-propensity strata and the highest-propensity strata, leaving the middle strata in these analyses. The outcome differences in these remaining strata are weighted according to the Alcohol population distribution and combined to estimate the average treatment effect on the treated population (Alcohol group).

In terms of assessing statistical significance of differences between the Alcohol and Control conditions, we include in the relevant figure captions p-values and Cohen’s d effect sizes. These were obtained by comparing monthly aggregates of topical word likelihoods over all people in each of the two conditions. Thus these statistics are based on an N of 55 months rather than an N of tens of thousands of people in the study. This is therefore a conservative estimation of differences between the Alcohol and Control groups.

_data and Analysis Limitations_

While social media data is recognized as a rich data source, capturing a wide array of information about both on-line and off-line human behavior, experiences and dynamics, we recognize the many factors that bias social media data sets and their representation of on-line and off-line events. These factors include population biases (Mislove et al. 2011; Diaz et al. 2016), self-presentation and behavioral biases (Kıcıman et al. 2012; Gong et al. 2016), potential algorithmic confounding (Hargittai et al. 2010) and biases introduced by differing affordances in the underlying social platform (Malik and Pfeffer 2016). With a longitudinal study such as this, survival bias (who continues to tweet over time) is also a potential biasing factor. Furthermore, though we augment our quantitative analyses with qualitative sampling of underlying messages, we do rely significantly on various machine-learned classifiers and mappings, such as the propensity score estimator, and machine learned topic mappings. Systematic errors in these algorithms may lead to unexpected biases.

Our propensity score analysis may be affected by unobserved confounding variables. In particular, the effects we identify should be interpreted as being linked to the social and physical circumstances both on-line and off-line that lead individuals to post alcohol mentions. As our analysis only stratifies on potential confounds measured prior to Fall 2010, experiences occurring concurrently with our counts of alcohol mentions during the Fall 2010 are effectively unobserved confounders, and their influence will be entangled in our results. Similarly, it is possible that the Control group population contains people who mentioned alcohol prior to our observation period but not during their first college semester. Finally, our analysis assumes treatment effects on an individual are independent of others’ treatment status.

_college Student Timelines_

Our data consists of 658M tweets by 63k users, recorded from Aug. 1, 2010 to May, 2015, representing approximately 12 messages per day per active user. Each tweet includes message text, creation date, user id, and profile location.

_user characteristics_

We briefly characterize of the gender and geographic makeup of the individuals in our dataset. The gender distribution, inferred from users’ first names cross-referenced with United States Social Security Service records of annual births, indicates that our user base consists of a plurality of users with names identifiable as female names (40.6%). The remainder of accounts are split among male (29.8%) and users with names not identified with a gender (29.5%).

Applying a high-coverage learned mapping from users’ profile locations to their geographic regions, we see that 57.2% of our users are placed within the United States, with the largest remainder in the United Kingdom (22.4%) and Canada (2.8%), followed by a broad variety of other countries (14.2%) and unidentifiable or blank profile locations (3.1%)². Note that this skewed distribution to largely English-speaking countries comes about because we restricted our dataset construction to consider only Twitter accounts with an English-language profile. As of Sep. 15, 2010, the users in our dataset had a median of 77 followers (10th percentile=11; 90th percentile=537; max=1.6M). Users followed a median of 104 accounts (10th=23; 90th=485; max=96k). Users had tweeted a median of 1221 tweets prior to Sep. 15, 2010 (10th=60; 90th=10k; max=154k).

_VALIDATION of Covariate Balance: To validate that our stratified propensity score analysis is creating statistically comparable alcohol and control groups, we calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) of each of our covariates in the two groups, as recommended by (Stuart 2010). SMD is defined as the difference in mean covariate value between the two groups divided by the standard deviation of the treatment population. Conventionally, two groups are considered balanced if all covariates have an absolute SMD less than 0.25 (Stuart 2010). Before our analysis, the maximum absolute SMD among our 49k covariates—including tweet frequencies, tweet lengths, and word distributions—was 0.997 standard deviations. After, the maximum absolute SMD is reduced to 0.207, and the median is 0.0124.

Alcohol Mentions

Applying our curated list of alcohol related keywords, we find 4,865,291 tweets from 58,618 unique users over the entire time period and 365,474 tweets from 39,723 unique users.
were significantly less likely (\(p<.05; \text{effect size } = .65\)) to mention studying over the next two years, and somewhat less likely (\(p=.12; \text{effect size } = .30\)) over the entire time period. Figure 2: Academic effects: People in the Alcohol group were more likely to mention legal and criminal challenges through most of our study (\(p<.001; \text{effect size } = .65\)); and slightly more likely to mention financial difficulty was approximately the same across the two groups other than a slight increase by the Alcohol group relative to the Control group divided by that for the Alcohol group. The results of our analysis are shown in Figures 2 - 4, where we see the relative treatment effect (RTE) of alcohol mentions on our selected topics, as well as the weighted (i.e., comparable) measured outcomes for the Alcohol and Control groups. Measured outcomes are topical word likelihoods for the word category (the percent of words in the word category relative to the total number of words). Note that the y-axis values for the topical word likelihoods are irregular because of scale differences. Relative treatment effects are the ratio of the topical word likelihood for the Control group divided by that for the Alcohol group. Relative treatment effects > 1.0 indicate that people who mentioned alcohol in fall 2010 are more likely to mention the given topic than their counterparts. Effects < 1.0 indicate the opposite.

Effects of Alcohol Mentions

Effects on College-Success Linked Topics

We quantify the effects of alcohol consumption by first semester college students on a number of topics linked by prior literature to college success and failure. The results of our analysis are shown in Figures 2 - 4, where we see the relative treatment effect (RTE) of alcohol mentions on our selected topics, as well as the weighted (i.e., comparable) measured outcomes for the Alcohol and Control groups. Measured outcomes are topical word likelihoods for the word category (the percent of words in the word category relative to the total number of words). Note that the y-axis values for the topical word likelihoods are irregular because of scale differences. Relative treatment effects are the ratio of the topical word likelihood for the Control group divided by that for the Alcohol group. Relative treatment effects > 1.0 indicate that people who mentioned alcohol in fall 2010 are more likely to mention the given topic than their counterparts. Effects < 1.0 indicate the opposite.

Starting with academic outcomes (Figure 2), we see a relative treatment effect for the Alcohol Group to mention fewer words related to study habits (e.g., ‘study’, ‘library’, and ‘homework’) throughout nearly the entire college time period, and especially early during college. For almost the first two years of college they are 10% less likely to post about study habits, except during summer months when the two groups are effectively identical.

For non-academic outcomes, perhaps the strongest effect was for the Alcohol group to mention more legal and criminal related words for nearly the duration of college, with a relative treatment effect of about a 10% increase in use of such terms over the Control group (Figure 3). Discussion of financial difficulty was approximately the same across the two groups other than a slight increase by the Alcohol group over the second half of the first year of college.
Finally, social measures of family related posting remain fairly similar between the two groups (Figure 4), though if anything there is a slight trend for the Alcohol group to post at slightly lower levels, especially earlier in college. The relative treatment line for instance, generally remains at or below 1.0 for the first half of college. The Alcohol group was generally less likely to engage in friends related posting.

Taken together, these results suggest a picture of those students more likely to mention alcohol early in college as less focused initially on study habits, with increased legal and criminal concerns. Early financial difficulties, a known stressor on college success, and mildly depressed social interactions relative to controls may also contribute.

**Effects on Risky Behaviors**

One risky behavior is alcohol consumption itself. Previous research supports the conceptualization of alcohol consumption as varied trajectories throughout college and beyond, where some individuals who engage in risky alcohol consumption will continue to do so or increase their use after early adulthood, while others’ alcohol consumption will significantly decline as they go through a “maturing out” process as they take on new adult roles (Schulenberg and Maggs 2002; Dawson et al. 2006). To shed light on this, we study early mentions of alcohol by college students in our dataset and the measured effect on their future alcohol mentions. We find that people who mentioned alcohol during the fall of 2010 do mention alcohol at higher rates than their matched counterparts, for nearly the duration of the college time period, as shown in Table 4.

The relative treatment effect drops over the first two years and then stabilizes at about 1.15x. The weighted (i.e., comparable) proportion of alcohol mentions in the Alcohol group rises slightly over time, though the Control group rises more and meets the Alcohol group toward the end of college.

Alcohol use is not the only risky behavior college students engage in. Thus we also examined relative treatment effects for empath topics of other known risky behaviors. Recall that empath topics are human-validated lexical word categories (Fast, Chen, and Bernstein 2016). Table 4 also includes the effects of early alcohol mentions on people’s mentions of sex and party topics. Like the alcohol topic, the sex topic mentions are elevated compared to the Control group, though it decreases over the time period. Notably, the party topic skews toward the Control group effectively throughout the entire time period, lightly suggesting a tendency toward non-social drinking for the Alcohol group.

**Effects on Jobs Outcomes**

While we do not have data that bears directly on college outcomes, Table 4(e) shows that those in the Alcohol group are less likely to mention work and jobs throughout college, indicating overall less focus on employment, presumably a common transition for graduating students.

**Effects on Social-Emotional**

Examining social-emotional topics, Table 4(i) and 4(l) show that both social topics like friends, family, and home, as well as the positive and negative emotion topics start with an RTE lower than 1 but increase over time. In fact, for most of those topics the RTE flips by the end of college to a positive RTE for those in the Alcohol group. Notably, negative emotion shows an RTE that is always higher than that for positive emotion, and in fact rises above 1.0 while the RTE for positive emotion does not. Thus, while those in the Alcohol group generally use fewer emotion words than their counterparts, they are relatively more negative than positive, and do surpass their control counterparts in negative sentiment by late 2013.

**Other Strong Effects**

We identified empath topics that yielded the strongest effects for either those in the Alcohol or Control groups. To do this, we compared the the values of the two time series for each empath topic to identify topics for which the time series for the Alcohol group was notably above that for the Control group or vice versa. Table 5 shows the 10 topics with the strongest effects for the Alcohol group are very physical in nature and include the alcohol topic. For the Control group we see topics that are emotionally positive and church related. Note that after statistical correction for multiple tests, all effects in Table 5 remain highly significant.

**Discussion and Future Work**

The propensity score analyses indicate that consumption of alcohol early in college leads to fewer mentions of study habits along with heightened mentions of legal and criminal activity as compared to a stratified sample control group. Further exploration of effects suggests that those who drink early in college are also more likely to mention sexual words, and appear to be less focused on school and work. Social-emotional topics such as positive emotion words and relationship topics like friends and family were lower in the Alcohol group.

This suggests that early drinking, as reflected through social media data, is a correlate of future academic and social red flag indicators of increased student drop out risk. These
Table 4: Effects on risky behavior, social-emotional and broader context (p-value, Cohen’s d effect size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risky behavior</th>
<th>Alcohol Outcomes (p&lt;.001; d=2.2)</th>
<th>Sex Outcomes (p&lt;.001; d=1.6)</th>
<th>Party Outcomes (p&lt;.01; d=0.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Blue-collar Outcomes (p&lt;.05; d=0.4)</td>
<td>White-collar Outcomes (ns; d=0.3)</td>
<td>Work Outcomes (p&lt;.01; d=0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional RTE (p&lt;.001; d=1.2)</td>
<td>Neg. Emot. Outcomes (p&lt;.01; d=0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social RTE</td>
<td>Family Outcomes (p&lt;.05; d=0.4)</td>
<td>Friends Outcomes (n; d=0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Empath topics with strongest effects for Alcohol and Control groups. Effect refers to Cohen’s d effect size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Topic</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Control Topic</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eating</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>divine</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>exasperation</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquid</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooking</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swearing</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>cheerfulness</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugliness</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>pride</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hygiene</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>optimism</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kinds of analyses, in conjunction with the risk factors identified in prior research, may be able to improve identification of individuals at high risk not only for the current time period, but also help clarify which students will continue engaging in risky alcohol consumption.

One way to leverage these findings is through earlier interventions than those that would be initiated upon poor academic performance, school conduct issues, or legal problems (e.g., an arrest for underage drinking). At the individual level, interventions could include opt-in programs where students receive private feedback via apps or websites on their alcohol exposure. These could be particularly useful during the first semester and year at college when many students are experiencing novel levels of freedom and alcohol exposure. During this transition period, individuals are encountering new norms and establishing new peer groups, and as such, intervention at this stage may be particularly efficacious (Schulenberg and Maggs 2002; Borsari, Murphy, and Barnett 2007). Further, previous research supports a progression model of binge drinkers’ behavior of engaging in increasingly more careless and risky behaviors (Vik et al. 2000). Thus early interventions through timely awareness could make critical differences. At the student population level, universities and public health officials can leverage these data to better design programs targeting student awareness of potential consequences of early college drinking, alcohol consumption norms, and corresponding resources to help mitigate these effects.

Methodologically, social media as a data source provides a picture of college student behavior captured in situ, complementing existing methods such as self-report recall studies. Although subject to self-presentation biases, our
data show that many social media users in college are sufficiently free in their posts as to make public mentions of alcohol consumption. Previous research similarly suggests that posting alcohol-related content, particularly content which suggest personal drinking, predicts recent drinking, alcohol consumption levels, alcohol use disorder risk, and problems related to drinking (Westgate et al. 2014; Moreno et al. 2015).

One advantage of these data is that consequences of behaviors can be empirically determined from the data themselves rather than predetermined by researchers creating questionnaires and interview protocols. In our example analyses, we focused only on the first semester of college, but similar efforts such as propensity score analyses could be applied to any time frame to examine behavioral outcomes ranging from immediate (e.g., next day) to long term (e.g., college dropout likelihood). For many individuals, binge drinking and alcohol consumption in general decreases after college and their early twenties, but research such as this could help identify which of these risky drinkers are more likely to reduce their drinking after graduating and which are at higher risk of continuing or even increasing their drinking rates (Johnston, O’Malley, and Bachman 1999).

As future work, we plan to extend our study through to 2017 to further examine post-college experiences for those who started in 2010. This will enable analyses such as emotional, relationship, and general life satisfaction coming out of college, as well as any employment and financial outcomes. In addition, repeating our analyses for students beginning college in 2011, 2012 and 2013 will provide a test of the generalizability of our findings. We also plan to more deeply explore the possible heterogeneity of treatment effects, to better understand the specific contexts under which alcohol may have particularly detrimental effects on students.

**Conclusion**

We examined a dataset of social media timelines of young people entering the transformative life stage of college. For many, college marks a leap forward in independence, responsibility, and behavioral exploration. Prior research highlights the critical nature of college as a step toward future success in life, and yet 40% of students do not finish. Our hope is that detailed longitudinal data such as these can help us empirically explore factors that are predictive of success or failure in key outcomes, particularly so that undesirable outcomes like alcohol abuse and college dropout can be discovered and mitigated in a timely fashion.

**Ethical Considerations:** Our analyses include potentially sensitive topics, though our use of historical, publicly posted data simplifies some ethical considerations. At no point in our analysis did we attempt to ascertain the real identities of individuals in our dataset. We paraphrased for anonymity the tweets we give as examples. Thus no individual person was identified or could be identified from this work.
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